

# **2014 MPO TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES**

**January 81, 2014**

**February 12, 2014**

**March 12, 2014**

**April 9, 2014**

**May 14, 2014**

**June 11, 2014**

**July 9, 2014**

**August 13, 2014**

**September 10, 2014**

**October 8, 2014**

**November 12, 2014**

**December 10, 2014**

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014  
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:40 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Mike Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; and Patrick Dame, Airport Authority.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Stephanie Erickson, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Brett Sergenian, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Haugen declared a quorum was not present.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO ADJOURN THE JANUARY 8<sup>TH</sup>, 2013, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 1:43P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014  
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the February 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:33 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Mike Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Patrick Dame, Airport Authority; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Ryan Brooks, Grand Forks Planning; Ali Rood, Cities Area Transit; Dustin Lang, NDDOT- Grand Forks District; and Bobbi Retzlaff (Proxy For Joe McKinnon), MNDOT-RDC (Via Conference Call).

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

Guest(s) present were: Al Grasser, Grand Forks Engineer; Patty Olsen, Safe Kids Grand Forks; Bill Macki, Grand Forks Police; and Roger Hille, MNDOT-Bridge Division.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

Haugen asked that, because we have some new faces here today, everyone please state their name and the organization they represent.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 8<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BROOK, TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 8<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS**

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen referred to the packet and pointed out that it includes a staff report that discusses some recent action the MPO Executive Policy Board made, as well as a request they made to the Grand Forks and East Grand Forks City Councils. He explained that the MPO Executive Policy Board stated their preference for a cantilevered bike/ped accommodation off the Kennedy Bridge a couple of times, so in January MNDOT asked if they could come before the board to discuss that option. He stated that at the end of that discussion the MPO Board still wanted the cantilevered option to be considered, and asked the MPO Staff to approach each City Council for a resolution in support of that option. Haugen reported that the MPO Staff submitted the request to both City Councils, and both did adopt resolutions in support of the cantilevered option, copies of which are included in the packets as well. He added that both resolutions have been conveyed to the MnDOT Team.

Grasser said that he would like to expound just a bit on the City of Grand Forks' resolution, which they did modify slightly. He explained that the discussion that was held indicated that they were looking for more information before they actually made a decision. He added that it is his understanding, at least it is his hope, that some of that information will be coming through the Bridge Planning Study.

Grasser commented that, speaking for himself, and hopefully on behalf of the City; some of the things that he was looking at, that he feels will be important for them to consider at the community level would be whether or not we do an EA or an EIS. He explained that that could maybe add two years or so to the project. He added that he thinks what they are looking for, what he is hoping to see in the report, is more discussion on that, or affirmation of it, as well as what the timelines might be, what trigger points might be, etc.

Grasser stated that what has occurred to him is, if we delay the Kennedy Bridge for two years, that would move us to a 2018 timeframe, which would be concurrent with the Sorlie Bridge project. He said that he thinks it is important that if we can identify and understand what the permutations of that might be, and he doesn't know if there are any, but he knows that we can't do two bridges in one year, but he doesn't know if there are permutations with funding, so he would be looking for more insight, or understanding of what that might be.

Grasser commented that dollars are always a concern, and right now the local communities really don't have any dollars in the game, but would that change if we continue with the cantilevered bikepath option.

Grasser said that he knows this isn't supposed to be as real detailed study, but they are curious about tie-in points also, especially on the south side of the bridge. He commented that we have a historical structure, we have a flood protection structure, so, again, just some insight so they get a better sense of decisions and impacts so that they can come back to, and make knowledgeable

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

decisions as to what those are so the closest they can get to that would be great, so they are looking forward to seeing the plans.

Grasser asked if either Mr. Hille or Mr. Haugen know what the timetable is for completing the Bridge Study. Hille responded that the study should be out on Friday. He said that he has seen initial drafts, and because they need to move this project along and keep it on schedule, they are just as concerned, or maybe even more concerned, about both projects combining, so they fully plan to take that, and take a step out of it by not doing their normal DOT review, so it will be sent out to everybody on their Study Advisory Committee. He stated that you may see some things that maybe aren't quite as refined as you would like, but to do further refining would take another two weeks in the process, so he fully expects it to be out Friday, or certainly no later than early next week.

Hille commented that he thinks you will see some options laid out before MnDOT and NDDOT make their decision to go forward. Grasser said that he thinks this will be helpful. He added that, suffice to say, the City of Grand Forks, and others are very interested in getting this information and being a participant before any decisions are made, and again in understanding what any permutations may be about the different decision options that are there, so he fully expects that this will go back to the City Council.

Hille stated that he would like to give a short update on some of the challenges with this project, and answer any questions anyone might have.

Hille reported that the progress on this project has been going fairly well, on schedule, although they have delayed the final draft report another week because they are doing some internal audit checks to take care of any quality control issues, quality assurance issues, but it should be out this Friday, or early next week for comments.

Hille said that the intent of this is not to be a detailed study that says "this is the option we are going to proceed with", it is instead a broad statement that says that this is what a replacement study would look like, this is what the cost will be, this is what some of the rehab options will be.

Hille commented that the process they tried to go through with their Study Advisory Committee is to garner all the comments that they may not have foreseen otherwise, as well as to determine the level of concern. He said that there are three major concerns they are addressing on this project. He stated that the number one concern is that we have some structural issues with the pier that have to be addressed, and they have to be addressed soon. He said that he won't define soon because they are monitoring that pier on a six-month basis, and if they were to find that it is moving a whole lot more than it is right now they might have to take some kind of interim action. He added that the deck also has about four or five years of life left at the very most, so between now and the rehab project there will be a lot more patching on that deck.

Hille said that two other things that have come out is a major concern about traffic, and how it is handled during a rehab project; and the other is that we need all four lanes in terms of capacity. He stated that they are also hearing that projections for a six-lane structure are probably not

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

there. He commented that lastly they are hearing a lot of things about pedestrian traffic and allowing pedestrian and bike facilities on that structure. He said that they are hoping to go into this thing, they have done a lot of projects in a lot of communities, and they are hoping to do this one with a little bit more of a partnership type process than some of the others. He stated that he knows that there are resolutions out there saying that this is the option we want, but generally speaking they go into these projects saying that, as you make your decisions you need to make sure that you are spending enough time contemplating the pedestrian issue, and that you make sure you do address it.

Hille commented that there are many, many competing interests on this project; there are historical aspects affecting this project that if we were into replacement or major changes to the façade might put us into an EA or and EIS study. He added that there are some positives with a cantilevered structure in terms of more capacity for the vehicles, but there are certainly some negatives that we need to look at closely as well, such as whether it would put us into a different NEPA process, and does it change the corresponding schedule of the project.

Hille reported that MnDOT, along with its partners in North Dakota plan to take everything into account, so if there are going to be resolutions they would rather see resolutions that request that we make sure that we consider the needs of pedestrian and bicycle traffic, and vehicle traffic versus limiting us to one option.

Hille said that, if he can just speak to the cantilevered structure, they have not looked deep into it in terms of cost sharing. He stated that they know that a pedestrian facility on the bridge, in a cantilevered fashion can be done, but what happens once they get across the truss portion, does that become the City's responsibility, because at that point it is separate from the structure, and what does this mean in terms of cost sharing, and he doesn't know what it means in terms of the connects at each end, but he thinks they will need to have some additional communications and meetings to work those issues out.

Hille added that there is also the issue of fiscal responsibility, so if they can find a way that they think they can safely accommodate pedestrian and bicycle facilities within the truss system, they will want to look at that very hard, especially from a cost standpoint because he thinks their last estimate was in the \$2,500,000 range for that extra structure, and that certainly is not going to suffice if they have to include a new substructure on each side of the bridge.

Grasser commented that he heard that the six-lane investigation kind of fell by the wayside, is that because of lack of vehicular volume or lack of connectivity on the bridge. Hille responded that they only looked at the vehicular volume, so he was only referring to vehicle counts on that, a twenty-year projection.

Haugen stated that he feels that this has given everyone a good background on the study; and if you make those people on the Study Advisory Committee aware of the draft report, in turn we will make sure that the Technical Advisory Committee is aware of that draft report, which he would assume will be available on the Kennedy Bridge website. Hille responded that he isn't sure how they plan on distributing the document at this time.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Hille reported that when they went into this they really had to look at this structure to say: “Is there enough structure to salvage”. He added that they knew that some structural issues were major, and that was confirmed in the study by the concentration on Pier 6, of course; but as far as the structural capacity, especially of the gussets on the truss, it certainly looks like we can get another forty or fifty years out of the superstructure on that project. He said that exactly what needs to be done with the hanger connects and some of the approach spans, they aren’t there yet, but the bulk of the study was to determine if we can look at just a rehab and it is certainly looking like there is enough value in the truss to continue down that way.

Haugen asked, if you do a rehab what is the life that you would expect to get out of the rehab project; what is it you’re trying to achieve, forty years, fifty, sixty, etc. Hille responded that he hesitates to answer that because their consultant might challenge it. He said that, certainly with the truss they are rehabbing in Oslo, there are ways of rehabilitating that truss for a twenty year period, and there are ways to rehabilitate that truss and superstructure for a forty-year period; but he is going to guess that, just because of the volumes we are talking about here, they would not attempt a rehab that wouldn’t have at least a thirty-year life, so he would assume somewhere in that thirty-year to fifty-year life span.

Grasser asked if there is an opportunity to provide accent lighting on the bridge as an aesthetic feature, or would that be in conflict with the historical issues. He said that a few years back they had a discussion on the Sorlie where, between Grand Forks and East Grand Forks we added some accent lights to pretty-up the structure, and he is just wondering if anything like that is being contemplated on the Kennedy. Hille responded that he thinks that he can answer that by saying that conventional lighting on this structure will be part of the rehabilitation process, any accent lighting, any special lighting, and special sorts of things or signature structures would require local participation, so if you want a certain type of lighting you would be part of that design and cost process.

Bergman reported present.

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen stated that he doesn’t have any information available on the Sorlie, however there are some drafts being circulated around for review and comment, but he doesn’t believe they have been released for general public consumption. He asked if there is a timeline for when the Purpose and Need draft chapter would be available for the public. Hille responded that he is on his way to Bismarck tonight, and he knows that their next meeting will be going through more of the structural aspects of the report because an EIS is a major process, and there are conflicting thoughts among agencies as to whether or not that project will demand an EIS or an EAW, or even a CADX in terms of a NEPA process, but North Dakota has elected to go into that EIS process, and MnDOT supports it, but that is a lengthy process, so he thinks the concentration will be kind of how is it organized versus what is the content.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen reported that there is an Advisory Committee meeting next Tuesday, so maybe after that that chapter will be released for public consumption. Hille said that he thinks KLJ is using their website for distribution.

Information only.

**MATTER OF MINNESOTA SIDE CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE 2015-2018 T.I.P.**

a. TAP Project

Erickson reported that Safe Kids Grand Forks is applying for a Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) Grant to help fund the Safe Kids To School Program with the East Grand Forks Public School system. She explained that TAP now combines Transportation Enhancement (TE), Safe Routes To School infrastructure, and Scenic By-Ways into one grant program.

Erickson stated that their goal is to get more training supplies, safety equipment, bicycle racks, and speed radar signs; and East Grand Forks is the sponsoring agency and they signed a resolution in support of this. She added that this is consistent with the MPO's Long Range Transportation Plan, and the Safe Routes To School Coordinator supports this.

Haugen pointed out that Patty Olsen, Safe Kids Grand Forks, is present today for any questions you may have. He stated that this, again, is on the Minnesota side and the TAP application is for FY2017 and FY2018. He added that there was a total of \$900,000 set aside for TAP projects, and there is no minimum application amount for non-construction projects, so this doesn't fall below any type of minimum amount, therefore staff is recommending that this body forward a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board that this is consistent with our planning documents, and, since it is the only application, to give it a top priority ranking.

***MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL NON-INFRASTRUCTURE TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM (TAP) APPLICATION AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND GIVE IT A PRIORITY RANKING.***

Olsen said that she just wants to say thanks to members of the MPO and the City of East Grand Forks who have helped and supported them. She stated that it has been a complicated process with the change in federal and state funding for Safe Routes To School projects, so they really appreciate the support and input they have had in putting this application together.

Brooks asked if there was a certain type or style of bike rack being considered. Olsen responded that they looked at the basic bike rack. She explained that they bought a bike rack for West Elementary last year, and it was just a basic \$400 bike rack, and what they saw at Southpoint last year when they did the "Bike to School Days" is that they are getting three or four times as many bikes as they have bike racks space for, but she would be happy to look at any racks you would

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

like considered. Brooks commented that they have been hearing that some of the old style racks don't fit with some of those new regulations, but if you start going with the new designs the costs will go higher than \$400 a rack.

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Haugen reported that tomorrow the ATP has invited the TAP Applicants to come and present their project to the ATP for consideration, so the ATP will have a presentation before the MPO Board to ensure they make the final decision on whether it is consistent and a high priority. He said that the ATP is just having the presentation, they aren't going to make decisions tomorrow, but they will make a decision in two weeks and by that time the MPO Executive Policy Board will have met and will we will probably be authorized to sign the application as being consistent and a high priority. He added that they typically like to have the MPO take its action before the next step, but just for timing purposes, this is how it worked out, and again, as Patty Olsen alluded to, this new TAP process on the Minnesota side has some growing pains.

b. City Sub-Target Project

Haugen referred to the staff report and pointed out that it states that we have received nothing on the State Highway system for FY2018; nor did we receive anything on the County System. He stated that every fourth year East Grand Forks is on rotation for the City Sub-Target Funds; and 2018 happens to be the year they receive those funds. He commented that in 2014, this year, they will be reconstructing 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.E.; and in 2018 East Grand Forks has submitted a project to convert a portion of 10<sup>th</sup> Street N.E. from gravel to pavement.

Haugen stated that the amount of federal funds available is still unknown. He said that one of the things the ATP will decide tomorrow is how much of the City Sub-Target they will take away from the City and convert to Transit Capital. He added that Minnesota is giving our ATP several hundred thousand dollars more for both the City and County system in FY2018, so, again, we, as an ATP have to decide how much of a value above \$0 we have to set aside for Transit Capital out of the City Sub-Target and the County Sub-Target programs.

Brooks asked how much East Grand Forks is spending on Transit Capital. Haugen responded that it isn't just East Grand Forks Transit Capital, it is for the whole district. Ellis stated that they are in need of a bus.

Haugen commented that the State of Minnesota has informed each ATP that they do have to set aside some highway dollars for Transit Capital out of the millions of highway dollars Minnesota receives, the only two programs that Transit Capital can come out of are the County Sub-Target and the City-Sub-Target.

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE LIST OF CONDIDATE PROJECTS FO RTHE FY2015-2018 T.I.P. AS***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

***BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND GIVE PRIORITY RANKING.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF NDDOT LOCAL ROAD SAFETY PLAN**

Haugen reported that an update presentation was given on the status of the work done on the NDDOT Local Road Safety Plan (a copy of the presentation was included in the file and available upon request). He added that if anyone is interested they can download the webinar at: <https://srfconsulting.filetrnsfers.net/downloadFilePublic.php?filePassId=d40dfcceb47c91f6c967b5fbd3d21ecf>.

Haugen explained that the plan is based on County boundaries and will include safety issues in the 12 Urban Areas of North Dakota. He added that ultimately there will be a plan for Grand Forks County, and the separate plan for the City will be a list of projects and a cost estimate for each.

Haugen stated that the plan is consistent with our plans.

Information only.

**MATTER OF STATUS OF METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

Haugen referred to the staff report, included in the packet, and pointed out that it states that both MnDOT and NDDOT have reviewed our Long Range Transportation Plan, and all comments have been addressed. He added that the plan has a five year shelf life which means that in January of 2019 we will need to do another update.

Haugen reported that there is one corrective action that we need to address; our Environmental Justice Manual needs to be updated to reflect new guidance regulations. He explained that our current document requires an “and” designation for our low income and minority concentrations of population, having both rather than just one or the other; while the new regulations require they have an “and/or” designation.

Haugen asked what the timeline is for making this correction. Johnson responded that it needs to be done as soon as possible as the Long Range Transportation Plan was approved subject to this change being made. Haugen stated that the reason he asked is because Teri Kouba will be attending Environmental Justice training in April, which will help with the update.

Williams asked if the City of Grand Forks would be getting a letter saying that their funding has been unfrozen now that the Long Range Transportation Plan has been approved. Johnson responded that they instructed the MPO to finalize their 2014-2017 T.I.P., which will do that.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

**OTHER BUSINESS**

a. Status of 2014-2017 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that staff will be seeking approval from the Technical Advisory Committee for the Final 2014-2014 T.I.P. at your March meeting. He added that between now and then there will be a lot of requests for T.I.P. tables.

Haugen commented that we will also begin working on the Draft 2015-2018 T.I.P. in April. He said that we finish one T.I.P. document and begin another.

Information only.

b. Status of 2014 Work Program

Haugen reported that last month we approved carrying over the Pavement Management and Freight Access projects into 2014. He said that the Traffic Incident Management Plan may be delayed until some training is able to be done, which would free up some additional monies for another project so if anyone has anything they would like the MPO to consider, please get that information to him as soon as possible.

Information only.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY LANG, TO ADJOURN THE FEBRUARY 12<sup>TH</sup>, 2014,  
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:23P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, March 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014  
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the March 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:36 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Mike Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division (via conference call); Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Rick Audette (Proxy for Patrick Dame), Airport Authority; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; and Bobbi Retzlaff (Proxy For Darren Laesch), MNDOT.

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

Guest(s) present were: Roger Hille, MNDOT-Bridge Division.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

Haugen asked that, because we have some new faces here today, everyone please state their name and the organization they represent.

Haugen reported that Joe McKinnon has been promoted and will no longer be assisting the MPO in its planning efforts, nor attending our Technical Advisory Committee meetings. His replacement is Darren Laesch. He stated that today is actually Mr. Laesch's first day, and he was unable to attend today's meeting, but should be in attendance at our next meeting.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 12<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 12<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

**SUSPENSION OF AGENDA**

**MATTER OF SELF-CERTIFICATION**

Haugen reported that typically when we adopt our Transportation Improvement Program we also do a self-certification that the document is completed and that it is consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan, and also that we have followed all of the requirements of relevant sections of the US Code and CFR.

Haugen referred to the Self-Certification document included in the packet, and pointed out that in the document we outline all of the activities that have taken place over the last twelve months to show that we are able to self-certify. He explained that for a long time this document was only included as an appendix to the overall T.I.P., however several years ago it was requested that we have it as a separate agenda item prior to the T.I.P. adoption.

Haugen commented that it is fairly straight forward as to what we are required to do, and how we have fulfilled doing those requirements.

Kuharenko referred to the “Planning Requirements” section, 1B(5), and pointed out that the sentence states: “To date, no complaints no complaints from the private...”. He said that we may want to remove one of the “no complaints” from the sentence.

Retzlaff referred to the signature page, and pointed out that the term “SAFETEA-LU” should be changed to “MAP-21”.

***MOVED BY GENGLER, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE 2013 SELF-CERTIFICATION, SUBJECT TO THE CHANGES DISCUSSED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**RESUME AGENDA**

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS**

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that, as indicated in the staff report, MnDOT released a draft of the Study Report to the Study Advisory Committee, and others, for review and comment. He said that he believes the comments are due March 17<sup>th</sup>, and then the Project Manager will assemble the comments and the Project Team will then prepare a response to those comments, and release the final draft of the Study Report.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Hille commented that they are at the point where they are going to do everything they can to accelerate the process, and they want to make sure there is ample time to comment.

Hille stated that he just wants to make sure that everyone has access to the draft report, and he is available for any questions or comments anyone might have. He said that he thinks it is important that everyone spend a little time, at this point in time, to read through the draft report. He added that it is on the website, and is pretty easy to navigate.

Kuharenko asked, once you get comments back, will copies of the responses be submitted to the respective City Councils. Hille responded that they will put the final report on the website and notify the City Council members that it is available for their review.

Hille commented that he doesn't know if there is anything since the original draft that's has monumentally changed. He said that a lot of discussion and planning has been held on the bike/ped facility, with a number of different concepts arising from those discussions. He added that they asked the consultant to delve quite a bit deeper into the challenges, the pros and cons, of inside the truss and outside the truss and those sorts of things. He said that it is quite a balancing act, folks, when you have the traffic aspects and wanting 14-foot lanes, and bicycle and pedestrian wanting additional facilities, and trying to meet all those needs, but he thinks the consultant has done a very nice job laying it out and discussing the various options.

Haugen stated that he would send the website link out to the Technical Advisory Committee members so they can download and review the document.

Haugen asked when a decision might be made, because the way the draft document lays out is that if you go down this track you're doing basically a CE Technical Memorandum, and if you go down this track you're probably going to be doing an EA Process, and if you're going down this track you're probably going to be doing an EIS Process, so when do you think that decision will be made, or has it been made. Hille responded that a decision has not been made, and they won't make that decision until they get all the comments in, so they the concept of the process is to get all the comments and formally ponder through and respond to them, and then put out a final draft.

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen stated that the Sorlie is going down the EIS track right from the start. He explained that there have been a couple of drafts of the Purpose and Needs Statement distributed to the Coordinating Agencies for their review and comment. He added that in looking at their website, it doesn't appear that they have released it to the public at this time.

Haugen reported that they have also produced what they are calling a "Methods Document" that sort of lays out how they will screen alternatives, or what the minimums are that they want to see done, and they have included primary and secondary criteria they want met.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen asked if the next Coordinator Meeting has been scheduled. Ellis responded that they have not.

Haugen commented that one sticking point had to do with the rehab option, and whether the screening criteria was a hard fifty-year life, or whether it could be a little softer and allow a 40-year or 45-year life, and so the Resource Agencies specific with historic preservation, he thinks they are going to meet with the Federal Highway and DOTs to try to reach some agreement on what that language should say.

Hille stated that it is a pretty concise, and to the point, abbreviation of a lot of discussion around; if it is in-fact a rehab option, rehab project, does it need to last approximately 50-years, at least 50-years, what are the grey areas, and, again, as he explained earlier, while they are trying to maybe avoid the EIS Process on the Kennedy, he thinks downtown, where you are absolutely attached to the Downtown Historic District, and all those other downtown elements, he believes that the EIS Process downtown is the right way to go as there are too many other elements down there, including the possibility, and they really want to look at getting it raised up a little bit, and anything you do involving hydraulics will cause mitigation issues.

Hille said that if this project goes into, and he thinks the least it will go into as an EA, it's a step backwards, or it is a step back in the process and it will still go through fast if you start it is a CAD-X, and you get down the road and determine you need to go with the EIS Process, you basically start over, and they can't afford to do that, they can't afford to let it go past 2018, so they felt they needed to go down that EIS Process.

Haugen asked if he knows if that discussion has taken place with the Historic Committee. Hille responded that it has not.

**MATTER OF FINAL 2014-2017 T.I.P.**

Haugen reported that we are now able to finally take action on our FY2014-2017 T.I.P. Document. He explained that this document was on hold until after we got our Long Range Transportation Plan updated. He said that now that the Long Range Transportation Plan Update has been completed we were informed at the end of January that our plan is up-to-date and our T.I.P. was unfrozen, so we are now able to take action.

Haugen commented that both States have already adopted their final S.T.I.P., so we should have a pretty solid reconciliation between the three documents as to what the projects are. He said that there are a couple of things he will highlight, but the first thing we need to do is hold the public hearing that we advertised for today.

a. Public Hearing

Haugen opened the public hearing.

There was no one present for discussion.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen closed the public hearing.

Haugen reported that staff was accepting written comments until noon today, no comments were submitted.

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that a copy of the T.I.P. document, however it is missing two things, the maps that showed where all the projects are in relationship to the year. He said they also had some Fiscal Year 2013 status reports and listing of obligations that were not completed at the time the packet was sent out, or the draft was submitted to the public, but they have all now been completed and he can show them if interested.

Haugen commented that the big thing that has occurred was that North Dakota, in their Final S.T.I.P., in Fiscal Year 2017, includes the Sorlie Bridge as a project, and therefore our T.I.P. needs to include it as a project in 2017 so that when MnDOT has to amend their S.T.I.P. to include our Adopted T.I.P., that will be something they will have to show in their S.T.I.P. as occurring in 2017 as well.

Haugen stated that the project funding for the Sorlie Bridge is only being shown with half of the cost estimate being funded in 2017, the remark section identifies that that half funding is only North Dakota's half, Minnesota still intends to fund their share of that project in 2018, so when you see the next draft T.I.P. cycle you will see the project showing up in 2017 as North Dakota's funding share and then in 2018, since we will include 2018 next time, you will see the other half coming on the Minnesota side. He added that until 2017 comes and goes that just might be the way it is shown in the next several T.I.P.s and S.T.I.P., as being funded in two separate years.

Haugen said that the projects are, again because both States have already adopted their final S.T.I.P.s, they had placeholders for these projects, the dollar amounts should be accurate. He added that they do have, as they have had in the past, for Grand Forks two illustrative projects; one is for the grade separation at 42<sup>nd</sup> Street, which also shows up in the ND S.T.I.P., and then there is the additional funding request for Phase 2 of Columbia Road. He explained that when the Columbia Road project was moved back a couple of years, the year of expenditure did not occur, so now there is about a half million dollar difference between what the current federal cap is and what it could be based on normal 80/20 splits.

Kuharenko said that he has a couple of questions on these two projects. He pointed out that the Columbia Road project almost looks like the numbers for the total and the local share might be off. He stated that the total value is actually, in this Illustrative Project, is actually less than what we are showing in the T.I.P., and the federal amount has increased, so he thinks that what might

have happened was that the total local amount might not have been the total City value. He added that he thinks that it is supposed to be is for a total of 6426 and a local of 2025 based on what was in the T.I.P. Williams asked if it should be listed in both the projects and the illustrative projects. Haugen responded that it is listed in both. Williams asked why that is. Haugen responded that it is because one is the fiscally constrained number and so if we didn't have it as an illustrative project the State, nor anybody else would consider giving you additional

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

money, so that is why it is listed twice. Kuharenko commented that it looks like the 5437, that is the total federal eligible that you have on there, but if you end up looking back in the rest of the T.I.P., where that project appears again, there is a 6020 in there that appears to be the total amount and not just the federal level.

Kuharenko stated that he did not see the 42<sup>nd</sup> Street Underpass project in the S.T.I.P. for \$40,100,000. Haugen responded that the S.T.I.P. doesn't show a dollar amount, but he can pull it out. Kuharenko said that he was kind of curious, looking at this one, as this project isn't until further out, and the fact that it gearing more towards acquiring right-of-way, he thought there were a number of other projects in the illustrative list that also were going to require right-of-way, and so he wondered what the reason was for including this project in the T.I.P. Haugen referred to a slide, and pointed out where it is located in the S.T.I.P. He added that the reason we are showing it in our T.I.P. is because it is in the S.T.I.P.; why it is still in the S.T.I.P., it may have been sort of a legacy and he thinks the original payback was going to happen in 2014, but then it was clarified that it would be done in 2013. He explained that there was advanced right-of-way purchased twenty years ago that had to get paid back so we had to list it for that reason, as well as because the City was doing their environmental document and the feds wouldn't take action on it unless it was listed in the T.I.P.

Haugen stated that a question we will need to ask ourselves when we do our next cycle is whether or not we still need to show the 42<sup>nd</sup> Street project as an illustrative project. He commented that we have federal action, whether it was the EA or EIS process, and it has been signed off on. He asked if they have their record of decision. Williams responded that she doesn't know if they have nor not. Johnson commented that actually the EA was revised and became a documented CAD-X. He said that he thinks it is going back and forth right now between their division and KLJ for comments, but Federal Highway is not acting on it, nor has the DOT acted on it. Haugen said, then, that this would be why we are still listing it.

Ellis referred to East Grand Forks Project Number 13, and pointed out that it should be for just a para-transit vehicle. She asked if, since we recently received TAP funds, will that go into the next T.I.P. Haugen responded it would, adding that it is a 2016 award. Ellis said that she should have a project number for that by the end of the month. Haugen stated that he has to publish the Draft Minnesota side T.I.P. at the end of March, so if he could get it sooner that would be good. Ellis responded that she got the paperwork today, and is meeting with Lou Tasa next week, so she will get it to him after that.

Williams asked which is the correct street for the Columbia Road Project, one says 14<sup>th</sup> and one says Knight Drive. Consensus was that it should be 14<sup>th</sup>.

b. Committee Action

***MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FINAL 2014-2017 T.I.P., SUBJECT TO THE CHANGES DISCUSSED.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF DRAFT RFP FOR PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT UPDATE**

Kouba reported that last October we did imagery so we could do this pavement analysis. She said that it is basically a continuation of everything that we have been working up to, and hopefully this will be able to update the conditions of our pavements, as well as get a report from them so we can have something to give to both City Councils so they can understand what the condition is based on a quantifiable source, with the caveat that, of course, there are always choices to be made that don't necessarily mean that we have to go by that exactly.

Kouba stated that they have this RFP out, they had it sent to the NDDOT for about a month now, and they have heard back nothing for changes or anything of that nature, so they should have, they are hoping to get the proposals back by the middle of April, and hopefully they should get something finished up sometime in July.

Kouba said that staff is looking for approval of this RFP.

Kuharenko said that, if memory serves, they are going to be using Goodpointe's ICON, when was the last time they got a GIS update. Kouba responded that also as a part of this they did update their GIS shape files, but she doesn't know if they put it in their ICON Data Base or not, but it should be there by the end of this process. Williams asked what date they pulled the GIS information to give to them. Kouba responded that the latest was August. Williams stated that they updated since then, so we probably need to get the latest GIS to them. Kouba responded that she will talk to them, it will be a matter of updating that information into the ICON, so if there are streets you want to be analyzed in the future you will need to make sure that those also have new IDs attached to those segments.

Johnson commented that he sent the RFP to Federal Highway for their review and comment, but has yet to hear back from them. He stated that the only thing he saw, and he doesn't know if it is appropriate for the RFP or more appropriate for the contract, but if he remembers correctly, when you go into the digital imageries they had a stipulation in there that the CPG funds are only applicable to functionally classified roadways, and he thinks that that same analysis and pay scales would be the same for actually analyzing the pavement; was that your plan, should that be in here, or what is the status on that. Haugen responded that it would be his understanding that when we did our work program it was clear that the MPO would only be doing the functionally classified streets, and we reached agreement with both cities that if they want their local streets done at the same time they would pick up their share of that cost. Johnson said that that is good, and that is what he remembered as well. He asked what was done with the right-of-way imagery RFP, did we put that in that RFP or was it in the contract. Haugen responded that he will look it up, but if someone wants to include language to make it consistent with what the RFP for the imagery was, they can do that, to make the RFP consistent. Teri responded that she believes it shows in the contract and not in the RFP for the other project. Haugen said that they will just verify, but if it is part of the motion, if it is there they will include it in this one, and if it isn't

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

there then they will be consistent. He added that whomever makes the motion should also include the caveat, or the condition of Federal Highway comments, if any.

***MOVED BY JOHNSON, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE RFP FOR THE PAVEMENT CONDITION ASSESSMENT SUBJECT TO CONSISTENT USE OF LANGUAGE CONCERNING THE USE OF CBD FUNDS, AND FEDERAL HIGHWAY COMMENTS, IF ANY.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF DRAFT SCOPE OF WORK FOR TRAFFIC COUNTING VIA VIDEO**

Haugen reported that this item approves the Scope-of-Work with ATAC to continue on our traffic counting study. He explained that Phase 1 was done last year, and consisted of assembling an inventory of what equipment we had, and doing a pilot location to see whether or not our video detection equipment at our traffic signals was okay to detect turning movements.

Haugen commented that the Phase 1 Study concluded that our equipment is capable of doing turning movement counts, so they proposed the Scope-of-Work included in the packet. He stated that they met with City staff, along with ATAC, on Thursday to make sure that everybody understands and is on board with what the equipment capabilities are, particularly regarding protocols as to how ATAC would have access to the signals, the cameras, and then with the data that is being stored, where that would be, what amount would be expected, and the protocols as to how it would eventually be dumped to ATAC to give us back reports that will help us identify the average daily traffics, the turning movement factors to use by time, day, year, etc.

Haugen referred to the first page of the agreement, and commented that in the initial draft there were 30 intersections listed as a result of Thursday morning's meeting, but we actually have 31 intersections identified, and they are not all the same as shown here, so when this goes forward to the Executive Policy Board it will include 31 intersections, all those agreed to by ATAC and the City, so that would be the one change to what is displayed in the Technical Advisory Committee packet information.

Ellis asked if, for the Minnesota side they are still relying on MnDOT to provide those type of counts. Haugen responded that that would be correct, except that they would still be doing the turning movement counts manually. Williams asked if they could make sure they get MnDOT the information from DeMers and Gateway for their counts because if it starts over the bridge it will end over the bridge. Haugen responded that they can do that.

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE SCOPE OF WORK FOR PHASE II OF THE TRAFFIC COUNTING STUDY SUBJECT TO 31 INSTEAD OF 30 INTERSECTIONS BEING STUDIED.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Williams commented that they did furnish them with some of the Synthrex reports so that they are aware of what Synthres is capable of.

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF DRAFT SCOPE OF WORK FOR ITS REGIONAL ARCHITECTURE  
UPDATE**

Haugen reported that we are updating our Regional Architecture with ATAC's assistance. He stated that this was last done in 2008, and our Regional Architecture of our Intelligent Transportation System is part of our Long Range Transportation Plan, it is a sub-component of it, and we are on a five-year update cycle, so this is the year we need to do it. He added that part of the ITS will incorporate what we are doing now with the traffic counting via video so that as we discuss inoperability with our traffic signals with District 2 we might start actually engaging that because he knows that in the Grand Forks Downtown Traffic Signal project that came up as a desirable project, and the East Grand Forks Northwest Street Network Study that also came up as a desire to start trying to have better interoperable ability between our traffic signals at those corridors.

Haugen stated that ATAC is the go-to group in North Dakota to do the Regional Architecture, they assisted with the initial establishment many years ago, and have been the firm that all three MPOs in the State of North Dakota have gone to make sure we are having a consistent and coordinated Regional Architecture in regard to ITS, so ATAC has prepared a standard Scope of Work. He pointed out that their timeline is to begin later this summer, as they are just now finishing up the NDDOT update, they just finished the Bis/Man MPO's update, and a year ago they did Fargo/Moorhead, but are now doing an amendment or modification to their Regional Architecture update, so we will be starting ours in the fall.

Haugen commented that besides the Technical Advisory Committee members, there are a few additional people identified as participants in the process, so we may reserve some time at the end of our Technical Advisory Committee meetings to go into the ITS and invite some of our other players to come in and participate at that time.

***MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A  
RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY  
APPROVE THE SCOPE OF WORK FOR PHASE II OF THE TRAFFIC COUNTING  
STUDY.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF SPRING FLOOD OUTLOOK**

Haugen reported that for the Spring of 2014, it appears that our flood outlook is not going to be severe. He said, however, that the main reason for having this item on the agenda is to ensure that if we do need to close any bridges across the Red or Red Lake Rivers we do have the most

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

up-to-date contact information for all the various players. He referred to the last page of the document, and explained that it is our most up-to-date listing of titles and phone numbers of the contacts, and he would like everyone to look it over and let him know if there are any changes required.

Williams referred to the staff report and pointed out that in the Background section it states that during recent flood events two of the three bridges had to be closed to traffic and staff had to scramble a bit to determine appropriate adjustments to traffic signal timings. She stated that this was like eight years ago, so if we could specify that this happened in 2006 or so, that would be good because they aren't scrambling anymore, and haven't been for three or four years. Haugen responded that it can be updated to reflect that change.

Consensus was that the contact information needed no changes.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

a. Notice Of Proposed Rule Making and Performance Measures

Haugen reported that on Monday the first of a series of Notice of Proposed Rule Making and Performance Measures were out. He explained that this deals with safety, and he distributed the information to the Technical Advisory Committee.

Haugen stated, again, that this is just proposed rules and measures, so this is a docket where you can submit comments, and is open 90-days, which they may or may not extend, but then they will sit back and digest all the comments and see whether or not they can create a final document and release that information.

Haugen commented that he also sent last Thursday, as part of the Technical Advisory Committee Agenda e-mail, an attachment that showed the schedule for further proposed rule makings, but there was a bad winter storm last week in Washington, so that schedule is already a little behind, but they are starting to roll out a lot of these proposed rule makings and all of the measures, as well as updating the planning regulations for MPOs and States.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO ADJOURN THE MARCH 12<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:36 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, April 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014  
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the April 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:36 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Mike Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Lane Magnuson, Grand Forks County Planner; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Engineering; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; and Darren Laesch, MNDOT-District 2 Planning Director.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Stephanie Erickson, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner, and Kyle Economy, GF/EGF MPO Intern.

Guest(s) present were: Roger Hille, MNDOT-Bridge Division; Shaun Morrell, MN Transit; and Bobbi Retzlaff, MNDOT-RDC (via conference call).

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

Haugen asked that, because we have some new faces here today, everyone please state their name and the organization they represent.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 12<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Johnson referred to Page 7 of the minutes, and pointed out that in the last paragraph, fourth line down, it states "CBD" funds when it should state "CPG" funds instead.

***MOVED BY JOHNSON, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE THE MARCH 12<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, SUBJECT TO THE CORRECTION DISCUSSED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, April 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS**

Haugen referred to the staff report, and pointed out that it notes that there was no new information distributed, however, Roger Hille is present today to give us an update on what has occurred since our last meeting.

Hille stated that he would like to start with the Sorlie Bridge project.

Sorlie Bridge

Hille reported that work has been occurring on the Sorlie Monday and Tuesday, with the hope that it will be completed today or tomorrow. He explained that MNDOT, NDDOT, and the Consultant Team has been doing a field oriented structural analysis and inspection in order to give us a good idea of the existing condition of that structure. He said that all the work that impacts traffic will be done today, and then there will be a little work left on the deck that should be completed tomorrow.

Hille commented that the job is progressing well, and on schedule. He added that he doesn't think they have a milestone on that until sometime mid-summer, July or August.

Hille stated that he doesn't think that there is anything other than the new report, except for the fact that there has been a lot of work going on to try to ascertain the condition of the existing structure, so that if it is determined it is to be rehabbed to put it in rehab.

Kennedy Bridge

Hille said that, although there isn't anything new to report, he can certainly say that there have been many hours spent on the report since our last meeting here. He added that they have taken comments they received from the MPO, both DOTs, Federal Highway, etc., and are incorporating them into the report. He commented that he is personally very impressed with the report.

Hille stated that the final report should be available within the next few weeks, and when it comes out he would suggest that this body look at all the details that come with the decision, especially the decision between external and internal walkway options.

Information only.

**MATTER OF DRAFT MINNESOTA SIDE 2015-2018 T.I.P.**

Haugen reported that the public hearing for this item will be held at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting next Wednesday. He explained that the public notice was not able to be published within the required ten days prior to today's meeting, thus the need to hold it at the Executive Policy Board meeting instead.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, April 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that a copy of the draft document was included. He stated that it is covering only our Minnesota side of our study area, and beginning on Page 12 are the project listings. He said that, as you recall, in our Long Range Transportation Plan we were showing that there would not be much investment on the Minnesota side during the first ten years, so this T.I.P. document is consistent with our planning document in reflecting the number of projects.

Haugen commented that in 2015 just the transit projects are scheduled, and you will notice that they are fairly consistent throughout the four years of the T.I.P. document. He pointed out that there are also three basic transit program listings.

Haugen said out that the first real street and highway project scheduled to be done is the Kennedy Bridge project in 2016. He stated that this is consistent, and the dollar amount has not changed, however there has been a change from our current T.I.P. document in that the current document would show the federal participation being \$10,000,000, but this current document shows it as being 100% Minnesota Bridge 152 Bond funds, so that is a change from our current T.I.P., however it does not affect the total funding amount.

Haugen stated that Safe Kids Grand Forks, along with East Grand Forks School District and the City of East Grand Forks were awarded TAP funds for their project, if you will recall, to help encourage and educate Safe Routes To School in East Grand Forks.

Haugen commented that in 2017 we show North Dakota trying to participate or finance their half of the Sorlie Bridge project. He said that, if you will recall, last month we adopted the 2014-2017 total T.I.P. for both sides of the river, and this is how it shows up in that document with 2017 having North Dakota financing.

Haugen stated that in 2018 we have two projects outside of the transit projects; the first one is the Minnesota half of the Sorlie Bridge, and, again, it is showing up as 100% Chapter 152 Bonding revenue.

Haugen said that the last project is, every fourth year the City of East Grand Forks is awarded ATP Subtarget funds; and they have identified converting 10<sup>th</sup> Street, just east of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.E., from gravel to concrete pavement.

Haugen stated that those are the Minnesota side projects that have been identified and vetted through the MPO process for inclusion in our Draft 2015-2018 T.I.P. document.

Ellis commented that she thinks we are missing the purchase of a bus, a fixed-route bus in 2018. Haugen asked if, instead of a para-transit vehicle it should say a fixed-route coach. Ellis responded that that would be correct. She added that the dollar amount will need to be changed to reflect the difference in vehicles as well.

Laesch commented that their only concern was with the North Dakota portion showing up in East Grand Forks T.I.P. here. He said that they felt that since it is just an agreement on their end

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, April 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

that only their portion should show up in 2018, the 2017 portion should just be on the Grand Forks side.

Johnson asked if the first sentence of that remark could be changed to say “has” hired instead of “is” hiring a consultant. Haugen responded that he would make that change.

Haugen referred back to Mr. Laesch’s comment and stated that hopefully we will have a reconciled final draft document that shows both sides at the same time. He added that because they are doing a one side only draft, his preference would be to show the total project, and how it is being sequenced and financed in one document. Hille added that it may be important to know that the agreement with North Dakota states that we each pay half of the project costs, we don’t pay for just the half in our State as we don’t own half of the bridge, we jointly own the bridge. Haugen responded that he doesn’t think he is stating that. He added that he is suggesting that because it is one project, with two different financing mechanisms, it makes sense to show how it is being financed totally in the document. Laesch responded that they ran this by the St. Paul folks, by ???, to see what her preference would be and she agreed with them that she felt that their S.T.I.P. should reflect only their portion of the project since it is just an agreement on their side. He added that he looked at the Kennedy and how we show both for that project, but he thought that maybe it shouldn’t be the same as the Kennedy. He said that their concern is since it is just an agreement, and North Dakota is the lead, it can show up like that on the North Dakota side, but on their side it should just show it as the agreement portion. Haugen responded that the Technical Advisory Committee can take that recommendation and adjust their motion if they wish, but his preference is still, because it is a public document showing how projects are scheduled and financed, that it makes sense to show how the project is being totally financed in the document.

Haugen reported that when their S.T.I.P. comes out, it should be incorporating our T.I.P. without modification so, again, this is a draft document, and you will have a final document, which they hope will contain both sides at the same time, but when you do incorporate our T.I.P. without modification you will need to show the 2017 project being financed by North Dakota and the 2018 project being financed by Minnesota. Bergman asked if the North Dakota document shows the same configuration in it. Haugen responded it does. Bergman said, then, that he wouldn’t see why there would be a problem with it, and he would leave it on there because otherwise you’re going to have confusion trying to figure out who is paying what, and the public will only see it as the total cost. Haugen stated that that is the point that they are trying to make. He explained that one of the purposes of the T.I.P. document, and they were trying to avoid having to do separate approvals for both sides, but it didn’t happen again this year.

Johnson asked if it is helpful at all that in the 2017 project list it shows the funding as other versus the 2018 project list showing it as being a State share, is that helpful at all. Laesch responded that he would like to defer this to allow them to look into it further over the next couple of weeks because he is no expert on this, and he is just taking some recommendations that he was given from his folks, and the folks in St. Paul. He added that their concern was that it appeared that it was reflecting the cost twice on the East Grand Forks side. Haugen responded that that isn’t the case, and he thinks the wording is clear that North Dakota is programming their

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, April 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

portion of the project cost in 2017 and Minnesota is programming their portion in 2018. Johnson added that it is really a pending designation on the North Dakota side. He said that for all purposes of the T.I.P. and S.T.I.P. it is an 2018 project, but they flag certain projects as pending to possibly eat up 2017 funds if they need to, but the intent would still be that it be constructed in 2018, and it would probably be that end of fiscal year bid opening where you can use early money and old money in one bill, that is the intent, so it is still technically a 2018 project, it is just that a decision was made on their end to put it in as a pending 2017 project. He added that he doesn't know how it is going to show up in the 2015-2018 T.I.P., it may show up as a 2018 now, but he doesn't know that for sure.

Haugen stated that the beauty of it all is that this is a draft document, so nobody is doing and programming and signing any contracts off of this draft, yet it is trying to be as informative as it can be for the public to ensure they know what is going on.

Laesch said that, all in all he thinks it is a pretty minor thing, but it is just that they want to make sure that all the "t's" are crossed and the "i's" are dotted as it reflects what is in their S.T.I.P.

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE DRAFT 2015-2018 T.I.P., SUBJECT TO THE TRANSIT VEHICLE CHANGE DISCUSSED, TO RECEIPT OF ANY PUBLIC COMMENT, AND TO CHANGE THE WORDING OF PROJECT 18 FROM "IS" TO "HAS" CURRENTLY HIRED...IN THE REMARK SECTION.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF DRAFT RFP FOR U.S.#2 ACCESS MANAGEMENT PLAN**

Haugen referred to a map illustrating the study limits, and explained that this item was submitted last year by the NDDOT District Engineer to include in our work program. He stated that the study is to be completed in 2014, so in order to get the activity going they have drafted the RFP, and have distributed it for comments. He said that it has been modified to reflect the comments received.

Haugen stated that essentially this RFP is trying to identify and lay out what the likely access points are along Highway U.S.#2 as it transitions from its urban developed area out to its rural area. He commented that different jurisdictions have different rules governing the access points, and so part of this study will be to meld and come up with an agreed to access management plan for that stretch of U.S.#2.

Haugen reported that a Selection Committee has been identified, and most of the people on the committee are representatives from this body. He stated that they will receive proposals at the end of May, mid-June will make a selection, and by December have the final report available for review and comment.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, April 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen commented that they also proposed to have a Steering Committee assist us, and the committee membership is listed on Page 35.

Kuharenko referred to Section O, Termination, and pointed out that it states: “The right is reserved by either party to terminate this agreement with or without cause at any time if the recipient does not comply with the provisions of this agreement or its attachments”, and asked if that is really then, a “with or without cause”? He said that the other question he has is, under Section Y, Hold Harmless, we include Minnesota and MNDOT in there, but we don’t include the City of Grand Forks. He doesn’t know if Minnesota and MNDOT are required to be in there because it is in North Dakota and Grand Forks. Haugen responded that they pass through the funds. Kuharenko asked if we should include the City of Grand Forks in there as well. Haugen responded that then would raise the question do we have the City of East Grand Forks, Grand Forks County, Polk County, etc.. He said that we have never in the past found a reason to include those other local jurisdictions because the federal funds pass through both States. Kuharenko referred to Appendix B, under the Required Budget Format it says East Grand Forks Northwest Street Network Study. Haugen thanked him for catching that, and said that it would be corrected to reflect U.S.#2 Access Management Study.

Johnson commented that, while this isn’t needed for the RFP, but when you get into the actual Steering Committee level, himself and Stephanie Hickman should be included in all Steering Committees

***MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY MAGNUSON, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE DRAFT RFP FOR THE U.S.#2 ACCESS MANAGEMENT PLAN, SUBJECT TO INCLUSION OF CHANGES DISCUSSED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF FY2015 NORTH DAKOTA STATE AID PROJECT APPLICATION**

Haugen explained that Ms. Kouba will walk us through this item. He pointed out, however, that as you are aware there was nothing included in the packet for this item as we were somewhat uninformed at the time the packets were prepared as to what it was this agenda item was trying to address, but Mr. Bergman was able to help us yesterday to identify that this document is the State Aid Application on the North Dakota side for transit.

Kouba reported that this is a requirement for the State of North Dakota that they want to know the particulars of the operation for funding from the State. She said that she is assuming that approval is needed for this application to be submitted to the State.

Haugen pointed out that the document identifies who Cities Area Transit is, how they operate, contact information, ridership statistics, etc.. He said that the one thing it doesn’t have, or ask, is what is your financial request for State Aid funds, which is something that is usually indicated on an application.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, April 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FY2015 NORTH DAKOTA STATE AID PROJECT APPLICATION, AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF FY2015 NORTH DAKOTA FTA 5310 PROJECT APPLICATION**

Kouba reported that they solicited projects for the 5310 program in February, and the only application received was from Cities Area Transit, and they are looking to fund a couple of para-transit vans, as well as to continue funding their Mobility Manager. She stated that both of these are considered Capital Projects, even though the Mobility Manager is a paid position, so there would be an 80/20 split, and is consistent with our planning documents, so staff is requesting approval of the application.

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FY2015 NORTH DAKOTA FTA 5310 APPLICATION, AND TO GIVE PRIORITY RANKING, AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF FINAL FREIGHT RAIL ACCESS STUDY**

Haugen reported that we did hire Olsson and Associates last year to help us identify potential properties along our rail lines, and also to determine what impact there would be to our existing street and highway network if we were to increase rail activity.

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that a copy of the presentation made at the last open house held on March 20<sup>th</sup>. He said that with the increased oil activity out west the City of Grand Forks has had increased interest in having businesses locate here and access the rail to better serve the western edge of North Dakota.

Haugen stated that the Economic Development Agency approached us two years ago to assist in identifying properties in and around Grand Forks/East Grand Forks that might be able to accommodate those entities. He said that they identified all of the property ownership along our existing rail lines, and the maps included in the packet gave preliminary identification from a land use/zoning infrastructure point of view, how well suited they were so the red highlighted areas are those areas that had the highest preliminary ranking. He stated that they met with these individual property owners to see if they had any interest in selling their property, and then based on that information came up with some rail access concepts for the individual sites.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, April 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen referred to a map illustrating property on North 42<sup>nd</sup> rail line heading north of Grand Forks. He pointed out that one property has two different layouts: the more common one being where they just add track to the side of the main line. He explained that it is called a closed siding and you have the ability to operate at both ends of the line. He added that the other is an open siding, but as you see they have more fingers so it can serve more cars; and then there is a complete loop system where you could accommodate a unit train. He explained that part of their efforts included BNSF, since they are the main rail service provider in the area, and they are really pushing unit trains, so this property was the only one identified that had basically the existing acreage to land a unit train. He said that in East Grand Forks there was one site at 220 North's connection to U.S.#2.

Haugen commented that all of these concepts are not on the Amtrak mainline, which is a benefit to site development. He stated that the next concepts are all on the southwest part of Grand Forks, and therefore are on the Amtrak mainline, and being on the mainline one of their operation requirements is that there be installed a remote switch that cost \$1.25 million dollars, so if you're on the non-Amtrak line your site development costs compared to being on the Amtrak line is a negative \$1.25 million, so hence why there is more interest in the North non-Amtrak sites.

Haugen reported that in any of these concepts laid out here, if there was enough acreage identified and assembled on the south or west part of Grand Forks, it could be developed but it just wasn't identified, or the acreage ready to do some of them, so all of these just did concepts that utilized the acreage available.

Haugen referred to the map, and pointed out that, just to give you some idea of the costs involved, costs up here are around the \$2 million dollar range until you get into the big loop, then you are around \$3 to \$3.5 million dollars. He stated that if these were on the non-Amtrak route they would just be barely above \$1 million dollars.

Haugen commented that the next set of concepts are improvements to our existing street network, and looking at our truck routes. He said that they were also aware, through the public comments, that we could not negatively impact our existing quiet zones, so as part of the analysis, if we do have increased train traffic, because of the supplemental safety measures that we have already installed at our quiet zones, we are sort of insulated from increased rail traffic and vehicle traffic across those crossings. He said, however, the one exception (highlighted in blue) is if for some reason we ever decide to incorporate a new crossing of the railroad within these blue zones, those would impact our quiet zone because they are within a quarter mile, so we have identified, for the most part, that anyone who is trying to develop additional rail access and needs to have a road crossing that access, would automatically need to incorporate into their costs the minimum requirements for a quiet zone.

Haugen reported that for the most part the street network improvements were already identified in the Long Range Transportation Plan. He said that they did receive a lot of comments about the North Washington/Gateway Drive intersection, so they developed three concepts as a way to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, April 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

potentially address the skew of the intersection, and there are a lot of grain trucks making a left turn to head up to the State Mill.

Haugen stated that the first concept is just creating a connector route utilizing about the only platted street that heads north on Gateway Drive, and that is the access to the Fairgrounds. He explained that there is one rather significant impediment, and that is the historic gate structure to the Fairgrounds. He said that the second concept is a much simpler connection, but obviously it has some existing businesses that would impact it, however it does tie in to 20<sup>th</sup> Street North, and utilizes the existing traffic signal; and the third concept would be to grade separate Gateway Drive, and again make this connection point.

Haugen reported that because of the difficulty of identifying increased train traffic, there is one recommendation we keep on top of, by monitoring the delay. He explained that included in the final report were some, from a handbook by Federal Highway on railroad grade crossings, and there are a series of questions that are commonly asked, and if you meet one of those criteria you are then deemed a good candidate for a grade separation. He said that the two the report focuses on are the delay to vehicles caused by the train, and exposure rate, which is a calculation of how many trains times how many vehicles and if you reach over 500,000 you have met another criteria. Haugen commented that they added in the delay because of BNSF's emphasis on unit trains, and most of the crossings amenities are slow train movement, so obviously since a unit train has to move slowly, and is a mile long it will cause a longer delay even though it is only one train that doesn't add to the exposure rate, so we are trying to balance the two as the criteria to focus on.

Haugen commented that, for the most part we were able to accomplish what the study was asked to do, and that was to identify some parcels of land in Grand Forks/East Grand Forks that could be developed with better rail access for freight. He said, however, that we weren't as successful, because of the nature of train movement, in being able to identify the necessity and timeline of street and highway improvements that would be required.

Kuharenko asked, you were talking about those various criteria we have for exposure and delay, so would that eventually lead to, if we end up exceeding one of those, a grade separation. Haugen responded that it would get you one step closer, but your biggest obstacle is always going to be the financing of a grade separation. He said that part of it is also to inform the powers that be that when they do locate facilities, that they understand that it might have an impact on the traveling public, and therefore they could consider the trade-off of a developer having to invest \$1.25 million for this remote switch on the south and west part of Grand Forks that you don't have to do on the north side, but as you invest in more train activity on the north side your impacting a whole lot more at grade crossings for the traveling public, so you end up investing more than the \$1.25 million for a grade separation and other street improvements. Kuharenko asked then, if an industry did develop on the north side then they would be on the hook in some way shape or form for a future grade separation. Haugen responded that that would be part of the Cities' development agreement with any industry that goes in at those locations.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, April 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen commented that, just based on the current train traffic, like Gateway Drive, to reach that threshold of 500,000, there is currently 30,000 vehicles crossing it a day, there would need to be roughly 17 trains utilizing that track and he believes there are currently 7 identified to-date, so there is room to grow to reach that 500,000 threshold.

Kuharenko said that another question that can be asked is, as we continue to grow as a community, and there might be a need for additional grade crossing, and he knows that BNSF has pretty much been in the mindset that if you want one new grade crossing you need to close two, so are you going to be reaching a point in the near future where we won't be to close the two they want in order to add one, so what will the game plan be at that time. Haugen responded that that wasn't part of this studies mission so that is something that would be up to a future discussion to address.

Haugen commented that the State Mill quiet zone, or safety study we did, identified a couple of crossings that could be, or should be closed, so there are a few that have been identified, and are included in the document as being recommended for closure, but there aren't very many.

Haugen stated that the next recommended step is for the City and the Economic Development to sort of put together this marketing package so as, either they go out and try to attract industry or industry comes to them, they have a document they can hand them that shows some potential sites that have already been identified.

Kuharenko asked if Olsson and Associates would be producing that marketing packet, or will the MPO be doing it. Haugen responded that most likely not the MPO, nor was it part of Olsson and Associate's contract to produce the marketing package, however they did provide us with an example of a marketing package they have done.

Information only.

**MATTER OF MPO COMMUTER PROFILE**

Haugen stated that Kyle Economy, MPO Intern, will be ushering us through this agenda item. He explained that, as the staff report identified, and as we have discussed many times at past Technical Advisory Committee meetings, we have some unusual or surprising traffic statistics that come our way, so we asked Kyle to start looking into census data to see if there is any unique census data that will help us identify some of these traffic trends we are identifying, so, included in the packet was a first draft of this presentation, but Kyle has beefed it up quite a bit so he does have the updated information to disseminate.

Economy referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request).

Economy reported that the Commuter Profile is to discover whether the American Community Survey, or ACS, could identify some unique and graphic characteristics. He said that, basically

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, April 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

they will be focusing on the commute to work question, and also to compare the 2000 Census as well.

Economy commented that the ACS data is a continuous survey of population characteristics. He said that there is a one year data set, a three year data set, and a five year data set series; and the set with more years is the better set, so we used the latest five year data set.

He referred to the information distributed, and went over it briefly.

Haugen reported that the reason they are showing the margin of error is because, for instance, Track #101, if you look at the difference between 2000 and 2012 you will see in the neighborhood of 150 less people commuting by car, but the 2012 estimate has a margin of error of 200, so that 150 could actually be covered by the margin of error, so it could have been a wash instead of a decrease. He said that the same with Track #102, the margin of error is enough that they could be washed out when you include the margin of error in the estimate.

Haugen commented that Track #103, though, the margin of error doesn't come close to covering the statistical difference, so that is why we highlighted it because it is something that isn't covered by the margin of error and it tells us that it is significant data that we should look at, so, again, when you go and look at 3,500 new people in the City of Grand Forks, but only 50 additional people commute by car, we went to the track level to identify where those geographics might be, and we are seeing that it appears to be Track #103.

Economy continued with the presentation.

Economy stated that the next step will be to dig further into Track #103 and try to figure out some of the discrepancies between Track #103 and the rest of the tracks around Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, and continue to work at developing ideas for the other modes of transit as well.

Bergman asked if this will have any effect on the Cottage Grove section over there. Economy responded that it will. He said that Cottage Grove will be opening up in the next year, and it isn't in Track #103, it is in a different track so it kind of skews some of the numbers. He said he thinks it is actually Track #108.01, so that will be something to start looking into once it opens next year, just seeing the amount of stuff that will be going on through there. He added that, obviously, since we won't be able to dig into past years, since we do like to look at the five year data since it gives us the most distinct idea, we won't be able to look into that for a number of years even though that will be a large amount of student population moving into those apartments. He stated that Track #108.01 will be one area that will need to be looked at over the coming years just due to the amount of growth in that has been occurring there since 2010. Haugen commented that for the City Bus, this last thing we have, it is interesting that the data, again over a five year period of time, where the City is growing the most in population, it says that there are zero people using the bus to commute to work, so that might be something that we will dig into a little more to see if we can identify, perhaps, some of those parameters that are from your Route 12/13.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, April 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen reported that what Kyle has done is, this is the fourth year that they have done the five-year data set, look at the previous three years of five year sets to see how this data is being skewed, if it is being skewed, and we are finding that it is not deviating as much as we thought it would.

Laesch asked if the traffic count data used was DOT or City data. Haugen responded that it is DOT data. Laesch asked if we know what modification factors have been used in those. Haugen responded that we don't know the latest modification factors, the 2013 ones. He explained that what this means is, when the DOT lays traffic counting tubes across the roadway, they don't just take the raw number and use it, they factor it, or modify it using certain factors. He said that in 2000 they may have used one or two factors, but in 2013 they may be using three or four factors, and what a factor typically does is bring it down so it is representing an average annual daily count, so that could be why there are some differences between 2000 and 2013.

Haugen commented that, again, the reason we are doing this, and the reason we are doing the traffic counting with our video detection is to allow us to have a better snapshot other than the every couple of years that we get the tube counts, to identify what is really going on in the traffic, and what might be driving some of the decisions made, so it was a little surprising to him to see that growth in population, yet to see the rather stagnant commute by car statistic, so that prompted us to have Kyle dig a little bit deeper to see if we can get some answers.

Haugen reported that East Grand Forks is kind of going along as you would expect, more people, more commute by car, so we weren't seeing the same surprises there.

Information only.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY LANG, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO ADJOURN THE APRIL 9<sup>TH</sup>, 2014,  
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 3:04 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2014  
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2014, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:37 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Mike Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Mike Yavarow, Grand Forks Engineering; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineer; and Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Stephanie Erickson, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner, and Kyle Economy, GF/EGF MPO Intern.

Guest(s) present were: Roger Hille, MNDOT-Bridge Division; Stacey Hanson, NDDOT/Local Government Division; Scott Mareck, WSB Associates; Kris Riesenberg, FHWA-MN; and Mike Bittner, KLJ.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

Haugen asked that, because we have some new faces here today, everyone please state their name and the organization they represent.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 9<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE THE APRIL 9<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

**SUSPEND AGENDA**

Haugen reported that they are having some technical difficulties getting the bridge presentation uploaded so he would like to suspend the agenda in order to discuss the proposed T.I.P. Amendment item first.

**MATTER OF PROPOSED T.I.P. AMENDMENT FOR CITIES AREA TRANSIT  
CAPITAL PROJECTS**

Haugen commented that they did advertise for a public hearing at today's meeting, therefore he would now like to open the public hearing.

There was no one present for discussion.

Haugen closed the public hearing and explained that the public hearing notice also stated that staff would accept written comments until noon today, there were no comments submitted.

Haugen reported that this amendment is to add a couple of 5339 Program Capital projects to our 2014 annual element.

Haugen explained that, as identified in the packet, the City requested, and was awarded funds to replace the bus washing system out at the Bus Barn; to renovate the dispatch area out at the Bus Maintenance Facility; and to purchase a fare collection system for Demand Response Vehicles.

Bergman commented that the bus washing system is a replacement for an item that is fourteen years old, and whose company went out of business about eight years ago, so it is time to replace it.

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE PROPOSED FY2014-2017 T.I.P. AMENDMENT FOR CITIES AREA TRANSIT CAPITAL PROJECTS, AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**RESUME AGENDA**

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS**

Kennedy Bridge Project:

Hille reported that he would like to go over a very abbreviated version of the Kennedy Bridge Planning Study just to bring this group up to speed on where they are, and where they'd like to go in the very near future. He explained that this project is on a very abbreviated time-line, and they think they have things going in the right direction.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Hille said that he hopes that everyone has seen the longer version of this presentation, and if there are any questions, please stop him as he is going along.

Presentation ensued.

Hille pointed out that the Kennedy Bridge is a 1963 model, which makes a difference in Minnesota because it is 50-years old and thus eligible for inclusion on the National Historical Register, therefore they have to treat it as a historic structure in their State.

Hille commented that North Dakota and Minnesota are partners on this project, just as the NDDOT leads the Sorlie Bridge Study, and consequent project; MnDOT is the lead on this project.

Hille stated that the primary need, of course, is to provide a safe and reliable traffic facility; with a secondary need to provide a safe and reliable bike/ped facility.

Hille reported that some of the Minnesota Legislation they have in place requires that they consider bike/pedestrian traffic on projects they are constructing with Chapter 152 monies. He explained that some of the regulatory requirements are listed in the report, and include such things as hydraulics, which is a major issue here because, generally speaking, on projects such as this they can do analysis on 100-year frequency floods for hydraulic analyses, but this, because you've got your Corps flood protection system, and you have to be at 500, there is a whole new issue to get a 500-year without any adverse effects. He stated that they also have geo-technical issues that they have been dealing with for years as well.

Hille commented that this is a bridge that is 1,200 feet long, half of it is approach spans and the other half is truss, with no sidewalks. He referred to a drawing of the bridge, and pointed out that what we have now services traffic very well, with 12-foot lanes, some buffers on each side, and some minor shoulders. He stated that they don't necessarily like this bridge from a maintenance standpoint, they would like to have an extra lane for their equipment, but they have to live with what they have.

Hille stated that they thought a lot about bicyclists, and heard a lot from the community about the need for bicycle and pedestrian traffic here.

Hille referred to a slide illustrating some of the various piers, and pointed out that the lower part of Pier 6 has moved something around 40 or so inches, and the top has moved about 30 inches on the south side; and on the north side the bottom has moved around 20 inches and the top around 19 inches, so they have a crazy-twisting mess. He stated that that section of the bridge is designed to take loads as the pier moves towards the river.

Hille referred to what they call the bents, that have to be straightened because of some abutment movement; and the pin and hangers have been a problem, they work very good for thermal expansion and contraction, but, again, they don't have any redundancy built in so that is

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

problematic for them. He stated that they have some abutment bearings that are an issue, as much as the lateral pressure that is causing some shearing of those anchor bolts.

Hille reported that they looked at an external pathway to the truss, or to the structure, for bikes and pedestrians; and they looked at four different options to determine how they can safely accommodate traffic and pedestrian and bicycle traffic within the truss. He stated that, again, hanging a cantilevered piece off the truss is not an issue, it is not problem, it has been done on the Sorlie Bridge, but what is a problem here is that their approach spans and the 500-year hydraulics would require they put in additional substructure units and additional piers to carry things, and they would have to make sure there was no impact hydraulically up or down stream. He added that they also feel it is problematic in terms of the historic features of the structure.

Hille commented that there are four different layouts. He pointed out which layout North Dakota prefers, but what the final option will be he can't say at this point, although he can say that they have talked to some of the councils and certainly some like one, and some like another, so they don't have all the issues sorted out, and they can't work them out until they get into the final design phase of the project.

Hille reported that the way this structure was built, right along the approach spans on both sides there are longitudinal expansion and contraction joints, mostly designed to make sure that as those piers move there is the ability to accommodate those movements, so they aren't sure whether they can take those out or not, and they won't know that until they get further into the design aspect, so they can't tell you right now if they can move this far enough so they have a joint over or closer to one of the girders on the approach spans or whether they can delete that. He said that they think, without getting into the final design, that they will be able to delete that expansion, that longitudinal expansion joint which will give them more options.

Hille stated that some of the things that the final report discusses are: Pier 6, there is no question, from a technical standpoint, that it has to be addressed, and after looking at other options of rehabilitation, they don't think that's a possibility. That's a replacement.

Hille said that the study was to look at rehab or replacement; and when they looked at a \$35,000,000 replacement cost, and probably \$16,000,000 to \$18,000,000 for a rehab; and part of this study was to analyze the structural capacity of the existing truss, they think they are all right there so they are leaning pretty hard towards rehab in the final study.

Hille commented that this rehab, this is just the bridge. He said that they know they are going to put some substantial dollars into analysis of the pier, that when they put the pier in they are going to put some technology in there so they can monitor subsurface movement; and they know that if they are going to do some different things with the curb on the bridge they will make some adjustments there and will require they remove some curb on the Minnesota side, move the centerline one way or the other so they will have a couple of million dollars there. He stated that the thinks they came up with about and \$18,000,000 cost once the study was out and they looked at some other issues to include the approaches and some of the other instrumentation they want to do on Pier 6.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Hille reported that the next step will be to get feedback on the study. Haugen commented that the MPO Executive Policy Board has pushed hard for an external bike/ped structure, and he hopes that that allowed MnDOT to look at that option closer than you perhaps you originally thought you would have to look at it. Hille responded that there is no question that they did look at it closely, and they appreciate the Board's input, and he isn't so sure that if they weren't in that environment that contains historic and 500-year hydraulics, he thinks they might look even closer at it, but with the timeframe that they have, and the other structure in town going under construction as well, he just doesn't think that is the right direction to take. He added that in any event, this will not be an easy fix, it is not an easy project and it will not come without some major inconvenience to this community.

Haugen said that one of the reasons the Executive Policy Board was focusing so hard on the external facility is because they felt it provided the safest option for bikes and pedestrians to cross, but he anticipates that this particular feature, which is labeled as the NDDOT preferred alternative, will appease a lot of their concerns as far as safety, and it creates a more robust barrier between the bike/peds from the vehicles than the other alternatives that were previously displayed.

Haugen asked if they were seeking, from this body, a sort of recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board on the three points: 1) Rehab versus replacement; 2) Internal versus external for bike/ped accommodations; and 3) Which side should the shared use/multi-use trail be located on, the North or the South side.

Hille agreed, but added that he looks toward this group, or this organization to have the foresight to say that if you put the path on this side we connect to not only what we have now, but what we expect to build in the future. He said that the last thing anyone wants is to put a path out here to do what we think is right, and then it isn't compatible with the MPO's Long Range Plan for the greenway and other bicycle and pedestrian uses, so if you can help them with that kind of North Side/South Side issue, that would save them a lot of time and effort. He added that they don't want calls from the Governors after it is built asking why it was put on one or the other side, so that is why they are looking to this group for that foresight.

Lang referred to the NDDOT preferred drawing, and asked if it has a direction associated with it, or is it just a drawing that could be shown either with the east or the west, but it isn't designated. Hille responded that their intent, when they sent it to him, was that it was located on the North Side, but it could be either side. Lang said, then, that the preferred side would be the North Side. Hille said that he isn't so sure that he would call it a preferred option of the NDDOT, it is another option to consider during the final design. Haugen commented that he thinks it would be fair to say, just like those other internal bike/ped options, those could be flipped to either side, so he is sure this has that same availability as well. He added that last evening Mr. Hille was between both communities giving this presentation, and at the East Grand Forks Working Session they didn't take any action, they just received the information; but at the Grand Forks Service Safety Committee did take action, and they will be recommending to the Grand Forks City Council that they approve the rehab, internal bike/ped facility, and north Side option.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Bergman pointed out that East Grand Forks doesn't have any bike paths in this location so it wouldn't make any difference which side it goes on on that side. Haugen responded that the only connection that exists is a sidewalk on the north side on the Grand Forks side that leads up to about where the approach officially starts, and then heads to the greenway. He added that, as Mr. Hille mentioned, with this project accommodating bike/peds then both communities will have to get their current existing trail systems to connect to the bridge, and that is why he believes the Grand Forks Engineering Staff, with the knowledge of the greenway flood protection system, prefers the north side.

Hille added that the communications they have received from Grand Forks Engineering pretty much pointed out some substantial problematic challenges they would have if it were placed on the South side, because of getting down to the greenway, limited right-of-way, historic property, and more. Haugen commented that it doesn't sound like making the connections to the greenway trail systems is overly cumbersome on either side of the river, particularly if we stay on the north side on the North Dakota side, although there is more flexibility on the Minnesota side.

Williams asked if action was necessary today or can we wait until the City Council formally acts on it so that we aren't going to circumvent anything that might come out of the meeting. Haugen responded that he is sure that next week both City Councils will be doing something, and the MPO Executive Policy Board will also want to take action as well. He said that, if you will recall, the original action by the MPO Executive Policy Board was to recommend an external bike/ped facility be constructed was without any input from the Technical Advisory Committee, and you do have committee recommendation from the Grand Forks side, and you certainly have both engineering staffs' recommending the same three options that the Service Safety Committee recommended.

***MOVED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE SUPPORTING BOTH CITY COUNCILS' FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS.***

Haugen said, however, that you might have two different recommendations from the two city councils. Williams said that, without having the absolute final come through, we have representatives from both communities, many communities, in here and she wouldn't want to try in any way or means give the idea that we are trying to circumvent any authority that the City Councils have by trying to come with a recommendation that may not be consistent with what one or the other City Council has, that is what she is trying to avoid.

***BERGMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.***

West asked if this recommendation would be for the replacement, or a new structure, or both. Haugen responded that the motion is stating that we support, essentially, whatever recommendation each council makes next week on the three choices that MnDOT and North Dakota are asking for direction on. He reiterated that the three points are 1) Rehab or replace; 2) Internal or external; and 3) Southside or Northside.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Hille commented that if you are going to make a recommendation, concurrence is probably a word the councils are using.

Lang asked if this were delayed until our next Technical Advisory Committee meeting, would that delay the process. Noehre responded that we are making a technical recommendation, not a policy recommendation, while the City Councils are making a policy recommendation so he wouldn't have an issue making a preferred choices recommendation, because in regard to the technical aspect he is kind of starting to squirm a bit about just passing it on by saying that we will support whatever the councils want. Lang agreed, adding that the council could do something that we don't think would be in our best interest. Noehre added that there could also be the issue of the two councils choosing different options, which would then mean that we would be supporting them both, how do you do that. He said that he understands the idea behind the motion, but that isn't the intent of this body. West said, then, that what Mr. Noehre is saying is that we should be making a recommendation that the City Council should take into consideration when they make their decision. Noehre responded that that is correct.

***WILLIAMS WITHDREW HER MOTION, SECONDED BY BERGMAN.***

***MOVED BY LANG, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FOLLOWING OPTIONS: 1) REHAB; 2) INTERNAL; AND 3) NORTHSIDE.***

Ellis asked if there was enough room for a bike lane. Hille responded that he cannot tell what the inside looks like, or what it will look like until they get into the design phase. He said that he can't tell you whether the historians are going to allow a barrier between the sidewalk and the traffic, those things have to be worked out during the design phase. He added that they don't have nearly enough information to talk about the specifics of the cross-section itself at this point in time. Ellis asked if one of the final designs, then, could possibly have no bike or pedestrian facility. Hille responded that he doesn't think that is a possibility. Ellis said that that is their council's biggest concern, that you can accommodate bikes and peds. Hille commented that they are certainly going to have facilities that will accommodate bicycles and pedestrians, exactly to what degree and what the cross-section looks like they do not have enough information to say.

Williams said, then, that it would be fair to say that we are doing a conceptual plan. Hille responded that that would be correct. He added that the first three items we are talking about; north or south, rehab or replacement, inside or outside, those are more than conceptual, what the cross-section is is conceptual.

West asked, then, if the existing clear space is 66-feet and change, so we can get four lanes and a bike-lane in there, in the existing structure as it is today. Hille responded that they can get four lanes of traffic and some type of bicycle/pedestrian facility, they are confident of that.

Haugen referred to a drawing of the bridge, and explained that it was submitted by the NDDOT as their preferred alternative. He pointed out that they have conceptually laid out how they can

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

design four lanes with a bike/ped accommodation. Hille commented that, again, there are some challenges with that because it eliminates the center barrier, but he is certain they can work through some of those issues.

Williams asked if the bike/ped access has to be ten-feet wide. Hille responded that there is no question during this process, there are standards for bicycles, for a healthy combined use path. Haugen commented that eight-feet is allowable as the minimum. Hille said, again, Minnesota has some standards, North Dakota has some standards, certainly the standard width for a traffic lane is twelve-feet, but there may be some design exceptions either from the traffic side or from the pedestrian combined use paths that they will have to determine, however, ultimately they know enough that they can come up with safely accommodating the traffic and safely accommodating the pedestrians to some degree inside that truss, whether that is eight-feet or ten-feet, whether that is twelve-foot lanes or eleven and a half-foot lanes, they just aren't there yet, nor can they get there with the amount of information they have or without review by the historians or Federal Highway.

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Hille commented that they are hopeful that this project will be let sometime in 2016. He added that they all hope that they don't experience major movement that causes them to have to do pier repairs or accommodations prior to that. He said that at their last inspection, it looked fairly good.

Haugen stated that there is some interest in the room as to when they might be doing the request for the next phase, the design phase, project development, when do you think MnDOT might release that. Hille responded that he was actually working on this last night, and they have to renew their agreement with the NDDOT to include some of these things. He stated that this body understands, he thinks, that ultimately the decisions will be made by those with the checkbooks, and that is North Dakota and Minnesota DOTs combined, but they like to have as much of the issues ironed out prior to that as possible, so this helps substantially, and he would like to thank this group, and the City Councils for accepting the recommendations of the study, and this will help accelerate that process, but when will they get there, the next phase under contract, certainly this calendar year, but which month he can't say, but they are working on it already, and North Dakota has already said that they were going to accelerate the approval process in the agreement, and that helps, so they have everybody working together here. Haugen added that the T.I.P. already has a project for the NEPA process included, so you have funds from the North Dakota side to pay for it.

**Sorlie Bridge Project**

Noehre reported that they did some additional testing and inspections. He said that they have received some of the test results back, but all indication is that the concrete samples they did take look very good considering the age. He added that they the North Dakota and Minnesota Bridge Divisions are going through and checking all the calculations and inspections, and there is a new

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

ASHTO guideline on rating fracture critical bridges, so they are going through and updating that process as well.

Noehre stated that they are getting very close to coming to a conclusion and determining what the next steps will be, but they aren't quite there yet. He said that both bridge divisions are working together, and will meet again to go over the calculations and what the implications are, and make a decision on which way to go. He added that this could mean that they may conclude the EIS process, but it isn't fully determined yet.

Hille added that the bridge was designed under one set of design standards, but it now has to be analyzed under a different program, so the strength analysis, being different, plus section loss in certain areas being different, plus some of the rivet types that were used back when it was constructed, makes it a complicated process.

Haugen said that the last time the committee met there was to be a subsequent meeting with the historical preservation group, has that occurred. Noehre responded that he isn't sure what meeting is being referred to. Haugen asked if it was called the Methods Document that some discussion was had regarding a forty, forty-five, or fifty-year rehab life span was going to be followed up with technicians and specialist in the historical preservation amongst everybody. Noehre responded that some of that meeting has taken place already, actually more than one, but he doesn't think there is a finished Methods document. He said that they went into the additional testing and inspection which might have some influence on this so, to his knowledge, it wasn't completed.

Haugen commented that the Purpose and Need document has been finalized, when will it be available on the website. Noehre responded that, again, because of the testing and the additional inspection it's the same question, the same answer, there might not be a need for it. He said that if there is a need for it he would answer yes; and if there isn't a need for it the answer would be moot.

Information only.

**MATTER OF SCOPE OF WORK FOR ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MANUAL  
UPDATE**

Kouba reported that back when we were doing our Long Range Transportation Plan, one of the caveats of approval was that we updated how we looked at our environmental justice. She explained that we previously had said our area of true interest, or the most need was when minorities and low income populations were localized in one area, now the outlook is that it doesn't matter if they are both there, it matters that there is a population in any part of our cities.

Kouba said that what we are going to do is to look at the data again to make sure we show that our EJ areas are including all areas that have high concentrations of minorities and a separate area of high concentrations of low income people, so we are focusing on both caveats of the environmental justice.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Kouba stated that one we have done the above, then we will look at our Long Range Transportation projects and make sure that they still have taken into effect that there are no major negative effects on these populations.

Kouba said that they are seeking approval of the scope-of-work.

Haugen commented, again, this is a two-step process, the first is to look at the manual, remove the “and” specification and replace it with an “and/or” qualification; and once that is complete look at the Long Range Transportation Plan. He stated that we have a new date of September for the Environmental Justice analysis and November for any impact it may have on the Long Range Transportation, and that is what is in the scope of work.

Williams asked, at one time our funding was tied to this being completed, is that still true. Johnson responded that it is not, he explained that the letter stated that the Long Range Plan has been accepted, but this needs to be done as part of that acceptance, so everything is a go with the Long Range Plan, this is just a direction to follow-up on and complete in order to get everything done and updated.

***MOVED BY GENGLER, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE SCOPE-OF-WORK, AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF A LETTER OF REQUEST FOR NDDOT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR MPO**

Haugen reported that this is a request from the three MPOs in North Dakota to the North Dakota DOT. He explained that the development of this request originates out of the Fargo-Moorhead area. He said that they have had some conversations with Director Levi about the possibility of receiving some North Dakota State funds to assist their operation.

Haugen commented that most of you should be aware that both Fargo and Grand Forks receive Minnesota State funds to help with our operation of MPOs, so as part of the discussion with Director Levi, he asked that the three MPOs jointly present a letter to him with this request, a copy of which is included in the packet.

Haugen stated that the letter outlines the request, suggesting a dollar amount of \$100,000, as well as how it could be distributed between the three MPOs. He explained that the request is trying to mirror what Minnesota does for its MPOs by having the NDDOT include an item in their budget to help financially with the MPOs.

Haugen reported that all three MPOs are processing this letter through their Technical Advisory Committees and Executive Boards so that, assuming it is approved by all three, they can make

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

the formal request to Director Levi, and then can start having discussions and determine whether or not we can input these dollar amounts into our work programs for the next two years.

Williams asked if they know what fund the money will come out of, the additional funding if NDDOT pledges additional funds, do we know where it is going to come from, is it going to come from our Highway Users or is it a separate fund. Haugen responded that we don't know, but it would more than likely be internal funds that the NDDOT has, not taking from the distribution, so they wouldn't be playing with the Highway Distribution formula at all. Williams agreed, but said that she is wondering is if there is just going to be a line item created within that that once the distribution is made, then this is one of our liabilities or obligations. Haugen responded that for the NDDOT budget it would be part of their administrative costs, it wouldn't be something that would reflect negatively on the local side, what it would do on the local side would be to reduce whatever match the two cities have by the amount we receive. He pointed out that the State of Minnesota doesn't reduce the amount of funds it distributes to its locals for projects, and Minnesota funds are used to reduce the amount of dollars the locals have to have to match the MPO progress.

Williams pointed out that it indicates what Fargo-Moorhead would do with the additional funding if it is approved, do we have anything lined up, or outlined up as far as where those funds will be targeted for. Haugen responded that it will just be reducing the local match requirement, which is how we use the Minnesota funds.

West pointed out that in the second paragraph of the letter it states that "federal funding provided for the MPO operations in North Dakota is typically adequate to meet the minimum planning requirements however state funding will assist the MPOS and any DOT match the full obligation of federal transportation funds provided through the grant program", so we are keeping the overall budget the same, but in here it is indicating there is more happening. Haugen responded that the other two MPOs get a greater share of the planning funds available to North Dakota, they have also had issues in the past of spending down their planning dollars. He explained that one of their issues has been local match, so that is what that statement is addressing. He added that for us it isn't an issue.

Noehre asked if we haven't helped them with that in the past. Haugen responded that we did receive funds from another MPO to help erase some of that backlog of funds. He added that, because one of the issues they had was the local match. He explained that it will not increase any of the federal dollars we would get, it only decreases the dollars the locals have to match.

Noehre commented that the funds have to come from somewhere, somebody is going to get less. Haugen responded that it is part of the State DOT budget. Noehre said that he just knows there are eight places they usually go to get additional monies.

Haugen reported that the Fargo/Moorhead Transportation Technical committee did review it last Thursday, and they recommended approval of the letter being signed by their executive board. He said that Bismarck/Mandan reviews it Monday, and their executive board will act on it on Tuesday, and we meet today and our executive board next Wednesday.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Williams asked if it could be changed from a funding request to additional information, she would feel more comfortable knowing exactly where that money is coming from, and how it is going to work out. Haugen responded that he doesn't know if they would know the answer for some time, but they are asking you to approve the concept of the NDDOT providing some financial assistance to the MPO operations, and how it will be used here in Grand Forks and East Grand Forks is to lessen the local match requirement. He added that there is a suggested dollar value, but they don't know if that is too little in the eyes of the North Dakota Director, or if it is too much, and they don't know for sure how the funds will be distributed, it is only being suggested that it follow the distribution method used for distribution of federal funds, using a base amount plus population share.

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE LETTER REQUESTING NDDOT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE MPO, AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF NORTH DAKOTA DRAFT FREIGHT PLAN**

Haugen reported that North Dakota has released a Draft Freight Plan. He pointed out that included in the packet is the Executive Summary of that Freight Plan.

Haugen commented that yesterday he did present some of the freight issues in Grand Forks and East Grand Forks to the open house they held for the eastern half of the State.

Haugen pointed out that in the draft they do identify a strategic system, and they have identified it for not only highways, but for rails and for pipelines. He said that this plan happens to be the one for highways, and you can see that I-29 and U.S. #2 are part of it. He added that they didn't go into the urbanized areas to try to identify roadways or streets.

Haugen commented that they have a Level 1, 2, and 3; Level 1 are shown in red and are the highest strategic freight highways. He pointed out that our main route is Level 1; the one that parallels 42<sup>nd</sup> Street, Glasston Spur, is Level 2; and the primary difference between the two is the carrying capacities and the speed for the lines. He added that they do include airports and we only have the one pipeline coming through our area as well.

Haugen stated that the Freight Plan did identify some of the trends and issues, those are listed; and it tried to identify some of the needs as well. He outlined the process they follow as to what goes on after the freight plan is in place; explaining that one of the impetus for why they are doing a freight plan is because MAP-21 does call out for a freight plan, and it sets the stage for funding a freight system. He explained that a few months ago there was discussion held on the fact that MAP-21 also says that there is going to be identified a national freight/highway network, a primary freight network, and they had some discussions about the language in that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

and what it means. He said that it is probably too small of a freight system that they identified in MAP-21, so what the freight plan is doing is setting the stage for North Dakota to be ready and at the table if and when Congress does fund the freight program that is in MAP-21, or in the reauthorization bills.

Haugen reported that the plan is out for public input and comment, the website is provided, and there are forms on the website for comments.

Haugen stated that the one last thing to identify with this freight system, or freight plan, might be it is Jack Olson's official last major piece of work for the NDDOT; and that his replacement has already been hired, and that is Ben Erath, who was formally with Bismarck/Mandan MPO.

Noehre asked how soon they want comments. Haugen responded that he believes they want them by the end of June. He commented that on the website you will also see the presentation that was made, and the full plan. Williams asked if the freight plan we did with the Long Range Transportation Plan update was included in this. Haugen responded it is included as an appendix.

Noehre commented that something he found interesting was that the railroad is looking at potentially going to two-mile unit trains instead of one-mile unit trains. Various locations that would definitely be adversely impacted by two-mile unit trains were discussed. Haugen stated that this would certainly impact the State Mill if they are still trying to land a unit train, or the nitrogen fertilizer plant.

Ellis reported that the East Grand Forks Fire Department was sent to training for the oil cars, and were told that the railroad would be re-routing a majority of those cars through Grand Forks and East Grand Forks. She said that when they looked into it further it appears that there could possibly be a train every 40-minutes. Williams said that they are talking about instead of taking it down to Hillsboro to shoot it through our area. Ellis responded that that is correct, and it is a concern to them on how it will affect 2nd, as anyone from the Point will find it difficult to travel without hitting a train.

Haugen commented that, Jack, as part of his presentation does show how it has already impacted the Fargo-Moorehead area; in 2007 the numbers of trains going through there were in the neighborhood of 60 a day, and in 2013 it is 130. He added that we also know that because of our Amtrak service, that BNSF has had one-way traffic essentially trying to accommodate all of the capacity constraints and the hauling they are doing, so it isn't too surprising that they are looking at going more easternly because if you do drive up I-29 almost anytime now you will see trains sitting there waiting their turn to proceed through wherever they are going. He stated that BNSF is investing, he believes the number mentioned was half-a-billion dollars, in North Dakota to upgrade and double-track some of this area.

Haugen reported that in terms of the pipeline, included in the full report, North Dakota does anticipate what the future will bring, and they see that even with additional proposed pipelines being built, rail is still going to maintain its current, and most likely increase its share of oil, plus

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

they also lay out the agricultural needs, and how much the production has changed as far as tonnage, and how much we produce in the State versus what we did ten years ago, there is a tremendous increase in production taking place.

Haugen commented that, as Mr. Olson describes it, we are in almost a perfect storm wherein we have a lot of in-bound materials to service the oil, to service the fertilizer; but now we also have a lot of out-bound things, and we know that the rail system grew a hundred years ago, and then was kind of slowly being abandoned, and now it is being ramped back up in a hurry to try to accommodate all the increased capacity needs.

Kuharenko said, then, that one question he would have is if we are looking at a shift of train traffic from the Glasston Line to another east/west line, because he knows that 42<sup>nd</sup> Street has a lot of trains on it already, and he knows that when that freight/rail access study was done, there was an indication that if train traffic increases at this location it will end up triggering the need for a grade separation, so do you have any idea as to what kind of increase in train traffic we are going to have and if that threshold is going to be met. Ellis responded that she doesn't know, what she does know is, because it was discussed at one of their department head meetings, that their Fire Chief was notified by Nels Christianson, after they were given this free training in Utah, that there will be increased train traffic, with a train going through about every 40-minutes. She said that they weren't actually given any information as to how many trains, or what they are going to do, they were just told "heads up", so that would be a good question for either the Fire Chiefs or Emergency Managers for both cities to see what they have actually been told.

Haugen commented that he thinks the federal rules were just looked at recently, and if he recalls correctly, the railroads are just required to inform the State as to the daily volumes they are hauling, he doesn't think they are required to notify any cities within the State.

Haugen reported that, as a side note, they learned through the Freight Rail Access Study, as best as could be analyzed, the increased train traffic would not jeopardize the quiet zones. Williams said, however, that if it goes to one every 40-minutes, it will because they can't put in any more safety measures than they already have unless they go with quad-gates, and that would be just impossible to do.

Kuharenko stated that by going with two-mile unit trains instead of one-mile unit trains there will also be the issue of increased delay. Williams agreed, adding that that is a whole other concern, the constant delay as the railroad bisects the downtown, and it also bisects UND from a great number of the student population.

Noehre commented that the one thing that jumped out at him on the highway side is that, again this is just a draft, but the red lines, the primary routes don't match exactly all the rest of our routes like National Highway System, Highway Performance Classification System, etc.. He said it doesn't necessarily have any significance for the MPO, but it does regionally.

Haugen encouraged everyone to visit the website, read the documentation, and leave any comments you may have on the plan.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

**MATTER OF MNDOT BIKE PLAN PUBLIC MEETING**

Erickson reported that MnDOT has been going around Minnesota to hold open houses, and workshops at the different districts. She explained that because East Grand Forks is in District 2, we would have had to travel to Bemidji last week, however, since most people wouldn't travel do that, we requested they come here and they said they would be happy to do so, and will be here on May 29<sup>th</sup> in the East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room.

Erickson stated that they are looking for input, things that you like about the bike system, things you don't like about it; to help them create the Statewide Bicycle System Plan, and improving things in the future. She said it should be a good workshop/open house, and she hopes a lot of people will attend. Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that a copy of the presentation given to the MPOs on May 5<sup>th</sup>, was included for your review.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

**Grow America Released**

Haugen commented that Grow America has been released by the Administration on its proposal of MAP-21 Reauthorization, four-year, three hundred billion dollars. He said that most of the additional revenue needing to be raised is through taxing off-shore business interests.

Haugen stated that the Senate has released its version of reauthorization, however he doesn't know if there is a name or acronym for it, but it is really a continuation of MAP-21 with many of the programs remaining the same, and the current funding levels plus inflation.

Haugen said that because the committee that released the highway side of MAP-21 isn't the committee in the Senate that deals with finances, they don't have a finance mechanism identified to pay for it. He stated that this is a six-year bill versus the Administration's four-year bill, and MAP-21 expires at the end of September.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO ADJOURN THE MAY14<sup>TH</sup>, 2014,  
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 3:01 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, June 11<sup>th</sup>, 2014  
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the June 11<sup>th</sup>, 2014, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:32 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Mike Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Mike Yavarow, Grand Forks Engineering; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Darren Laesch, MNDOT-Planning Director; Rick Audette, Grand Forks Regional Airport Authority; and Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning.

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

Guest(s) present were: Joe McKinnon, MNDOT.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

Haugen asked that, because we have some new faces here today, everyone please state their name and the organization they represent.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MAY 14<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO APPROVE THE MAY 14<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, June 11<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS**

Haugen reported that unless someone from either NDDOT or MNDOT has anything to share on the Sorlie Bridge there is really no update that he is aware of.

Haugen stated that on the Kennedy Bridge, as you recall last month there was a request from MNDOT and NDDOT for concurrence on the planning study, particularly about the rehab option and the internal placement of bike/ped accommodations; and then also a request for the north side. He said that the City of Grand Forks approved those requests; the City of East Grand Forks also approved them, but then added a request that a median be placed between the driving lanes. He added that the MPO Executive Policy Board concurred with the final study report as is, and didn't itemize anything.

Laesch commented that there was a meeting held prior to this meeting, at which they had discussion on what the estimate should be in the STIP, and Mr. Haugen will put that together. He stated that this is so that they can ensure that their STIPs and TIPs coordinate.

Haugen added that this body may see the results of this at next month's meeting if North Dakota releases their Draft T.I.P., if not then we will wait until we do a final approval in August or September.

Information only.

**MATTER OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE UPWP**

Haugen reminded the committee that several months ago they recommended approval of a Request For Proposals on US Highway 2 Access Management Plan, however since the RFP was released the proposed Nitrogen Fertilizer Plant got a stronger potential to be a reality. He stated that in our 2040 Plan our traffic forecasts did not account for such a plant being located adjacent to this corridor, therefore, because it seems more likely than not that it will become a reality, we are amending the work program to include additional work as part of this access management study to incorporate into the forecasted travel what the plant may add to the system, particularly to the US Highway 2 Corridor.

Haugen stated that the second part to this amendment is; because of the proposed fertilizer plant, and also as part of looking at the east end of the corridor, we were originally going to stop shy of the I-29 Interchange, but after looking at the 2040 forecast numbers, the capacity we are showing for the Interchange we find that it is pretty congested, and with the additional traffic from the proposed plant we felt that we should include the interchange ramps in the study as well.

Haugen reiterated that the purpose of this amendment is to have the Access Management Study incorporate the likely increase in traffic from the proposed fertilizer plant and also to expand the study to include the interchange ramps with I-29 and US #2.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, June 11<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen commented that, as part of the effort to keep our funding neutral, as noted our original plan was to do a traffic incident management plan this year, however, as Stephanie Erickson has explained there are some things at the National/Federal Highway level that we are waiting to occur in both States, however they aren't likely to happen any time soon, so we have decided to delay the start of the plan until late in 2014 and carry over into 2015, and then the additional finances to help on the U.S. #2 study have been moved from the consultant line item under that plan up to the U.S.#2 Access Study.

Williams pointed out that this is a substantial increase from the original cost of the study, and she is wondering if, when costs increase over 100%, is it proper to proceed or should it be re-advertised to let everyone look at the new scope, because it is basically a whole new scope. Haugen responded that this issue came up between when we advertised and before the deadline for submittal of the proposals. He said that they didn't inform any of the potential firms that there was a possibility of added scope, so they were all ranked according to what the RFP was requiring. Williams stated, however, that what was added wasn't just more of the same thing, we actually added more elements to it, separate elements. Haugen responded that we are adding the interchange ramps to the east end, the plant is just sort of adding on one additional traffic forecast to account for, we are already accounting for the rest of the travel demand forecast, so it isn't too substantial of a change, adding the ramps would be the most substantial change.

Kuharenko commented that he would suppose the follow-up to that is that we are only adding the east ramps, the west ramps were already involved, so even though the ramps are the majority of the additional work, does that justify a 118% increase in the costs, what kind of review measures do we have in place that this is a justifiable increase in costs. Haugen responded that he is putting a number out there, it is a swag as to what the consultant costs will be. Kuharenko said, then, that that is your estimate, it isn't KLJ's number. Haugen added that they are also asking KLJ, as part of the cost increase, to provide 3-D animation, which is something the Selection Committee requested be added to the work, which will also add cost to the project. He said that a couple of intersections along this corridor will most likely have some heavy public involvement as to the solutions, the alternatives that will be considered, and the Selection Committee felt that the 3-D animation is extremely helpful in communicating what those alternative intersection treatments might be, so that will add cost to the project as well, so the \$120,000, or up to \$120,000 cost increase is a bit of an MPO Director swag of the costs. He explained that they are still negotiating with KLJ, who is the consultant chosen to do the study, to see what their final costs will be to do these added things to the U.S. Highway #2 Corridor Study.

Noehre asked, in regard to the Nitrogen Plant, will we be including what we know today of the Nitrogen Plant so that we can include it in the traffic counts and the Access Management Plan or is it to do that and to also be a Traffic Operations Study for the Nitrogen Plant. Haugen responded that it will do the first part, but some of the work can be used if they move forward into the next stage that requires they do an impact study, but one of the big questions along this corridor is, the Nitrogen Plant is indicating that they are going to rely heavily on U.S. #2 as its distribution route, whether 69<sup>th</sup> Street should be that main location or if 55<sup>th</sup> should, so it is pretty critical that we account for potential traffic as we go along and try to decide what the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, June 11<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

management plan will be, and how the accesses will be shaped. He stated that the primary purpose is the Access Management Plan. Noehre said that he would wholeheartedly agree with that element, but would equally disagree with this study being a traffic operation report for the nitrogen plant. Haugen commented that there will certainly be some portion of the work done here that can be used, but there is certainly other work that we aren't even considering in this scope. He said that if they have to do a traffic impact analysis, they will have to do it later. Noehre responded that he would hope that when they do do the traffic operations report they take this as a starting point. Williams stated that they support that completely because from the description of the work here we're not going to get all the information they need. Noehre commented that the plant is still just a proposal, so if it doesn't get built that leads to other options that we should look at. Haugen responded that this is one piece of information they need to know to allow them to make a decision to proceed further.

Williams commented that, prior to finalizing the contract, they have discussed this internally, they have a couple of things they would like to request; in establishing milestone dates and everything they would like for them to build-in a minimum of a week for any reviews, but they would prefer a two weeks. She explained that if they don't have enough review time they obviously just can't go do a good job. She said that the other request is actually regarding the format in which they are receiving some of these things; they would like to see a strike-through line format so that when they review the document they don't have to wade through everything every-time to determine what was changed. Haugen commented that these requests have nothing to do with this amendment, but instead has to do with the... Williams agreed, but added that it may have something to do with the timelines in the contract with the consultant, he may come back and say they can do it but it may add another week or so to the contract, and she believes that would be part of this contract.

Kuharenko said that another question we should ask is whether or not this body would be given monthly updates on where the project is at. Haugen responded that they have three public meetings, but he doesn't recall if KLJ's scope includes monthly project meetings. Kuharenko said that he thinks they have three Steering Committee meetings, but he doesn't think that has anything to do with this committee. Williams commented that she thinks they would just like to be updated similarly to how they are being updated on the Sorlie and Kennedy Bridge projects, so maybe you could just add another line item to this report so they can keep up with what is going on.

Noehre asked if this includes adding the junction of County 11 and North Washington. Haugen responded that it isn't identified in the work program, but the Selection Committee has asked KLJ to also look at that intersection, so we should probably add that discussion to the scope of work description for the U.S. #2 Access study. Gengler asked if it is appropriate to do that. Haugen responded that, in hindsight it would be appropriate to identify that it is being added to this work program line item because we are asking KLJ to look at that intersection. Noehre said, then, that if approve this we are approving up to that \$120,000. Gengler said that he thinks it is important that it be added. Haugen stated, then, that any part of the motion to recommend approval will include a recommendation to add in the secondary access point to the proposed

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, June 11<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

plan, the 70<sup>th</sup> and County 11 intersection, which is less than a quarter mile from the North Washington Interchange ramps to I-29.

***MOVED BY NOEHRE, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE 2014 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM, SUBJECT TO INCLUSION OF THE CHANGES/ADDITIONS DISCUSSED ABOVE.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF INTEGRATION OF THE LRSP AND LRTP**

Haugen stated that he would first like to explain that the “Erickson” listed for this agenda item is not Stephanie Erickson, but is instead Sarah Erickson, our new MPO Intern. He said that Sarah is in grad school studying public administration at UND, and will be working with us full-time over the summer. He added that her one assignment is to help us with integrating our Long Range Transportation Plan and the Strategic Highway Safety Plan, the Local Roads Safety Plans; so that we can become more accountable for the revenue and expenditures for the Safety Program.

Haugen reported that we talked about the integration as we went along with our Long Range Transportation Plan process, and also kept you up-to-date with the Local Road Safety Plans. He said that the Local Road Safety Plans are not finalized yet, they will be soon, and in-fact there is a North Dakota Safety Conference going on today and tomorrow in Bismarck, which is where some of Technical Advisory Committee members are.

Haugen stated that Sarah put together, to help her kind of understand the scope of work, a power point presentation. He explained that she is hustling to get here today, however she had to be in the Twin Cities yesterday and was not able to leave until this morning so is enroute as we speak.

Haugen referred to the power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request), and went over it briefly.

Presentation ensued.

Noehre referred to a slide discussing the North Dakota Strategic Highway Safety Plan, and pointed out that it states that North Dakota sets aside 50% of transportation funds for local safety projects; and although he understands what was meant, it isn't exactly how it reads so he would suggest instead of it saying North Dakota sets aside 50% of transportation funds it should say safety funds instead. Haugen stated that he would update the slide to reflect that.

Presentation continued.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, June 11<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen reported that each State has a Highway Safety Plan, and within those documents they already have performance measures and performance targets identified. He said that the first four shown are in the National Proposed Rule Making.

Haugen stated that since 2010, both States have been annually submitting these documents to the Feds, with these performance measures identified, and also targets identified as well.

Haugen said that on the North Dakota side they were able to easily identify these first three bullets, on the Minnesota document they couldn't readily identify that it is there, but you can see that both states also go into a bunch of other performance measures, and have been for quite a while as part of the required national measures.

Williams asked; the Local Road Safety Program is not required, so it wouldn't be appropriate to list these as projects that we are going to do, they are ones that we could look at and then balance them with our existing needs, because that is one of the questions she asked early on in this. She explained that one example is the intersection of 32<sup>nd</sup> and 34<sup>th</sup> is one of the highest crash locations in the State, but it isn't included in our list at all because the idea is that it will be addressed under the HSIP or one of the other programs, so these are not hard/fast absolute we have to do projects. Johnson responded that they aren't, but it gives you a list of projects that you can do, and there is a pile of money you can tap into if you have access to it. He said that he looks at this as more of a benefit, of something that wasn't provided in the past, but the leg work has been done and it offers a way to improve your system. Williams said, however, that they may actually come up with additional stuff later one, correct. Johnson responded that there is always going to be something that wasn't covered by this, there will be other projects. Williams said that it is actually "may include that are not limited to the items that were generated in this 2014 study. Johnson responded that that is correct, there will always be opportunity for other projects, but these are items that have been identified as issues, and just like any other issue you have with an intersection or roadway, he thinks it is appropriate to identify them and look at ways to fix them.

Williams commented that what they are concerned about is that they have a known location that has many, many, many crashes; and they are looking at maybe spending their dollars on restriping the street so it has three lanes instead of two lanes, and there are no crashes on it right now, so that is the thing they are looking at in terms of being able to balance things out. She added that she knows it is better to be proactive than what you're doing, but if you have operational problems right now, you can't just turn your back on them and work on things that may happen in the future.

Johnson reported that another thing you have to be aware of is that some of those operational improvements, as a stand-alone, do not necessarily justify for safety funding, there has to be a safety improvement benefit for them, so all of these would fall under that pot of money. Williams commented that she is strictly talking about intersection improvements that would reduce crashes.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, June 11<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Noehre stated that he would suggest that there needs to be some kind of balance for all of this, because if we totally ignore where there is systemic then we would never get caught up, so we have to address urgent current needs and the systemic things and integrate them.

Johnson commented that another benefit this provides is that these improvements have already been studied and identified, and are ready to go; whereas if you did have something, even if it is on the high crash list you have to go through and do the leg work to determine whether or not the improvement you proposing will work and will reduce it, it isn't just a matter of saying that there is lot of rear-end crashes here, you have to do to the leg work to justify where the work has been done for you. He added that there will be projects that will be based on high crash locations, and based on other things, but he thinks these need to be practically looked at, and then practically used to help yourself get ahead of some of these so you may be able to prevent some in the future. Williams said that that's probably the point she is getting around to, is that we need to review them and then decide whether we are going to act on them or not, it isn't a matter of here is a list and you have to do them all type thing, and she just doesn't want to infer that in the Long Range Transportation Plan; that here's the list and we have to do these, that isn't what that program was designed as.

Noehre commented that the other side of the coin is also true, in that we don't have to only apply HSIP funding to those projects that are in the plan, if it is a high enough priority, and there is a high enough cost benefit then maybe we should be looking at it no matter where the funding comes from. He added that he also agrees that just taking that list and cutting and pasting it into the Long Range Transportation Plan would be challenging because that really wasn't the intent of it either; it has to be included in the Long Range Transportation Plan, he wholeheartedly concurs with that, but just how to get it in there without then narrowing everyone's focus to, okay here is your list, because that wouldn't be appropriate either. Williams agreed, adding that because every time something comes up we have to do a plan amendment to get it on the list, she doesn't want to get caught in a merry-go-round of, here is a high crash list and now we have to amend the Long Range Transportation Plan in order to spend those dollars, so she would rather we keep it as generic as possible.

Noehre stated that another part, as most of you have heard him say, is that the local road safety program individual projects contain some elements that the NDDOT isn't sure they are going to allow as far as policy is concerned, so they are in there because they are proven and tried strategies that have worked other places, but that doesn't mean that we are ready to implement them next week ourselves. Williams agreed, saying that she just doesn't want to create a problem where we are constantly going in and amending to either not spend or spend, one way or the other. Johnson commented, however, that you also have to put enough information in there so that you're not also amending, because if you don't put in enough information you still have to do amendments, so you need to find that balance and you may have to be more specific than what you are thinking so that you aren't amending either way.

Haugen reported that the local safety plan, just like the Long Range Transportation Plan, are at best five year documents just like the Transit Development Plan is a five year document, so we

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, June 11<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

do have to account for those other years somehow, so we are still trying to figure it out and are working to come up with a solution.

Kuharenko commented that one thing he wants to bring up is in the changes to the objectives and standards; and the standards are saying that we are going to install this or install that, and he is wondering if that is appropriate for this or should it be investigate A, B, or C. Haugen responded that, again the Strategic Highway Safety Plan uses this language, and the only thing we are changing from that plan is the word “standard” when they use the word “strategy”, otherwise we are pulling everything straight from the Strategic Highway Safety Plan.

Haugen stated that, again, under the engineering type strategies we aren’t incorporating the behavioral type strategies. Noehre added that, again, those things are to be investigated, but does that mean that we sit down and do every one of those items blindly with just a cookie-cutter and send it out for bid, that isn’t what that means. Haugen agreed, adding that that is where those identified projects in the local safety plan has investigated those segments, and some segments didn’t have enough characteristics to be prioritized while others had enough factors to make them rise up to a level of where the local safety plan identifies that if we invest a small amount to do these things you will have a great reduction in crashes.

Williams asked if we were limited to the number of objectives we can have. Haugen responded that we aren’t, but then there are only so many identified in the Strategic Safety Plan. Williams asked if the one that we have now reduce the number of severity and the rate of crashes compared to previous years, is that in there now. Haugen responded that he doesn’t know. Williams stated that she can’t see a comparison between these two, she can see them both being in there, adding one without deleting the other because keeping the vehicles on the road is not necessarily the same as reducing the number of severity and rate of crashes compared to previous years, so can we have both. Haugen responded that, again, the Strategic Highway Safety Plan and the Local Road Safety Plan have these objectives listed in them, as he recalls, and we are integrating those into our Long Range Transportation Plan.

Williams said that she kind of looked at one of them, and the proposed revision is kind of related to the Local Road Safety Program; whereas the one we have there now is kind of related to HSIP and there are still two separate fundings. Haugen commented that the Local Road Safety Plan is directly dealing with HSIP dollars, that is why they were done, so it isn’t separate funding programs. Williams stated that they are separate objectives though, you have urban objectives and you have rural objectives, and they are different. She said that she isn’t going to strike edge line on our city streets because we don’t have to. Haugen agreed, adding, however, that this isn’t the only objective we are going to have it is an example of how it is going to change, He explained that there are six emphasis areas, so there will be at least six objectives, and probably many objectives under those six. He said that if you will recall the local safety plan in particular, there are some objectives and some strategies that we aren’t pursuing even though they are under the emphasis area. Williams said, then, that we will have more than the three objectives we have right now in our Safety Plan. Haugen responded that that is correct, adding that we will have at least four performance measures, and maybe more.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, June 11<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen reported that on a national level there is a big fight going on about pedestrian facility fatalities and bicycle fatalities not being part of the national measures. He said that if North Dakota and Minnesota already have them measured, he doesn't know what the big fight is because they are already being done and have been done for the last several years.

Information only.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Highway #2 Access Management Study

Noehre commented that, going back to the Highway #2 Access Management Study, again in his mind it is a very important study, and very appropriate at this particular time to do this study. He said that he would also agree with Mr. Kuharenko that when we do address comments it is in some form reported back to the committee that the comments are addressed. He added that often we have someone make a comment, and here is the answer to it; or if it is in a line by line strike it out kind of thing, show that it was done; just do something so that all of us don't have to read the document over and over again hunting to ensure our comments were addressed, or each other's comments were addressed. He said that he would also agree that, because it is an important study, and it is important to the community, and to the region, we have some sort of monthly update in a similar manner as is done for the Sorlie and Kennedy Bridge projects, and he isn't suggesting that the consultant has to come all the time, just that an update is provided.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO ADJOURN THE JUNE 11<sup>TH</sup>, 2014,  
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:24 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014  
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the July 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:37 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Mike Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division (via conference call); Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Mike Yavarow, Grand Forks Engineering; Patrick Dame, Grand Forks Regional Airport Authority; Dale Bergman, Grand Forks Cities Area Transit; Ali Rood, Grand Forks Cities Area Transit; Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineer; and Ryan Brooks, Grand Forks Planning.

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

Guest(s) present were: Al Grasser, Grand Forks City Engineer.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 11<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE THE JUNE 11<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS**

Haugen reported that there isn't any information that he is aware of on the Sorlie Bridge Project to update the Technical Advisory Committee on at this time.

Haugen referred to the staff report and pointed out that on the Kennedy Bridge, both DOTs are in agreement to move forward on a rehab project, and are pricing it out at \$16,000,000 for the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Bridge; and \$2,000,000 for approaches, and construction engineering is roughly 10% so the total cost that will be reflected in the Draft T.I.P. will be the \$19,800,000 to be shared 50/50.

Haugen pointed out that the staff report also lists the major tasks that they have identified as part of the rehab project.

Haugen said that both States are now at the point where they have reached agreement on the next phase, and that is to issue a Request For Proposal from consultants to begin doing the project development stage. He said that he isn't sure when that proposal will be released.

Haugen commented that they have officially removed replacement as an option being pursued, and the price in the T.I.P. has been lowered to reflect the rehab costs.

Information only.

**MATTER OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FY2014 ANNUAL ELEMENT IN THE 2014-2017 T.I.P.**

Haugen reported that the staff report lists two project amendments; however, the East Grand Forks project request has been pulled, so we will no longer be entertaining that request.

Haugen said that the remaining request was from Grand Forks and affects two 2017 projects. He stated that one is to more or less merge the federal funds into one project and keeping it in 2017, and that is the project on 17<sup>th</sup> and Columbia Road. He added that the other project that had federal funds programmed in 2017 will now be zeroed out and moved to 2014, and done with 100% local funds.

Haugen opened the public hearing.

There was no one present for discussion, and no written comments were received by today's noon deadline.

Haugen closed the public hearing.

Williams referred to the staff report and pointed out that it does discuss switching the projects around; however, although she sees the Columbia Road and 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue Project, she doesn't see what the other project is. She said that she doesn't know whether or not it should be listed for clarification, but it is the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue/34<sup>th</sup> Street Intersection project.

***MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY DAME, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE 2014 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM, AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

**MATTER OF DRAFT NORTH DAKOTA SIDE T.I.P.FOR FY2015-2018**

Haugen commented that, as everyone is aware we would typically be doing this in April, however there was a delay on the North Dakota Side. He said, however, that the Minnesota Side Draft T.I.P. was approved in April, and we are now taking action on the North Dakota Draft T.I.P.

Haugen stated that it is a rush job, to be honest, as we got the Draft Urban Program the day of the required public hearing notice deadline, so the good thing is it is a draft, it isn't our final document, although we try to display as good of information as we can, he is fully aware that this draft perhaps has a lot of changes that will be made to it.

Haugen referred to the document, and stated that there are two parts; one is the first section that lists projects that will be done in 2015-2018, and then there is a separate section that identifies the status of projects that were supposed to be done in 2014, so just be clear that we are dealing with future projects, but also updating the status of current projects.

Haugen reported that on the transit ones we are basically doing 3% inflation for the operation side, and on the capital side we are identifying some potential applications for the different FTA programs, but as those applications are formally submitted, the T.I.P. would be amended to include what the awards, if any, are for the projects.

Haugen stated that on the highway side there are a couple of things that he is aware of; the Columbia Road Phase 2 request is being fully funded. He said that if you will recall, back when they first delayed this project they didn't adjust for the year of expenditures, and they are now programming that additional adjustment in funding to make sure the project is at the traditional 80/20 funding split. He stated that the second thing is that they have also slipped another Columbia Road Project in here. He explained that originally in 2017 Columbia Road south of 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue to 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue was to be done, but it is now being programmed in 2018. He stated that at the same time we are programming funds for the City's request of 2018 for North 42<sup>nd</sup> Street. He said that these are the major movements from the existing T.I.P. document. He pointed out that the Sorlie Bridge Project is still showing up in 2017, with construction occurring in 2018.

Haugen commented that when we merge these documents together, on the Kennedy Bridge Project you will see that on the Minnesota side a new project listing for preliminary engineering, and then on the Sorlie Bridge Project you will also see this same listing. He said that they already accounted for some of that on the North Dakota side in past T.I.P.s so that is why there isn't a mirror project for project in each State.

Haugen stated that he knows that Mr. Noehre probably has several projects that aren't identified in 2015 that we thought would be done in 2014, some interstate projects.

Noehre referred to a list of projects and went over them briefly as follows:

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

2015

Noehre reported that the Interstate Projects and Possible ITS Highway Advisory Radio – scratch those off for both the North Bound and South Bound and change the total cost for each to \$1,555,000.

Haugen commented that in the project status section we had these two interstate projects at roughly \$750,000, but those are the two that aren't being done now, correct. Noehre responded that that is correct. Haugen said, though, that back in December you had originally requested that they be funded in 2015, but they are now not being pursued at all. Noehre responded that they are being done in 2015. Haugen said, then, that the dollar amounts are changing and the project description is being changed. Noehre responded that that was correct.

2016

Noehre reported that the I-29 University Grade Separation painting should be moved from 2015 to 2016. Haugen said that, again, this was originally a 2014 project that is now being moved to 2016. Grasser asked if this was fiscal and construction year, or will there be a different year for construction. Noehre responded that he doesn't track fiscal so he can't answer that. Grasser asked if this document shows fiscal years. Haugen responded that it does, and this project is showing up in 2016, that is when the dollars are programmed to be available. Grasser commented that the reason he asked is because they are looking at doing some decking, perhaps, so they need to know this information. Noehre said that his own spreadsheet was getting him confused because he had a mix and match, and he decided that he wouldn't put the fiscal years on, that he would only deal with construction year because that is what he has to worry about.

Noehre pointed out that they removed replacement from the type of work on the Kennedy Bridge Project, and changed the dollar amounts, although he isn't sure that he has the correct dollar amounts on the spreadsheet he sent to Mr. Haugen. Haugen said that the T.I.P. should reflect the latest numbers that are in agreement between the two states.

2017/2018

Noehre said that they changed the DeMers Avenue Rehab or Reconstruction costs to \$4,100,000.00 as it is in the Draft ?? sheet they received. Haugen commented that this is in the T.I.P. at \$4,100,000.00 in 2017. Noehre stated that construction will be in 2018.

Haugen asked about any changes on the transit side. Bergman reported that he had a conversation yesterday with the feds, and they gave him a bunch of numbers that were different than what they should have been so he isn't sure where they got them. He explained that they gave him \$97,000.00 for two paratransit vans, and they just purchased one and only need \$36,000.00, so he doesn't know how they got that number. He added that they also gave him

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

more money for the mobility manager position than what was requested, so, again, he has no idea where they are getting their numbers from. Haugen said, though, that the sad thing is that the new route project is not just on hold, but probably dead. Bergman responded that that is correct, as the monies awarded were not used by the February deadline, so they have been pulled.

Noehre suggested that, going back to Mr. Grasser's question about the difference between fiscal year and construction year, maybe you could put an asterisk by the dollar amounts if they are actually fiscal and not construction so we can actually tell the difference. Haugen responded that where you will see if it is construction would be in the remarks box. Noehre pointed out that if you look at the DeMers project, it shows 2017. Haugen responded that there isn't anything in the remarks box for the DeMers project, but if you look at the Sorlie Bridge project you see a lot of remarks, so that would be where he would place a remark that it was programmed in fiscal year 2017 with construction in 2018. Brooks asked if something similar to this will now be placed in the remark box for the DeMers project. Haugen responded it would. Noehre said that he would still prefer to see an asterisk or something by the dollar amount, but maybe you can't because your using spreadsheets. Haugen said that he doesn't understand what the difference is, as the remarks section is where you are able to further explain the differences between funding and construction. Noehre commented that he understands that you need to keep track of where the dollars come from, and he isn't suggesting we don't track where that happens, but in the field they also have to manage the construction of it, and sometimes that won't make a difference, and sometimes it will make an extraordinarily large difference, so to avoid confusion he is making this suggestion. He added that they don't want it cleverly hidden. Haugen said that, hopefully in the remark section it isn't hidden, that people see that there is a possibility of a remark about the project.

Haugen asked if Mr. Johnson would explain the NDDOT process they came up with for the Urban Program, slipping of projects, etc.

Johnson said that what happened was that when all of the cities got their stuff handed in, and they were able to sit down and put all of the lists together; the one thing they had to try to account for that was a little bit different this time was exactly what the Grand Forks area is dealing with, and East Grand Forks as well, and that is the Kennedy and Sorlie Bridges and the new definition of "Mega Bridges", and trying to determine how those will be funded. He explained that because of a new bridge in Minot, a new railroad structure in Devils Lake, and other such structures, the amount of money that was originally being programmed will change based on that new internal policy, and this shifted quite a few things around, and required they come up with a new Urban Program funding process.

Haugen reported that the four year total for this T.I.P. will be \$90,000,000.00 on the North Dakota side, of which a big chunk is for our two bridge projects, so it is a pretty hefty program.

Williams referred to the tables, Project #26, and asked if it is the 17<sup>th</sup> and Columbia project. Haugen responded it is, and that he would make that change.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen opened the public hearing.

There was no one present for discussion, and no written comments were received by the noon deadline today.

Haugen closed the public hearing.

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE DRAFT NORTH DAKOTA SIDE T.I.P. FOR FY2015-2018, SUBJECT TO INCLUSION OF THE CHANGES AS NOTED ABOVE.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Haugen stated that while he did joke about this being a Draft FY2015-2018 T.I.P., and there possibly not being any highway trust funds available by FY2015, we are hoping that Congress does take action. He said that the latest news he saw today was that they may extend the program out to the end of June or May, and infusing it with \$10 billion dollars; \$8 billion for the highway side and \$2 billion for the transit side. He explained that the bulk of the money would come from something to do with relaxing pensions and transferring things from underground storage tanks fund, so it appears they are no longer looking at stopping Saturday postal service or increasing the gas tax or going after off-shore corporate income, but that changes almost hourly.

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON SCHOOL SAFETY STUDIES**

Haugen reported that we have identified in our work program that we would be doing some school safety studies.

Erickson referred to a power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request), and went over it briefly.

Presentation ensued.

Erickson stated that Grand Forks and East Grand Forks have seen an increase in safety concerns around their schools, so the MPO contacted ATAC and had them conduct pedestrian safety and traffic evaluations to get recommendations for improvements. She said that their main objectives were to evaluate pedestrian safety, traffic issues, and to ensure that the latest recommended guidelines and manuals are being followed so that we can get some short, medium and long term improvements from them.

Erickson commented that she is currently gathering input from the stakeholders on the studies that were previously done at each of the schools to determine what was done, what wasn't done, what they still want to see done, what they don't want to see done, etc. She added that they are also looking at their Safe Routes To School Maps and updating them as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Erickson gave some examples of things that have been done, are in the process of being done, and that haven't yet been done at the various schools.

Haugen reported that instead of taking on a new project, since we have looked at all the schools we can, we decided we should review all the past studies and update them to reflect what has been completed, what hasn't, and if it hasn't been completed determine if it should still be a recommendation.

Brooks asked if when the studies were sent out, since he knows that Mike Steffens is new with the school, were the appropriate studies sent to him. Erickson responded that she sent it to the school so he should have received it. Haugen commented that right now this is really just an internal review between the MPO and City Staff. He said that it hasn't been sent out to the school district, but the intent is that when school starts they will meet with the principals and the PTOs and go over them for their input before we finalize the new reports.

Discussion on some of the issues that are still a concern, as well as what has been done, at the various schools ensued.

Haugen commented that, as you will notice they did recommend, and they worked with the school district at the time, to construct a new parking lot to help ease some of the concerns, however it isn't completed. He stated that part of what Ms. Erickson will do will be to hold public meetings at Century, and the other schools as well, to get input on what has been done, what wasn't done, and what should be done at each of the schools so you will have the opportunity to give your input at that time.

Information only.

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON EJ REVIEW**

Kouba referred to a power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request), and went over it briefly.

Presentation ensued.

Kouba reported that, basically this is a project that was brought forward through our process with our Long Range Transportation Plan, so they are going through and separating out, basically, the minority populations and then low income populations with our projects.

Kouba stated that the first step is to make sure we have the correct areas that we are looking at so in April they went to training on the fundamentals of environmental justice, and then through May and June they went through all the information that is available, and there is quite a bit of information that the Census puts out for various topics, and now through July and August will get a draft completed and then, hopefully everything will be running smoothly. She said that by the end of October they should have the projects that are in the Long Range Transportation Plan looked at in comparison to where our new environmental justice areas are.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Kouba reported that overall changes between the two manuals are; in the current manual there were two different geographic areas – census block groups and census blocks – for different areas and the new manual will just look at straight census block groups. She stated that this provides a smoother comparison all around.

Kouba said that individual projects within the MPO Study Area will need to be looked at for environmental justice on an individual basis.

Kouba commented that there aren't too many major changes in the minority populations, just in how we are looking at them. She explained that they are using the most current available from the American Community Survey (ACS), the 2008-2012 document, and we are, again, looking at three times the population, or around 20%, and because the current manual was looking at blocks, we are looking at block groups so it changes a little bit. She stated that with the new manual East Grand Forks won't have any areas, and Grand Forks will only have three areas, whereas they had several small areas in the previous manual.

Kouba reported that the biggest change was with the low income poverty maps. She said that once again they are looking at the new 2008-2012 manual, and there is a difference in how this came about, what was what, and the current manual we used 2.3 persons per household average from the census, from the 2010 census, and then of course the Health and Human Services Guidelines for poverty; and this time we are using what the census has calculated. She stated that the threshold for what they consider poverty is slightly higher amounts of money in comparison to HHS, but with our federal partners they say, as long as those people who would be included in those HHS poverty guidelines are included in what you use then they are okay with what we are doing.

Kouba stated that, as you can see, they have higher guidelines, of course in the other manual, and, although it is hard to see in the lower right hand corner, but how they calculate it and get a ratio is basically how much the household makes, so if you have three people making money in the household, but there is a total of five people in the household, they divide that whole household income by what the threshold is and then that is the ratio for everybody in the household including the children. She said that they then use that ratio, the ratio that they used, the limit was 1.84, which means, basically, that will gather the people who are in poverty, but also those who are, a lot of the federal income level, on the federal aid programs.

Kouba referred to a map, and commented that with those changes, you should see on the left side of the map there is a yellow area, that was pretty much the area we looked at as our poverty/low income area; this time it is the areas shown in red. She pointed out that there are red areas on the Grand Forks side, but there isn't anything on the East Grand Forks side, but, once again we had a 50% cutoff, so 50% and higher was considered a significant area; whereas the last time it was, and the lefthand map there are three, four different areas that they were looking at, the yellow area was the over three times area, and then they looked at above two times, and below two times, and basically it was three times the total average population.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Kouba stated that we have the draft, and once we get the draft put together we will bring it forward to you for public information, as well as public comments, as well as our human services comments, and then Technical Advisory Committee and Executive Policy Board approval, and once those happen and we have our document we will look through our Long Range Transportation Plan projects to verify that they are still within the guidelines.

Rood asked if those areas are considered minority and low income, or one or the other. Kouba responded that each one is a separate map, one is minority and one is low income. She said that they will do the projects with each map.

West asked if the whole point of going through this exercise is to make sure that whatever projects a community is doing is to determine if it is impacting those areas more than any other area. Kouba responded that that would be correct. She explained that in the past, nationwide, in the past there have been projects that have basically decimated communities where the majority of the population are minorities, or the population is low income. Williams said that it wasn't a result of who the people were, it was a result of what the property values were.

Haugen commented that in the past we used that connector that it had to have both minority concentrations and poverty, and essentially this yellow area is the only area that we identified that we had concentrations of both and therefore had to really look at any projects implemented near that location; but now with the new maps you will notice we have more territory, so our projects in the Long Range Transportation Plan will go through this analysis to determine if there is a protected population affected, and if there is we need to determine if it is adversely affected, and if we find it is then we have to discuss what can be done to mitigate it.

Haugen said that their understanding, from going through the training and other resources of developing this, is that all the projects that you guys do when you do your environmental documentation, an EJ analysis should be part of that documentation, so it is almost as if you're looking at this in terms of historic properties, are there endangered species, are there endangered populations in your project that you, then, also have to address whether it is adversely impacted or not, and if so how you're mitigating for that population.

Williams asked Mr. Johnson if this is considered part of their environmental analysis, do they need environmental commitments on each of their projects. Johnson responded that as part of your NEPA process you have to identify if there are any EJ impacts. Williams asked if they want those listed on the environmental impact, that one sheet that they have to include that says how they are addressing this. Johnson responded that if you are doing a documented CAD-X there is an environmental check-list, and you would just follow the information that is on that check-list. He added that if it is a state document the environmental work is really, for lack of a better word, scaled down to the point where you don't have to go into that much detail. He said that if you are aware of instances where, even if you're doing just the check-list, you know what it is going to affect, you can identify it.

Williams asked if, because this is part of the Long Range Transportation Plan, does it have to go to City Council or Service Safety or Planning and Zoning, or any of those. Haugen responded

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

that they will be going through them with the integration of the safety plans, and so as part of that process they will also address this EJ Analysis section in the Long Range Transportation Plan at the same time, so the short answer is yes. Williams asked if there were dates available for those yet, do you have council dates or anything. Haugen responded that they don't have any dates yet. Williams asked if they could get them. Haugen responded that they should look for this going to those various bodies in November or December.

Rood asked if these maps were on the website yet. Kouba responded that the new maps are not on there yet. She said that the maps for the current EJ are within the EJ manual that is online.

Bergman asked if this is going to be affected by that stuff going on on 42<sup>nd</sup> now. Haugen responded that they haven't gotten guidance as to how frequently we need to update these maps. He explained that the American Community Survey is an ongoing survey, there is new information rolling out in one year, three year, five year averages every year. He said that at some point, at least every five years we will be reviewing that data so five years from now with the American Community Survey it should be reflecting, then what is going on out on 42<sup>nd</sup> Street with the growth and stuff, whether it should be more often or not, he can see the FTA looking at a three year cycle pretty easily. Rood commented that even since 2012 the increases in the refugee population would be impacting this. Brooks stated that it hard to say what that growth will do too. Haugen responded that, again, they are using the five year so any one year change is smoothed out by four years of unchanged, so it has to accumulate in order to have it be reflected in the five year data.

Information only.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Highway #2 Access Management Plan Study

Haugen stated that just prior to the July 4<sup>th</sup> Holiday the MPO had agreed to hire KLJ. He said that they did work the NDDOT to first get our work program amended, that was approved, then we had to submit our selection process to them for their review and approval, that was done, so as of July 2<sup>nd</sup> KLJ is under contract to do the U.S. #2 Access Management Plan.

Haugen commented that this week KLJ is collecting some data, we are distributing the data that we collected to them and they are out doing some additional turning movement counts at those additional intersections. He said that they are trying a new schedule. He pointed out that there was a steering committee that was identified in the RFP, and we now have the membership formed, and are trying to identify a first meeting date for that group by the end of July.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Possible Additional Studies

Williams said that she understands that there is going to be a review of our classification system that is coming up. She added that she also heard that there might be a land use study coming up, and they are looking for some dates and milestones so that they can schedule review time and make sure that they have what they are discussing. She asked if the classification study is in the work plan. Haugen responded that it isn't because the indication was, and he believes that North Dakota's thought process was that Federal Highway's Guidelines wouldn't really cause changes, but then Minnesota decided, and he did send out an e-mail about this, that the new Federal Highway Guidelines offers an opportunity to make substantial changes to the functional class on the Minnesota side, so we have been given guidance on the Minnesota side, and timelines. He stated that the last time they talked with North Dakota they were drafting something, but he can't give a timeline until they give us a timeline as well.

Johnson stated that he doesn't have anything new to share other than the fact that now that they know MnDOT's position after our mid-year discussion, it is going to cause more discussion on their end as to how they are going to deal with this.

Haugen commented that the biggest headache, probably on the Minnesota side that they are causing us to do, is Federal Highway now wants collectors separated between minor and major collectors for the urban area. He said that in the past they have not had to make that distinction, what is a major collector versus what is a minor collector, and the differences are very subtle.

Haugen reported that in terms of dates for Land Use, there is nothing in our current work program on this, but they are in discussions with both the Cities of Grand Forks and East Grand Forks to start considering 2015 work activities, which includes land use planning, but, again, he doesn't have any dates to give you today. Williams said that if they could just get a list of the current work plan with the milestones of what is expected that would be helpful.

Information only.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO ADJOURN THE JUNE 11<sup>TH</sup>,  
2014, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:36 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 13<sup>th</sup>, 2014  
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the August 13<sup>th</sup>, 2014, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:37 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Ali Rood, Mobility Manager Cities Area Transit; Darren Laesch, MNDOT Planning Director; Mike Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Dale Bergman, Public Transit Division Director; Mike Yavarow, Grand Forks Engineering; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Patrick Dame, Grand Forks Regional Airport Authority; Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Engineering; Dale Bergman, Grand Forks Cities Area Transit; Ali Rood, Grand Forks Cities Area Transit; Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineer; and Ryan Brooks, Grand Forks Planning.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Stephanie Erickson, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner, and Sarah Erickson, GF/EGF MPO Intern.

Guest(s) present were: Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Engineer; Bobbi Retzlaff, MNDOT-St. Paul; Mark Walker, Grand Forks City Engineer; Al Grasser, Grand Forks City Engineer; and Troy Schroeder, NWRDC.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

Haugen said that, for the sake of anyone new, he would ask that everyone please state their name and the organization they represent.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JULY 9<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE THE JULY 9<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 13<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS**

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that he is unaware of anything new to report on the Sorlie Bridge project.

Noehre commented that their consultant, KLJ is preparing a presentation that they will be giving to both Cities and the MPO Executive Policy Board that will give a broad outline of what it will likely contain. He hopes that they will be giving it within the next month or so.

Noehre stated that over the last several months they have gone through a detailed analysis on the Sorlie Bridge, with the result being that the bridge is in better condition than they thought it was when they started this process. He explained that this is due to a number of factors, some of them being updated methods, criteria, and formula calculations for evaluating bridges; and a more detailed inspection of the Sorlie Bridge, which revealed that the gusset plates are not in as poor a condition as was originally thought eight months ago. He said that this means that the repair methods for the gusset plates, for example, is not as extensive as they thought, as several months ago they thought that to repair them would require we dismantle the bridge and replace them, but that is no longer the case.

Noehre said that the bottom line is that the current conditions are such that we probably wouldn't have even started this project, but would have waited several years more before doing it. He stated that there has also been a question, or desire to raise the bridge to reduce the flood closures; but further analysis has shown that raising it at the abutments isn't that great of a challenge, however to do so would require removing much, most, or all of the bridge deck, which would mean complete closure of the bridge for at least six months, and at a considerable cost.

Noehre reported, then, that the direction they are heading with this project; and that we will ask both Cities and the MPO for input on before the final decision is reached, is to reduce the environmental documents from an EIS to a categorical exclusion, and to do a minor rehab on the bridge since we have already invested so much time and monies.

Williams asked if Mr. Noehre knows how long the bridge will need to be closed to do the work we are now looking at doing. Noehre responded that he doesn't, but there is a possibility that it may not need to be closed at all, that they may be able to do it with just lane closures.

Haugen asked, with the potential savings in our program, could we shift funds to a bridge to the south. Noehre responded that we cannot do that.

Walker asked, we started some discussions about a signature feature on the Kennedy, with the Sorlie moving to a maintenance project does that still allow that opportunity or does it close the door on that for the Sorlie. Noehre responded that he would say that it is still an opportunity, but again it will depend on the scope and the level of the signature feature. He said that we aren't

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 13<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

building a new bridge, so we aren't making bump-outs or adding other such things, so does it limit the potential signature features, absolutely, but does it close the door entirely, no.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that on the Kennedy Bridge there are two items; the first one was included in the staff report and that was the signature items. He said that when this idea was conveyed to the MPO Executive Policy Board there was a little bit of excitement on the Board's level, and that excitement was generated by some misunderstanding in that they felt that if they couldn't get some safety features attached to the structure, then how can we afford to put amenities or enhancements or betterments or signature items to the structure. He said that we have invited representatives from MnDOT and NDDOT to come to the Board meeting next month, but as part of the answer, looking through some reference material, MnDOT is leading this so looking at their bridge aesthetics manual, he pulled the two paragraphs out that explains the importance of aesthetics. He pointed out that it is so important, in-fact, that they have three levels, or three categories of bridges and percentages set aside to address some of those things.

Haugen commented that there was a meeting to start discussions on this topic. Walker explained that they did hold a meeting to open up the discussion about adding a signature feature to the bridge. He said that he would say that there were three options that were discussed, with no final recommendation made of course, but the three options were lighting the bridge in some way, adding an interpretive plaque in the center of the structure, and a nicer sign welcoming people to Grand Forks, North Dakota and East Grand Forks, Minnesota. He stated that they left the meeting with the idea that MnDOT would come back with some renderings of what a sign might look like; and with some potential costs for lighting options; and then regarding the interpretive plaque the thought was that it would be placed in the center of the bridge, so the question of a bump-out on the pedestrian path be allowed at that location. He said that within the next sixty days or so we hope to hear back on this issue and another meeting will be scheduled.

Laesch stated that Roger Hille had hoped to be here today, but was unable to make it, and that he will be available for questions and discussion at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting on August 20th. He said that Mr. Hille did want him to pass on that what they have agreed to thus far is that MnDOT is willing to pay for half of the cost of aesthetic lighting and that they will cover the cost of the curb and rail design to maintain the historic features; however the cost of any signage or plaques would be the responsibility of the communities.

Noehre commented that their funding picture may not exactly mirror MnDOT's. He said that they have to evaluate each item individually and determine whether or not they are able and willing to fund it.

Haugen reported that another issue he wanted to discuss isn't in the staff report, and it should have been, but the MPO Executive Policy Board is also trying to figure out how a low area on the East Grand Forks side of the bridge can be raised to assist in their flood fight effort. He said that conversations have been started, primarily via e-mail, amongst the MnDOT and East Grand Forks staff, and the Corps of Engineers.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 13<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Bail stated that he doesn't have much to report on this issue at this time, however he did contact the Corps of Engineers to get their input on what they would need to do to get this project done. Laesch said that they took a look at that profile, and it appears it could potentially be raised about a foot or a foot and a quarter, and that would eliminate about 300 square feet of overtopping, which may need to be made up with a box culvert or extend the bridge, but that is for the Corps to determine. He added that if it needs something significant like a box culvert or extension of the bridge, if it wouldn't get tied to the Kennedy Bridge, it might get tied to the 4<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge sometime in the future, but if it isn't needed now would be the time to do it since we are replacing the deck and would be ripping out a bit chunk of that pavement anyway to tie into the bridge.

Haugen commented that perhaps one of the first things would be to identify where the low spot is in relation to the approach, because it looks like your project already is here, and is really close to where the low spot is. Laesch responded that that is correct, and added that there is a catch basin at the low spot and it is in-between the two bridges.

Bail said that part of the issue out there is with both bridges having vertical curves, you have to have a curve between them, and they kind of maximized that as much as they could when they did the layout over there because they were involved at that time. He pointed out that the lanes are at a different elevations just to try to meet the minimum requirements needed to get the grades to work, so there isn't a lot of room to play with in there unless, like the DeMers underpass-overpass it would be raised up or something to give them more room. Laesch agreed that it will be challenging to get a lot of grade there, and they will have a drainage issue to contend with as well so they will need to put some additional catch basins in there to accommodate the drainage.

Grasser stated that this question is coming off the original conception of the Kennedy Bridge, and his strong recommendation to the City Council is going to be zero impacts on flood levees, so any impacts that come up about hydraulics flow and any increase in flood levels would have to be fully mitigated. Haugen said then, that for the Kennedy, there is the base project that is agreed to, signature items or aesthetic items that are also now in play, as is this dip in the road issue on the East Grand Forks side, so as the project progresses some of these things will be ironed out sooner than later, and we have somewhat of an idea from MnDOT as to what they think they can do but we also have the Corps of Engineer involvement as Mr. Grasser pointed out, the flood protection project is a high priority as well.

**MATTER OF DRAFT FINAL MINNESOTA SIDE 2015-2018 T.I.P.**

Haugen reported that he originally thought we would have a Final T.I.P. on the Minnesota side only, North Dakota hasn't promulgated a Draft S.T.I.P. yet, so it is difficult to do a Final T.I.P. when North Dakota hasn't produced a draft S.T.I.P.

Haugen stated that on the Minnesota side we got our A.T.I.P. too late to really draft up a Final T.I.P., and there are some significant differences between the A.T.I.P. and what our Draft T.I.P. was in April, so instead we just threw a question out there primarily looking at North Dakota and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 13<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

when they think they might have a Draft S.T.I.P. He added that we are hoping that in September we can have a combined North Dakota/Minnesota T.I.P. developed for final approval consideration.

Johnson reported that the snafu they ran into was that they were hoping to get a Draft S.T.I.P. out this month yet, but he just heard from the MPO in Bismarck that they aren't going to be able to adopt their Draft T.I.P. this month so they won't get that adopted until September, and they can't complete their Draft S.T.I.P. until their draft is adopted.

Haugen asked if would be possible for us to do a Final T.I.P. even though Bismarck T.I.P. won't be done, and thus NDDOT's S.T.I.P. won't be done, can it be done concurrent with those adoptions. Johnson responded that it would depend on when the timelines lay out. He said that the reservation he would have is that during their draft status changes happen and then you would already have a final and then you would be doing amendments. Haugen agreed. He asked when MnDOT would like to have a Minnesota side only T.I.P., could they hold off until October for a T.I.P. Retzlaff responded that they would prefer one in September. Haugen said, then, that we will proceed with a Minnesota side only T.I.P. in September, and a North Dakota side only in October.

Haugen reported that the Draft A.T.I.P.; and he doesn't know if this has been resolved, but they have been meeting on the Kennedy and Sorlie Bridges to try to make sure that our T.I.P.s and S.T.I.P.s all mirror each other, so he doesn't know if they ever resolved the issue of the construction engineering for the Kennedy and how that might lay out in our T.I.P. He explained that on the Minnesota side they are proposing, and this causes an imbalance, to subtract out the construction engineering and show it as a separate listing. He added, however, that maybe it isn't so important now that we have two separate final T.I.P.s going, but on the North Dakota side they essentially will have one project showing, and that is the actual project itself; and on the Minnesota side there will be three separate project listings; preliminary engineering, the actual project, and construction engineering. He stated that originally the construction engineering would have caused him concern because there isn't a similar one in the North Dakota S.T.I.P., plus you are proposing to show other funding that doesn't show up anyplace else in the S.T.I.P.; but the North Dakota half of the construction engineering, and then the total project costs are a little bit different because you subtract construction engineering from the project total then the projects do not match-up.

Laesch commented that typically they don't show any engineering, but their reasoning for showing and breaking out the construction engineering was to show just how the funding breaks down; the construction engineering will be state funds only through bond dollars, and the construction will be federal dollars. Haugen said, then, that even though we are showing \$990,000 in other, \$425,000 has been programmed and we aren't trying to capture the other \$500,000 in the program, so he will do something similar to this on the Minnesota side that says that the total \$1,800,000 has \$900,000 from the State of Minnesota and the other \$900,000 is already accounted for in the North Dakota project listing of \$19,800,000. Laesch said he was comfortable with this, as long as the total match. Haugen said, however, that they won't match

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 13<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

in the S.T.I.P. and T.I.P. documents because North Dakota is not showing any preliminary engineering this S.T.I.P. cycle, but it helps that we are doing two separate final documents.

Noehre reiterated that, as he mentioned at the last meeting, he understands this is a fiscal document, but when we talk about it, and even how it gets reported in the media, those dates get pulled up. He commented that the Grand Forks Herald a couple of weeks ago reported that the Kennedy and the Sorlie are to be done in 2017, but we have communicated with each other that it will be done in 2018, so his point is that somehow, so that we can communicate effectively and clearly, he would like somehow, better, that it is what the construction year is, and he knows that it is in the remarks section, but he doesn't know if that has been effective in communicating with the public as they don't care where the dollars come from or what year they are being pulled from, they only care when it is being built, and when is it going to impact them. Haugen responded that he guesses it is back on all of us to make sure that when we write our staff reports or other communication documents that we nail down as construction years, and be clear that it is construction years that we are identifying. He added that the Grand Forks Herald did not contact MPO staff, nor did they use our information to show 2017.

Haugen summarized by saying that we resolved three things: 1) Minnesota only in September; 2) North Dakota only in October; and 3) We will show that the construction engineering and make remarks on the Kennedy bridge the way we can, the two separate documents. He said that this means we will have a Final T.I.P. and begin soliciting for the next round of T.I.P.s at the same time so get ready for any changes in the 2019 year.

Laesch asked if there were any comments on their Draft S.T.I.P. Haugen said that he would send them to him as he needs to work with the transit folks on both the Minnesota and North Dakota sides to make sure that information they received from a meeting a couple weeks ago is included. He explained that Grand Forks, as the lead agency, has done a salary survey and the bus drivers are in for a significant pay raise that was not identified in previous financials so our numbers will have to be adjusted upwardly. He said that in addition to that the capital side of East Grand Forks, the Draft A.T.I.P., keeps referring to designated bus stops, and he isn't sure where that came from, but it will need to be changed.

**MATTER OF DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MANUAL UPDATE**

Kouba reiterated that she presented some of the findings they came up with for our Environmental Justice areas at last month's meeting. She reported that we now have a document for our Procedural Manual, and it is up for preliminary approval today.

Kouba stated that the document basically has all of the changes she talked about; where the low income and minorities are located in our area, as well as the change that we are not looking at only the areas that have both those populations, but the individual low income populations and then the minority populations are looked at separately.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 13<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Kouba said that she also discussed the method in which they came up with those populations and of where they are located, and that is the other significant thing in the manual, in the new manual as to the current manual.

Kouba stated that basically, from this body they are looking for preliminary approval, but they will begin our public participation process comment period right after we receive preliminary approval so they will go through their Human Services Coordination Committee, they will hold a public hearing, and then we will insert any changes/comments we receive from those, and bring the document back to the Technical Advisory Committee for final approval.

Kuharenko referred to the document, and pointed out that in looking at the flow chart that we have, it ends up calling out the various documentations that we are going to need based on what the project will do in that area. He said that he knows that for federal funds they are required to do a documented Categorical Exclusion (Cat Ex) or NEPA document unless we are going to do something greater than that, and in that there is the environmental checklist which ends up including whether or not there is an adverse impact to an environmental justice population, and he is seeing in this flow chart that we have various documentation in here, what kind of documentation are we looking for in this, what kind of documentation do we need, and where does it go. Kouba responded that it is basically exactly what you are doing already, we just kind of need to see it so that we are covering for the MPO side. Haugen disagreed, saying that it is a little bit different. He explained that they are doing project level specific analysis, while we are looking at all the projects that are identified in the Long Range Plan level and their relationship to these three highlighted areas, and also in relationship to these three highlighted areas somewhere on top of each other so then from a planning level we will be looking at whether there are impacts, whether those impacts are adverse, and then start to identify some potential mitigation to those impacts. He said that when you do it at your project level you are going to more specific refined detail.

Kuharenko referred to Page 10, last paragraph where it states: “For the purposes of this document anyone with a ratio number of 1.84 or less is considered low-income in the MPO area”, and asked where the 1.84 figure came from because he sees that in the paragraph before it ends up calling out anyone with a ratio number of less than 1.00 is considered in poverty and anyone 2.00 and over is considered to have a healthy income, many with a ratio number between 1.00 and 2.00 qualify for some assistance programs and have been considered working poor, so where did the 1.84 come from. Kouba responded that they basically were just trying to get a middle ground for a definition of low income. She said that the way it is divided up by the census, and their information, they have ranges, so we are just trying to get as many of the low income people included as possible, specifically those that are considered working poor. She added that, while they don’t want to get too close, they still want to get as many people as possible, so 1.84 is the end of the last ratio they used. Williams asked where the ratio came from, the 1.84, is that from FHWA. Kouba responded that it is from the census information, they divided it up, and they are using their poverty definitions/thresholds. Haugen referred to a slide illustrating the census definition. Kouba stated that this is coming straight from the census information, using that information, but making sure we include everyone that fell under the Health and Human Services guidelines for poverty.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 13<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Williams asked how the Department of Justice break this down, how do they make the determination. Haugen responded that the Department of Justice is not something we would look at for guidance. He stated that environmental justice, federal highway and federal transit agencies, which are two federal agencies, refer to the Health and Human Services guidelines. He said that the problem with the Health and Human Services guidelines, as we discussed last time we presented this, is that they don't have a lot of data attached to geography, the place that has data attached geography is the Census Bureau, and so the other guidance Federal Highway and FTA gives us is that we use HHS or something equivalent, but not less than what the HHS guideline would be. So Teri used an equivalent, which is the census data, which is more readily available and can be segregated by geography, and the 1.84 allows us to not be less than the HHS guideline for poverty, thus how it came about.

Kuharenko asked if there is a federal requirement for a minimum versus a maximum, as to what our value is, are we looking at the minimum or the maximum as to this 1.84. Kouba responded that it is probably considered more of a maximum because with the HHS they are looking at families with two, three, four, etc. person households, and it is broken down to each group have a certain income level they need to be at to be considered in poverty. She said that that is what is nice about the census data, it has already done it, but it is with their thresholds as the thresholds are different, the census has a little more give to it.

Rood commented that it may be maximum versus minimum. Kuharenko said that he is looking at this, and less than one puts you at the poverty level, and if your between one and two your working poor, so the 1.84 he is seeing as being closer to the maximum side, however he is curious as to what the federal requirements are for environmental justice and if they are making their areas larger than they could be, are we going to be impacting a lot more projects by saying it is an environmental justice area and therefore we need to an additional analysis and at the end of the day possibly throwing or increasing the cost of the project because of it being classified as an environmental justice area and all the paper work that is associated with it. Kouba commented that we probably are on the higher side just because it is closer, it is, we are getting into close to the two, and we feel like we need to go lower than that in the analysis, instead of the range between 1.0 we eliminate the range between 1.05 completely.

Kouba stated that if you look at the areas that show up on the map, they are areas that she would expect to see because in the downtown area you have the Mission, and we are looking at the main area, and are also looking at the main UND area; the area along Washington between 17<sup>th</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup>, she knows there are a lot of apartments there so you will find a lot of people trying to cram into apartments with larger families. She said that when she looks at those areas she doesn't see them as areas that are going too far beyond, but that is her opinion and it is one thing they are looking at from this body, is it too much, is it too little, are you seeing areas that are not out of context of all of this, so..

Williams commented that what their concern is is by trying to make these areas as large as they are we have the potential of increasing project costs unnecessarily, and that is what they want to avoid. She said that she isn't sure exactly what the definition of adverse impact is, but are we

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 13<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

looking to try to – disproportionately and high adverse human health and environmental effects. Kouba responded that she thinks we are also looking at the difference between a large area and a project specific. She explained that the areas that we are looking at are considered block groups, so they are a lot larger group area that is covered, where you are looking at your specific projects might be less than half the size, maybe a quarter of what they are looking at. She said that if you look at it and if it is in that area and you look at that area for your own project requirements, and you are seeing something different she wouldn't be surprised, so it would not affect your project or increase your costs, but you would have to bring forward that information, you could probably get your hands on more neighborhood economic information than the census can put out, so that is the difference. Kuharenko said, however, that it is still additional documentation that they would have to go through because if they end up having this in here saying that it is an environmental justice area, and they have a project that is adjacent to it, then they have to go through and, as you said, they would have to go in and get more of a neighborhood look at it to disprove that it is an environmental justice area, so that is part of the concern of having a larger area than what might be necessary. Haugen stated that he understands their concern, but they also have to keep in mind that we are also involving a federal transit agency, and so low income is a key ridership indicator for them, so working poor is a germane discussion for our other hat that we have to wear and do planning for, but only if you're doing adverse impact do you need to go through a high level of mitigation. He said that if you look at their areas they are extremely old neighborhoods, they are extremely well defined neighborhoods, so from a Long Range Transportation Plan perspective with state of good repair, they are basically working just within the curb to curb of existing streets, so he would suspect they will find there is no adverse impact coming through and if your projects are following our plan you will also find similar no adverse impacts, so a little more documentation.

Williams asked if the MPO staff would be going through and looking at the list of projects in the Long Range Transportation Plan in terms of significant, and then are you going to create a document that says that these have already been reviewed so that we can just put it in our project file. Haugen responded that it will be part of our Long Range Transportation Plan amendment we will be processing at the end of the year.

Haugen reiterated that this is a two-step process; the first was to update our manual to take out the condition of having both low income and minority populations, and the second is because we have more relevant community survey data we are utilizing it, and once we have identified the areas we will have to go back and look at all of our projects in relationship to these, not as a condition of both low income or minority, but if it has one or the other.

Rood asked how much lower the HHS threshold is, would it eliminate much of this area if they went closer to that. Kouba responded that, once again it is dependent upon the number of people in a household. She explained that in the old manual one of the things that was done was that they took the average census data, which said it was 2.32 people per household in this area, which you can see with our college population it can skew the results of family sizes in this area. She said then, just cut off, or use the income for 2.2 people as the cutoff and use income information from the census, so there is a lot of skewing and estimates being shuffled around previously. She explained that what the census does is they already weed out how many people

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 13<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

are in these amounts. She stated that this is one of the things they were having trouble with in our current manual, so if we are looking at HHS information we have to look at how many people are in a household and go from there, so it is very detail oriented, and take a lot of time and effort to get through it. Haugen commented that what is probably in play are these two census tract block groups, block group four and one, twenty eight and thirty four, and the other ones are forty five and fifty percent. He said that you would have a hard time not convincing him that if there is a 45% population in a block group that is identified as struggling to make a living, we should identify them as somewhat of a high risk population. Kouba added that in actuality, in our maps we put it at 50% so, of those examples shown only one of them would have been highlighted. Kuharenko asked where the 50% came from. Haugen responded that it comes from two different things; one is the actual Environmental Quality Board and its guidance of implementing EJ. He added that they are also the ones that control the NEPA process as well. He said that they are the ones that suggested the threshold of 50% or higher automatically, as a high risk population. He added that FTA and Federal Highway, when they promulgated their latest circular regulations on EJ, their draft identified that 50% as an automatic, but they removed it in the final draft based on comments such as those Teri has been making about just because you do not have a magical 50% doesn't mean there are no low income populations that are adversely affected by your projects, so they took out this straight forward 50% rule.

Haugen stated, then, that this means that on one side we have the NEPA folks suggesting 50% as the magical number; and the FTA and Federal Highway folks saying we can't rely on that because numbers less than 50% can be as adversely impacted and should be accounted for as people at 50% or more. Kouba commented that in addition when they did, with their minority population, it was three times the average number for the whole area. She said that when they did three times in the low income it was 86% and we would have nobody considered low income in our area, which she doesn't think any of our federal partners would agree with completely.

Williams asked where Block 1 is located, is it in the downtown area, because it is shown at 28%. Kouba responded that she isn't sure, that she would have to go in and look at it. Haugen commented that the work our Intern, Kyle Economy, did and presented as a map will give us an idea. He referred to a map and stated that Block 1 is located along Washington Street.

Rood commented that she would agree with Ms. Kouba, when you look at the map it seems like a natural break in those areas, they are the areas she would draw just based on their low income bus ridership numbers, and it seems like reasonable areas, and she doesn't see any one of them that you could eliminate.

***MOVED BY ROOD, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY GRANT PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MANUAL, AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 13<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

**MATTER OF MINNESOTA FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION REVISIONS**

Haugen reported that at the beginning of this year Minnesota met with their statewide partners to discuss reactions to 2010 census changes to the urbanized areas, Federal Highway's new guidance on classification that was released in late 2013, Map-21 requirements, and NHS designations.

Haugen stated that originally MnDOT, when they met with us on January 22<sup>nd</sup>, agreed that for NHS designations they would leave them pretty much untouched except for the new arterial's on the freeway/expressway classifications Federal Highway created. He said that MnDOT would focus just on those classifications and sort of highlight that they are freeways/expressways and leave the rest of the functional classifications alone.

Haugen referred to a power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request), and went over it briefly.

Haugen commented that since that January meeting MnDOT received a memo from Federal Highway's Minnesota Division that strongly suggests they reconsider their stance on Principal Arterials, and particularly how it connects to the NHS funding or NHPP funding. He said that with that in mind MnDOT came back to us and said that they are going to move forward and do a complete statewide revision based on the Federal Highway Guidance, and let the results shake out as they may, so without consideration to what prior practice may have dictated, etc., the new guidance is the primary pusher on this and we have truly been asked to look at how a roadway functions, and not really consider geography or political boundaries.

Haugen stated that another thing you need to be aware of is that in the federal guidance they have separated collectors on the urban side into major collectors and minor collectors. He said that this may not have an impact today, but since Federal Highway seems to be pushing the separation of major and minor collectors, if we translate that onto the rural side there is a major significance between major collectors and minor collectors when it comes to federal funding and eligibility, so MnDOT did release, statewide, it's draft based on the information they had available, and they will be the first to tell you they aren't 100% sure their data is 100% accurate, so it was a good test to make sure that we at least agreed with what the base current conditions are, and then start discussions about future reclassification.

Haugen referred to the power point slides and went over the definitions of the various classifications.

Retzlaff commented that the only thing she would emphasize, that came out of their meetings, is that when they did the statewide review it was truly a desk review, and they knew their data wasn't 100% correct so it was them sitting in St. Paul going through the AADT data they have, and when they had questions looking at Google Maps and Google Earth to try to figure out what was going on, so they are expecting changes, and if there are any disagreements with any of the findings please give them a thorough reason why you disagree with it, some kind of justification. She added that they have been receiving comments, and they are slowly trickling in from other

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 13<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

areas of the State, but so far the comments have been pretty minor, no huge changes. She stated that the reason they are asking the MPO to hold off on formal approval is so that they can go through this back and forth process to make sure we agree with all the changes that are being proposed by the MPO rather than having to go through an approval process twice.

Haugen said that a couple of other tried and true practices of functional classification are no longer held valid. He stated that the first one is when you go from an Urbanized Geography to a Rural Geography the standard practice was to automatically drop down a functional class, so you will see in practice, Bygland Road, as it passes that magical political boundary area, it drops down a functional class. He added that this is also true on 220 North.

Haugen stated that the other thing that was tried and true in past practice was that you didn't have hanging, or non-connecting functional classified roadways. He pointed out an example of this under the new criteria, explaining that you can have, and do end up with functionally classified roadways that don't connect at both ends of their termini, so that is a new item to look out for under the true guidance of Federal Highway.

Haugen said that you might be wondering what North Dakota will be coming through with on this, they are wondering the same thing.

Johnson reported that he really doesn't have anything new to share on this issue at this time, based on the conversations you have had with MnDOT. He said that the only real thing that might be a sticking point on their end is whether or not they are going to push the major and minor collector issue. He added that it will obviously cause some issues in this area as well as the Fargo area, so that will be a decision that will need to be made at a higher level. He said that, as far as redoing the whole thing, similar to what MnDOT did and send it back to you, he doesn't believe it will be a process they follow, they will leave it up to the entities to maintain what you have and look at your system as you see with the new guidance and see if it needs updating.

Haugen stated that they did have some conversations about whether or not one State would acquiesce to the other State for direction on this. Johnson commented that that would be the next step, if our Management Team didn't want to do it then you would have to have the secondary question of how about in these areas, should we do it, or how should we do it. Haugen said that he talked to Bobbi and her answer is that Minnesota is going to require it, so we would be doing it on the Minnesota side, and the only thing they may acquiesce is to allow us not to show it as our common functional class maps making that distinction, but on the official Functional Classification Maps a distinction will be made, but to make them kind of look similar they might allow us to mask the designation of major and minor collectors on the Minnesota side.

Haugen reiterated that this was a sort of reintroduction, he thinks we discussed this earlier this year, and next month they will be asking for preliminary approval of the map in order that we can forward it on to MnDOT and allow them to go through their process, and then eventually come back to us with final adoption, so this was more of an information type item.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 13<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Laesch added that their district took a look at some of the major cities in the district and they all kind of show something similar in that they are losing some of their Principal Arterials, bumping them down to Minor Arterials, those kind of off-shoots that just kind of die off. He said that he thinks they are kind of holding the position that they aren't really, when you look at the range of how many Principal Arterials they should have based on their mileage, they are in the lower range so it's difficult to eliminate some of those Principal Arterials, and most of them do meet the volume requirements, so he thinks they will push back a little bit on that, but as a district they want to support consistency so statewide that is the philosophy their district will support, but they feel that if they can they would like to keep those as Principal Arterials, so you aren't alone, Crookston, Bemidji, Thief River, they are all looking at a very similar situation.

**MATTER OF U.S. HIGHWAY #2 ACCESS STUDY**

Haugen reported that included in the packet is the kick-off meeting with the Steering Committee packet of information. He stated that they essentially met for the first time and got organized. He said that the committee is a mix of staff and property/business owners along the corridor.

Haugen commented that the KLJ team put together a highlight of what the study is trying to identify and take action on, and that information is included in the packet as well.

Haugen stated that the next phase will be to identify the individual stakeholder meetings, and around the second week of September we have preliminary identified it as our public open house to allow all the people who aren't individual property owners along the corridor to have the ability to come and give us input on the study. He added that they will also begin putting together the background analysis of current conditions and identify what the future conditions might be, including how a fertilizer plant might impact traffic conditions.

**MATTER OF SOLICITATION OF 2015-2016 WORK PROGRAM ACTIVITIES**

Haugen reported that we are starting a new two-year cycle of our work program, beginning in 2015, and are soliciting work activities from our local member jurisdictions. He said that part of the request we have from our federal and state partners is to identify the timeline, the major milestones, to allow us to reach our January 31<sup>st</sup>, 2019 deadline for a new Long Range Transportation Plan, so in backtracking that we know that we have our major modal plans of transit and bike/ped to update, and we do have a tentative timeline for those. He added that our street and highway plan will start in earnest in January of 2017, and will conclude at the end of 2018, with a one month review in 2019.

Haugen said that we have had discussions with each City, normally we start the process off by helping them look at their Land Use Plans to see how they should be updated to account so that when we do our street and highway and our other modal plans we are accounting for the traffic, where it will be generated from and where it wants to go.

Haugen stated that with this activity you will also notice that we have three activities in 2014 that we are doing to reach that 2019 deadline. He commented that you heard the EJ update already,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 13<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

you will hear about the safety integration later, and then you already had presentations on our Regional Architecture.

Haugen reported that this is just sort of solicitation kick-off as we prepare a two-year work program. He said that, as per usual, if you are going to submit something to us for consideration you need to have your local council, or local governing body formal approving it as an item for us to consider. He added that if you have project ideas contact us and discuss them with us as early as you can so we can make sure eligibility isn't a concern later in the process.

Williams asked when they need to have the approved lists to the MPO. Haugen responded that they need to be submitted by the end of September. He added that we hope to have a draft work program for consideration in October, and present it to the feds and states in November.

Haugen reiterated that this is a two-year program, so towards the end of 2015 we will re-exam what we have pegged for 2016 to make sure the projects are still valid and there hasn't been any new more pressing study that needs to be done, so the second year is written more in pencil than in pen.

Haugen reported that, for those of you that have been around long enough, you perhaps remember when there were emphasis areas put out by our federal partners, they have not been utilized for several years, however they have reinstated those emphasis areas so when you see our work program next time you will see us identifying emphasis areas and how our different activities also work those areas into our work program. He explained that the emphasis areas are the things that we are already focusing on, performance measures and stuff like that.

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON SAFETY INTEGRATION INTO THE LONG RANGE  
TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

Haugen stated that Sarah Erickson, MPO Intern, will be presenting this agenda item, she will talk about our integration of safety into our Long Range Transportation Plan.

Erickson said that, just to give you a bit of a background, she was brought on in May to start this Integration Program as MAP-21 now requires integration rather than just recommends it. She added that with MAP-21 they increased funding for safety measures as well as imposed a penalty for States if they don't reach certain safety criterias, so as a result she worked on two primary things thus far this summer; which were Goal 8, Safety section, as well as Chapter 2.

Erickson commented that for Goal 8 we initially had only two objectives that were really quite broad, not very specific, so, whereas we have to integrate both State's Strategic Highway Safety Plans into our Long Range Transportation Plan now, she went and looked at both of them and compared them, and for the most part most of the strategies and standards were the same, so she just incorporated all of them and added them together, and if there was one that was present in one but not the other she would still include it, so this is a pretty big compilation of all the different standards and objectives found in both Minnesota and North Dakota.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 13<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Erickson said she then sifted through the North Dakota Local Roads Safety Program, which is a subset of the Strategic Highway Safety Plan, and then on the Minnesota side she went through MnDOT's District 2 Highway Safety Plan and the Polk County Roadway Safety Plan, and pulled out all the projects that specifically pertained to our MPO area, and while this won't be included in the final draft, she identified which individual project from those three plans directly related to different standards or objectives.

Erickson stated that the first fourteen objectives are pretty concrete and directly from the SHSPs, but they are still looking at transit, bike and pedestrians; which she pulled from Federal Highway Administration website, as they had suggestions; however transit is still rocky as they had no specific direction.

Erickson commented that in looking at the performance measures they were able to compile them based off the HSP's as well, but, as you can see, Grand Forks and Polk County only had data for the first four performance measures, and even with that the way she approached those numbers was to take the same proportion on the North Dakota State level and apply them to the Grand Forks level, but she found that other in plans, such as St. Cloud, they kind of left a disclaimer stating that until they get further federal guidance they aren't putting a set number, so it is still up for discussion.

Erickson reported that for Chapter 2 she has added crash trees and maps from the Strategic Highway Safety Plans, as well as added language to incorporate the systemic safety approach in addition to the dark spot right now, their Long Range Transportation Plan still is the dark spot approach so she just added to it, and incorporated those as well as a discussion of emphasis areas. She stated that this is still a more recent update, and she has been working on this the last couple of weeks so it is definitely a very preliminary draft.

Erickson stated that looking forward there is still revenue that has yet to be touched on in the integration process, and we have very preliminary numbers based off of the Grand Forks County versus Polk County, and then the District 2, the total amounts for those projects, but the expenditures are still up in the air so they aren't entirely finished with revenues.

Haugen commented that this information hasn't been distributed yet, it will be after this meeting. He explained that Ms. Erickson just finished a pretty good draft of how Chapter 2 would look in the area of safety crash analysis so they will distribute that to this body for review and comment.

Haugen reported that on the revenue side they did identify that, one of the main things that is occurring is that North Dakota in particular used to have safety kind of wrapped up under the Urban Roads Program, now it is completely separate, therefore it allows us to add some revenue back in to allow us to address some safety specific concerns and projects. He explained that we originally thought Minnesota didn't have any opportunity for revenue, however we are seeing that there are some HSIP projects being done so we are working towards a number that we agree is reasonable from the Minnesota side for specific stand-alone safety projects to be identified.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 13<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen commented that before Sarah leaves us we will have reached agreement on the revenue side, and then it will be up to the full-time MPO staff to figure out how to incorporate them into the last chapter and identifying projects, if any, or how we are going to identify the expenditures in the plan.

Haugen stated, then, that just as we presented several Technical Advisory Committee meetings ago, that our safety goal, we would incorporate all of the strategic highway safety objectives and standards into our plan. He said that, just for this bodies convenience, and for our remembrance, we have highlighted those that have specific projects contained in the local safety programs so you have some idea as to how it all relates back together.

Haugen reported that they have incorporated the whole language in Chapter 2 about the strategic highway safety plans, and some of the outcomes that have been developed through that process.

Haugen stated, then, that this is where we are at in integrating safety into our Long Range Transportation Plan. He added that Sarah has been a great help, however she has a soon-to-come termination date, of her choosing. Erickson explained that she is going down to Dallas next month to intern with Southwest Airlines.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Update On MPO Projects

Williams asked for an update on the different programs and projects the MPO is currently working on. She said that she has the count program, the street analysis, Upper Great Plains, ITS, etc., and she would like an update on where the MPO is at with them.

Haugen responded that he would look to Teri Kouba to talk about the Pavement Management.

Kouba stated that she knows that they have started, and we are planning on getting a more in-depth progress report for next month's meeting. She said, however, that she does know that they have started the analysis, and are most likely in the middle of it right now. She added that they will be coming forward with some dates for some training for the ICON Software.

Kouba commented that they said that they had to redo some imagery that somehow got lost, but they have completed that so she has the whole right-of-way imagery package and she is currently making the rounds of getting into the Cities' hands, both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks.

Haugen asked for an update on the ITS Regional Architecture from Stephanie Erickson. Erickson responded that right now they are just meeting with the different stakeholders and getting their input into the document.

Williams asked about the Upper Great Plains and the traffic count program. Haugen asked what she was referring to on the Upper Great Plains. Williams responded that there are different staff working on different things, so if they had a summary of all these different programs every

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, August 13<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

meeting it would be very very helpful to try to keep up with everything. She added that the other program is the traffic count program.

Haugen responded that on the count program they have established the capture of vehicle detection through the videos at all of the intersections we have on our list except for those that are waiting for the new traffic signals to get installed. He said that on the South Washington project, while all the signals are up, they aren't operational, but ultimately they are starting to capture data. He added that they did do a sensitivity analysis that showed that the videos are pretty good at actually capturing data. He commented that before he went on vacation he requested a teleconference with A.T.A.C. about the scheduling of the remaining traffic signals, so he needs to work with Ms. Williams to schedule that call to assist A.T.A.C. in understanding when those new signals will be available for them to finish off their video detection capture. Noehre commented that it wouldn't pay, probably, to do it immediately after the project is done in order to allow a period for traffic to mobilize again. He said that even giving a project a completion date, or saying that the signal will be up and operational prior to the project being done, it wouldn't make sense to do it again, he wouldn't think. Haugen disagreed, stating that it does actually because what they are doing is they are going in and putting in the parameters of detection, so they aren't really starting the counting. Williams added that they are just doing the set-up as to where to put the counter and how to set the counter, etc., so they are just wondering when they will have access to the system so they can do the initial set-up. Noehre responded that they will probably have access within the next few weeks. Williams asked if the fiber would be put in then as well. Noehre responded it probably wouldn't, that it will follow shortly after the signals are up.

Haugen said, going back to the Upper Great Plains project, you will have to go back and ask what more they want of us to do because last he saw was a draft response from engineering that was in the works. He said that he provided Mark Walker with a project by project classification list with Upper Great Plains' maintenance versus improvement versus expansion, so he isn't sure what more he wants from them.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO ADJOURN THE JULY 9<sup>TH</sup>, 2014,  
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 3:05 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, September 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014  
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the September 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:36 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Ali Rood, Mobility Manager Cities Area Transit; Mike Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Mike Yavarow, Grand Forks Engineering; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Rick Audette (Proxy for Patrick Dame), Grand Forks Regional Airport Authority; Nels Christensen, BNSF Railroad; and Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning.

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

Guest(s) present were: Mark Walker, Grand Forks City Engineer; Al Grasser, Grand Forks City Engineer; Peg O’Leary, GF Historical Preservation Commission; and Mohammad Smadi, A.T.A.C. (via conference call).

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

Haugen said that, for the sake of anyone new, he would ask that everyone please state their name and the organization they represent.

**SUSPEND AGENDA**

Haugen explained that a request has been made to move Agenda Item 8 – Matter Of Regional ITS Architecture Plan Update, up for discussion. Item 8 moved up for discussion.

**MATTER OF REGIONAL ITS ARCHITECTURE PLAN UPDATE**

Haugen reported that Mohammad Smadi from A.T.A.C. would like to give a brief presentation on the Regional ITS Architecture Plan update.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, September 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

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

Smadi explained what ITS is, and what it does. He then gave a brief overview on what they have completed, to-date, on the project; and stated that they are about half way done updating the plan, but do still have some work to do over the next couple of months, and will have the actual report available for review and comments and finalized by November 2014.

Grasser said that they have had a couple of inquiries from the Grand Forks City Council regarding whether or not there is a method of putting some signs out in the community when the railroad tracks are blocked on 42<sup>nd</sup> Avenue so someone on Gateway Drive or on University Avenue would be able to turn off or avoid that conflict. He asked if this would fall within the parameters we are talking about here. Smadi responded that it could be an ideal project; to deal with the rail detection and then provide information to travelers, and is something they could add to the architecture. Grasser commented that he would like to throw that idea out there because they are being asked to start looking at it, and the other thing they are looking at is maybe an app on the phone. Smadi asked who the contact person should be for this. Grasser responded that he could be the contact person, unless Mr. Haugen would prefer he was. Haugen stated that he believes train detection was included in the 2008 Plan. Grasser commented that one of the challenges they have is getting that information back out to those locations where it would be useful to take an alternative action. Smadi reported that the challenge with these sorts of things is the timing, so you want to have a good idea of how long the train will be there, how long the intersection will be blocked, for it to be worthwhile to divert the traffic; that is the challenge they have seen from other locales. Grasser agreed, adding that they have identified some of that too, and they might not be able to get all of the way there, but there might be some benefit in at least identifying when a train is actually there.

Information only.

**RESUME AGENDA**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 13<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY GENGLER, SECONDED BY JOHNSON, TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 13<sup>TH</sup>,  
2014, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS**

**Sorlie Bridge**

Haugen asked if a tentative date had been set yet for the presentations on the Sorlie Bridge. Noehre responded that there has not yet been a date set, and it likely won't be as soon as he hoped, more likely it will take place in October.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, September 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that on the Kennedy Bridge a couple of things came back from the MPO Executive Policy Board that he needs to make this body aware of. He said that the first thing is on the signature features, or the aesthetic type things. He explained that the MPO Board directed MPO Staff to arrange a meeting with the public, and all others involved in trying to assess or come up with what is possible, what is realistic, and whether or not there is a desire to have aesthetic things on the Kennedy Bridge. He said that there was quite a lengthy discussion on this issue, and in the end that is what the board directed staff to do, so sometime before the end of September you will be notified of when this event will take place.

Grasser asked, then, if we are expecting the general public to help us define what is possible or what is not possible to put on the bridge. Haugen responded that that is correct. He explained that the concern was that the Grand Forks Herald had already asked for that input, so the invite would also include the Grand Forks Herald to see what input they have received, and what ideas they have come up with so it is a more open forum.

Walker asked if the Grand Forks Herald had received any comments. Haugen responded that the person he talked to, the editor, was not aware of any, but he wouldn't necessarily be the person who would know the answer to that question and said that he would have the right person get in touch with the MPO.

Grasser asked if there was any discussion at the Executive Policy Board about, and maybe it is just him, but he gets a little uncomfortable when we just throw the whole thing open to the public and get ideas that aren't technically feasible. He asked if there would be any discussion about a process where you try to identify the technically feasible options before you throw it open to the public. Haugen responded that there was discussion about the process of how it gets whittled down to stuff that is desired, but the initial point would be a bit of an open forum, thinking of how that topic is raised. He said that the one concept he has in his mind is the original concept of the Sorlie lighting project that the Downtown Leadership Group came up with versus what the end result was, and sort of step them through that process.

Noehre commented that Roger Hille is working on this project, but that he wasn't able to attend today's meeting because he is actually in Minneapolis on some other bridge work, but part of what they are doing, as well, is to try to work with their historical folks as to what the possibilities might be. He said that, as everyone knows, MnDOT is the lead agency on this project, so the contract with the consultant is through them, but as a partner he would suggest that their asking the question wasn't meant to allude we were raising our hands to lead a lengthy process to go through and receive the world of possibilities for features, then go through and evaluate them all, unless we are publically looking at the community saying that here are a couple of things we might be interested in, these are the parameters that we can work in with these one or two things, so that is really what they would be looking for from the communities, giving us one or two narrowed down ideas that we can consider. Haugen reported, however, that there was discussion that there already was a committee set up, and that that committee had met

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, September 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

and had a whole different tangent of discussion, so in the end this is what the board voted to have done so staff will follow through with their request and do the best we can with it.

Haugen stated that we are aware that the proposal for the soon-to-be-hired consultant does contain up to two meetings at which the consultant will work with this issue. Noehre commented that that isn't many meetings to kick the door open and say the universe is the possibility.

Williams asked if a list of some of the things that they did look at, and did determine aren't technically feasible, or where there isn't any way of maintaining it, or whatever the reason may be, could be created because it might help circumvent people coming in and starting all over again as that would be counterproductive.

Noehre stated that it might be easier to start out as we typically do, saying okay, here are three things, which one do you like best, you would probably get the most input, actually, from that. Haugen responded that staff will be scheduling something and they will be working with many of the people in this room to set it up, and supporting it with materials.

O'Leary asked what they are expecting to get out of this. Haugen responded that he thinks that part of the issue was the committee that did meet, and who was invited to attend that meeting and participate and provide input to that meeting. He explained that there was a considerable dislike for that process, so the board is perhaps going to the other extreme of making it as open and transparent as possible, that is the perspective he took from the request. Walker stated that he would like to comment a little bit on that since he is the person that set up the meeting. He explained that he originally thought they would just get some city officials together to talk about what we might like to see for a signature feature, and as a courtesy they did invite East Grand Forks to participate, and he thinks what Mr. Haugen is talking about is that maybe there were some people from East Grand Forks that wanted to be at the meeting that weren't invited, but the original meeting was intended to just be a kick-off meeting to determine how we should proceed with this issue, and what might be possible. Haugen stated that it wasn't a reflection on your call of the meeting or anything, it was a reflection of who was able to attend and who knew about it so they could make time to attend, or as one board member put it: "the wrong people attended", from his perspective.

Haugen reported that there was also discussion at one point about whether they want to have any aesthetics added to the Kennedy. Grasser commented that there are two ends to the bridge, so even if one side doesn't want anything it doesn't mean the other feels the same way, so there could be two different decisions on that. Noehre agreed that that may be the case with some things, however lighting would not be one of them. Walker stated that one thing that was discussed was more inviting welcome signs to either Grand Forks, North Dakota or East Grand Forks, Minnesota, and that is certainly something one side could invest in and the other side could choose not to. Haugen agreed, pointing out that you already see that investment on U.S. #2 whereby East Grand Forks has a nice welcome to Minnesota statue closer to the Highway 220 area, and on the Grand Forks side there is just a Welcome to North Dakota sign on the bridge itself.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, September 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen said, then, that there was some discussion about not having any aesthetics, or if they had to choose which one they wanted to invest aesthetics in, and they felt the Sorlie is the one that should have more consideration of signature items attached than the Kennedy Bridge. O'Leary stated, though, that the question then arises as to whether any aesthetic issues would be addressed on the Sorlie, or whether it would be required to remain as it is, in which case they will have lost their chance to have aesthetics on either bridge, because she thinks there is a real good chance of the latter happening. Haugen commented that the meeting that is going to be held by the MPO will be focused on the Kennedy Bridge, but there will obviously be some spill over about what is or isn't possible on the Sorlie since they are so close together in time, and in distance.

Noehre stated that his recollection of the MPO meeting discussion is that the two bridges were starting to get tied together, and they said let's not do it here so we can do it there, and his comment is that they need to be treated separately because they are separate, and even though they are being done close together in time, two years can be a long time in how rules and regulations and laws change or don't change.

Haugen reported that the other point that took place was the low spot on the East Grand Forks side. He said that MnDOT did make it very clear that it is part of their project, and they have extended the project limits so that it is inside the project. He added that if the Corps of Engineers determine that there will be minimal impact in addressing this low area, MnDOT said that they would include the repair in the bridge project. He stated that MnDOT is evaluating the area, communication has been sent to the Corps of Engineers for their input, and that is where we are at with this issue at this time.

Walker asked if the intent is to raise that low area both east-bound and west-bound lanes, raise that entire section to the height of the bridge. Haugen responded that they want to, as part of this project, raise it as much as they can, but the board also passed a motion that they would like to get the Minnesota side up to the equivalent of the Grand Forks side so that we get the most protection from having it closed as possible. He added that they know there is an increment that might be able to be done with this project, and that it won't get them to the same level as the Grand Forks side, but they still want the MPO to push for it, and remind MnDOT and East Grand Forks that getting it raised to an equivalent or higher height than the Grand Forks side is what they desire. He commented that this is an opportune time to perhaps do something in conjunction with the Kennedy Bridge project, but they still want to kind of push to alleviate the issue so that the closure occurs less often than it has in the past, if ever.

Haugen commented that with the low area discussion there was also a lot of discussion on how many feet the river has to get to force closure, so he reminded himself that we worked up the Bridge Incident Management Plan quite a few years ago now, and we did revise the river height table, and highlighted the section to show that there is a possibility that, and MnDOT has installed them twice in the past, putting berms on the ramps can protect the bridge from closure, and the amount of feet back then was an additional two-feet.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, September 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Grasser said that he has a correction and concern with the table, specifically the Point Bridge in that the closure should be 44.9 not 40 feet. He said that is based on where the low point is on those two closures. Haugen responded that Mr. Walker forwarded him that information the other day. Grasser said that the other one, the action level of the last bullet, he is a little concerned that when we start talking about what is going to happen with the Kennedy Bridge we are going to start talking two numbers; there will be a 52-foot number and a 52 plus 2, which is a 54-foot number. He stated that from his standpoint, when they are flood fighting, when you're adding these berms that is an emergency action, and a potentially achievable action, depending upon who knows what when, and so he doesn't want there to be any confusion, and he thinks we should still be talking about the closure potentially happening at 52-feet, not 52 plus 2 feet, so he would actually like to see the bullet point Action 2 changed, where it says: "river elevation for the Kennedy Bridge will be increased.." to "may be increased up to two feet if reviewed and approved by the Corps". He said he doesn't want someone to think this is a certainty, and this is all of a sudden going to happen, it is more uncertain than that in his mind so he would like to reflect that uncertainty in that review process.

Haugen stated, then, that it sounds like there are two changes you desire on this, and it has been quite a few years ago that it was changed to reflect this data, so they can do those changes. He asked if there was a physical change that caused the Point Bridge to raise four feet. Walker responded that he isn't sure where the number shown came from, but the criteria they have in the Corps of Engineers O&M Manual indicates that they are supposed to have the closure in place by 45.2 or so, but they recognize that the low spot is 44.9, and that is when water starts ponding, so instead of putting up some road closure signs, and then shortly there-after putting up the physical closure of the flood protection system, they just automatically put the flood protection system closure in place before the water hits 44.9.

Walker commented, on that low area in East Grand Forks, just as a clarification, he thinks the height is 52.6-feet, and according to the O&M Manual the Corps requires them to put the closure in before it gets to 52-feet, so there may be times when you even have that in place that the Corps will require you to have that closure in place even though the road is raised. He said that their criteria is that you get the closure in place at least three feet before water reaches the closure. Grasser added that there is one elevation that you are dealing with and a series of actions if it is impacting the sill there is another set of actions and elevations if it just the low area, but isn't at the sill of the flood wall, as it is the sill of the flood wall that they are supposed to assemble and close three feet ahead of the flood, but they have more flexibility at the low area.

Information only.

**MATTER OF T.I.P. AMENDMENT**

Haugen reported that this is an amendment on the North Dakota side, and they did advertise that a public hearing would occur at this meeting.

Haugen opened the public hearing. There was no one present for discussion. He closed the public hearing.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, September 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen stated that this amendment is in regard to signal foundation work at Columbia and 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue South. He explained that it is a somewhat convoluted project with a lot of history behind it, with the end result being that the federal funds increased from \$16,000 to over \$160,000, and we need to amend the T.I.P. to reflect that significant increase in the federal participation.

Haugen commented that they received no written comments prior to noon today, and no oral comments were received either. He said that MPO staff would recommend approval of the amendment.

Williams referred to the staff report and asked for clarification. She pointed out that the staff report that was provided has numbers that are not the same as what is in the T.I.P., and she couldn't find an award letter, which the report said would be available. Haugen responded that the award letter is the report that includes the contract that identifies the dollar amount of \$166,660.00, that is the award. He added that you normally get an award letter from the NDDOT saying please amend your T.I.P. because we are awarding you X amount of dollars towards this project, or please amend your T.I.P. because we are increasing participation in X amount of dollars, but the award letter is the staff report that was put together that contained this agreement that identified this dollar value. He said that is why he stated that this project is kind of an interesting one, and that is one of the interesting things. Grasser commented that it would be clearer if we called it a cost participation maintenance agreement or staff report, award letter is kind of confusing. He added that one thing they did notice in there too, was that if you look at the numbers in this staff report they don't add up to all the numbers in the T.I.P., but if you have the July staff report awarding the project all the number add up to the numbers in the T.I.P. Haugen asked if the T.I.P. number is correct, the total federal amount. Grasser responded it was.

***MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVAL THE FY2014-2017 T.I.P. AMENDMENTS, AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF 2015-2018 MINNESOTA SIDE T.I.P.**

Haugen reported that the public hearing for this item will be held at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting next Wednesday.

Haugen pointed out that, included in the packet, is the complete draft document highlighting just the Minnesota side projects, and, as we discussed last month, regarding the two bridge projects, this Final T.I.P. reflects those additional project listings Minnesota wants for construction engineering, etc.; and also the project listing for the Kennedy Bridge PE.

Haugen stated that there is no inconsistency between the MPO T.I.P. and the Area Transportation Partnership T.I.P., or the Draft S.T.I.P., so staff recommends approval subject to public comment.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, September 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Williams said that she has a question regarding the environmental study; is that just minority or is there supposed to be minority and low income on that map. Kouba responded that it is currently what is accepted in our current Environmental Justice Manual, and they will change it as soon as they change the manual.

Haugen asked when the final commentary for the manual will take place. Kouba responded that it is October 17<sup>th</sup>.

Haugen reported that the map is being updated and there will be a separation of minority and low-income populations shown. He added that there are, however, none identified in East Grand Forks, so the updated one won't affect the Minnesota projects.

***MOVED BY ROOD, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE DRAFT FINAL FY2015-2018 MINNESOTA SIDE T.I.P., AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Haugen commented that on the North Dakota side they are still shooting for next month to do the final T.I.P. as well. He explained that there are communications occurring between local government and the MPO about the Draft T.I.P. and the Draft S.T.I.P. and trying to reconcile those documents. He added that in addition to this, soon there will be a solicitation coming out for the next T.I.P. cycles on both sides of the river, and it is planned for the end of September or early October to have letters sent out, with a December 2<sup>nd</sup> deadline for submittal of projects so we can get them to our State Partners. He said that this will cover the Street and Highway, the TAP, HSIP, but not Transit, as we will have a separate deadline of October 31<sup>st</sup> for transit projects. Williams said that these projects need to be approved by their City Councils, correct. Haugen responded that that is correct.

Haugen stated, then, that in November they will be doing the transit side, and then in December, through our Technical Advisory Committee and Executive Policy Board we will process the candidate projects for 2016 through 2019.

**MATTER OF PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM UPDATE**

Kouba reported that currently Goodpointe is about 60% completed with their analysis. She said that one of the reasons why they are behind is because we had a very rainy May, which meant they couldn't come out and redo some of the areas that slipped through the cracks between transferring data and such, so they are a little behind schedule on that point, but they still believe they should be done by the middle of October, at which time we can then fit in some training sessions with the new software.

Kouba commented that she will be getting in touch with people to find out who will be attending the training sessions, and to let everyone know when and where the training will take place, as

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, September 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

well as when the analysis is completed. She added that they don't want to do the training until the analysis is completed.

Grasser said, then, that the change in scope was that they had to go back and pick stuff up that was missed the first time. Kouba responded that that is correct, but just with the timing itself in our right-of-way imagery RFP, and processing work, stuff got missed and it was transferred data that got somehow missed or deleted so they had to come back and get that information. She added that a few of the roads were completely missing. Grasser asked if was a budget thing, or a process thing that we separated out the data gathering from the analysis. Haugen responded it was a process. Grasser asked what kind of process. Haugen responded that they had to have a separate request for proposals on the Right-of-Way Imagery versus putting that into pavement management software. Grasser asked if that was a federal highway requirement, and not to be too critical, but it has been over a year since we gathered most of that data and now we are still trying to get the system up and running, so if there could be a way of consolidating those next time it would be beneficial. Kouba responded that when they did get their Right-Of-Way Analysis Proposals, both consultants that submitted proposals included training on putting information into our system, so they are used to having them both together. Grasser said that that is how they have seen it in the past as well. He stated that they are trying do updates to pavement stuff for this legislative session, and yada-yada-yada, and their last analysis is seven or eight years old, and the images they have are already a year old and they are still trying to get them into their working system.

Grasser said that one thing with the process that has always stymied them in the past is when they talk about doing budget scenarios, to do that you have to have a projection of a deterioration curve or something that relates age and condition to a specific technique, and he is curious how they do that, if they just have a one-point data, are they just bringing in their own curves, how are they doing that to come up with a scenario. Kouba responded that they have it as a module and we have to put in the kind of strategies we want to be using for pavement, whether we do some different strategies, whether it be that we are only spending X amount of money on updating it, or whether it be a total reconstruct, or just the chip-seal, or an overlay, but this is the scenarios we are going to have, so it kind of differentiates that. She stated that she isn't exactly sure which curves we are using or any of that, what the deterioration rate is exactly, but she can definitely look into it, and she is actually going to look into because she needs to look at it for our own Long Range Transportation Plan as that was one of the things that we are trying to work with, the Long Range Transportation Plan.

Grasser stated that they will need to understand that. He said that he is assuming they are expecting that we would use this process and data in our transportation planning, but if we don't understand it, and are comfortable with how they are arriving at those things, it isn't going to be of any use to us. Haugen commented that he isn't sure who on the Engineering Staff accesses ICON currently, but those modules, or those charts are in there already so you someone should be able to click on your ICON and find what you need right now, so you can find out what is used and whether it is acceptable or not. Grasser said, then, that those won't change. Kouba responded that they can change them and update them in those. Grasser said, though, that unless they do it it will just bring in the same ones they currently have, because they have always had

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, September 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

trouble with that in the past, because how do you develop those curves because you have such a wide variety, if it is a classified street, a private street, an asphalt street, a concrete street, etc., it is always different. He added that he was surprised that someone was able to do that.

Haugen commented that in looking at these last two weeks of October, not including the Fridays, let them know if there are better days than others for a day and a half training session.

Haugen asked if any of the 60% completed data available right now with the data base we have access to. Kouba responded that she doesn't think it is.

Information only.

**MATTER OF U.S. HIGHWAY #2 ACCESS MANAGEMENT STUDY UPDATE**

Haugen reported that the information this month is just to inform you and invite you to participate, if you wish, next Tuesday, September 16<sup>th</sup> at the Howard Johnson Motel, for our Public Input meeting.

Haugen stated that they sent out letters to all the property owners. He explained that in the letter they offered them an opportunity for more of a one-on-one meeting with the consultant team, or if they wish they can just attend the public open house.

Haugen commented that the intent of the this meeting is to inform the public that we are doing this study, what the extent of the study will be, what influences we will be looking at in order to try to capture all the issues that they might have generated for us.

Haugen said that they have already communicated with the airport to have one large airport interest meeting at the airport that day instead of trying to have six different interests meet at different times.

Williams asked if they will have the open house information that is going to be given out, will they have that available ahead of time so they can take a look at it. Haugen responded that it is the same information from our Steering Committee meeting.

Information only.

**MATTER OF MINNESOTA FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION**

Haugen reported that since there isn't anyone present from Minnesota today, and this is an information only item, unless someone wants to go over any of it there is no need to discuss it at this time.

Williams said that her only question is whether this is something North Dakota will be requiring as well. Haugen responded that they aren't requesting a wholesale revision of their functional classification.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, September 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Reminder of 2015-2016 UPWP

Haugen reported that he would just like to remind everyone that the MPO would like to have any work activities you would like considered for our 2015-2016 work program. He said that we know that the Land Use Plans are most likely going to be one important project for both cities for the next year.

Haugen stated that, on a related front, he thinks we discussed the possibility of the NDDOT providing some local match. He said that there is a more likely opportunity for this to occur if a study is being done on a State Highway, using the 80/20 split with the 20% being split 10/10; or 80/10/10.

Haugen explained that if we were just going to use it for an MPO general activity it would not be considered, but if it is on the State Highway System half of the local match will be covered.

Williams asked if it is correct that the work program is council approved, and when is it needed by. Haugen responded that it is, and it is needed by the first Tuesday in October.

Rood asked if the Transit Development Plan is already scheduled for 2016. Haugen responded it is in the que.

Haugen reported that related to the work program, although it isn't signed, sealed and delivered yet, there is a very likelihood that the MPO will receive an additional \$300,000 of federal funds for planning. He said that what he presented to the Planning Commissions about their land use plans, that was included in the \$450,000 available fund figure. He explained that FM/COG is releasing \$300,000, a one-time-only deal, similar to what Bismarck/Mandan did a few years ago. He said that in no way are they acknowledging or implying that the distribution formula is flawed, they are just saying that they have an extra \$300,000 that they need to release, so our work program in 2015 will be a little more robust because of this additional funding.

Grasser said that he just wanted to comment that he found the presentation given by Mr. Haugen at the Planning Commission meeting very enlightening and useful. He added that he would suggest that some of the timelines presented, and maybe the work elements would be good to bring to this group. He said that, speaking for himself, he sometimes has a hard time tracking which elements are ending up in the Long Range Transportation Plan and what the timelines are, so he would suggest that we add that even in here just for updates periodically, as he found it very useful to see some of those timelines and stuff at the Planning and Zoning Meeting, so thank you for presenting that, it is good information.

Gengler asked if Mr. Haugen would be giving this presentation to the City Council on Monday. Haugen responded that if there is a request he could certainly do that. He added that normally transit, engineering and planning get together and write-up one staff report to present it to council, but he doesn't know if all the entities are ready to do that on Monday, or do you want to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, September 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

wait until another meeting. Grasser responded that engineering has some more projects, outside the Land Use Plan, that they would like to have considered, but the Land Use Plan can move ahead on its own, but they do have some other things they would like to have considered, but they haven't brought it to their Service Safety Committee yet, and it their request will need to go before the Service Safety Committee before it can be submitted to the City Council. Gengler stated that he can wait and combine his request with the other requests later on.

Information only.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO ADJOURN THE SEPTEMBER 10<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:40 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014  
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:40 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Darren Laesch, MNDOT-District 2 Planning Director; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit Supervisor; Ali Rood, Mobility Manager Cities Area Transit; Mike Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division (via Conference Call); Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Mike Yavarow, Grand Forks Engineering; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; and Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning.

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

Guest(s) present were: Peg O’Leary, GF Historical Preservation Commission; Roger Hille, MNDOT-Bridge Division; and Kris Bakkegard, KLJ.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

Haugen said that, for the sake of anyone new, he would ask that everyone please state their name and the organization they represent.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 10<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY ROOD, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 10<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS**

Sorlie Bridge

Kris Bakkegard, KLJ, was present for a brief presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request).

Bakkegard reported that he is here today to give a quick update on the Sorlie Bridge project, and to fill you in on what they have been working on. He stated that they have been working on the study for about 18-months.

Presentation ensued.

Bakkegard referred to a map of the study area, and explained that it includes the bridge plus a couple of blocks on either side of the structure.

Bakkegard stated that most of you probably already know this so he will just highlight the environmental process they started, however if you want him to delve a little deeper let him know. He said that at the very beginning of this project they recommended to the NDDOT and the MnDOT that they start this project as an Environmental Impact Statement, which is the highest level of documentation in the federal clearance guidelines. He explained that the reason they made this recommendation was because their initial understanding of the Sorlie Bridge was that there was a strong potential that the gusset plates, the main connector plates of the truss members, would need to be replaced, which is a very extensive process, very time consuming, and would mean closing the bridge for an extended period of time and removing the deck, so it entails a very extensive amount of repair work. He added that as they looked at this project the cost of doing those repairs appeared like they might get very close to what the replacement cost might be, so as they discussed things with the DOTs early on and they agreed that they should at least look at all of those options, however realizing that the bridge is historic, is in a historic district, they also knew that there might be an extended length of closures, so they felt like there was a potential then that there may be other options chosen, selected, or identified that could be of a significant impact to the resource of the Sorlie Bridge so they started with an EIS.

Bakkegard said that one of the first steps that they did in the EIS was to develop a purpose and need. He pointed out that they basically say that the Sorlie Bridge is an important crossing to the area, and we need to maintain it in a safe and reliable fashion, and that that is a commitment and need of the basic project.

Bakkegard commented that one of the first things that they started as the project kicked off was to do their own evaluation of the bridge, the DOTs asked them to do their own calculations, which is what really led to the potential issues of the gusset plates. He stated that one of the first things they discovered as they got into their research and analyzing of the bridge is that there had been new guidance issued by Federal Highway on how to rate those plates since the last time this bridge was structurally rated, so they went through those calculations and kind of put it in a condensed format. He explained that one of the potential stresses in a plate is bending, and that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

bending stress is what was controlling the capacity of these plates, and in the new guidance that Federal Highway had been undergoing for several years, through their research they realized that that type of bending just wasn't a stress that these types of plates saw, so their new recommendations and their new guidance indicated that that check and analysis wasn't required anymore, so as they went away from that method of rating to the next type of load path, the capacity of the plates actually increased because they didn't have that type of bending.

Bakkegard stated that, based on their findings the gusset plate analysis fell to a level of most likely few, if any needing to be replaced. He said, however, that there are some rivets that might need to be replaced with higher strength bolts, but, again, much less invasive, much less extensive types of repairs.

Bakkegard said that, based on that recommendation, the DOTs said, okay, before we do anything differently they wanted an in-depth inspection of the bridge, so KLJ had their team go out last spring and do a top-to-bottom review of the entire bridge. He added that MnDOT was there at the same time and let them use some of their equipment, which was very helpful. He explained that what the DOT wanted to know was whether or not there is anything else out there that they might see, or that our team sees that would get us right back into that mode of this being a very expensive, in-depth repair. He said that the inspection did not reveal anything beyond what they would call maintenance, and just maintenance activities.

Bakkegard commented that they then recommended, based on those findings, to both DOTs that it really doesn't make sense anymore to move forward with projects that include looking at replacement structures. He said that the magnitude of the repair work has fallen down to a level where it is not getting anywhere close to what a new bridge might cost, and the time elements are going to be considerably shorter. He added that there is a likelihood, the way things are looking, that they will be able to do most if not all of the work and still maintain at least a lane of traffic on the bridge, so most of what they thought might become significant impacts are falling off the table, so they recommended that they move forward with a more maintenance type project, address the issues of the bridge that need to be done such as painting, damage repair, some members that might need some work done to them, some miscellaneous concrete work to the substructures where areas are starting to show some signs of early deterioration, but nothing of a serious magnitude, which leads us to where we can actually process this under a much less time consuming and extensive environmental process, so they are looking at even dropping it down to a CATEX level, which is the base level of clearance through Federal Highway. He reiterated that they are here today to give you an update on what they found, as well as to gather input, ideas, and thoughts that you feel should be considered before the DOTs make the move away from the EIS.

**QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:**

Williams asked what the width of the bridge, curb-to-curb, inside is. Bakkegard responded that it is 40-foot wide, curb-to-curb. Williams asked how wide the pedestrian walkways are. Bakkegard responded that they are 5 ½ to 6 feet wide.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Bakkegard reported that they have given this presentation to both City Councils, to the Grand Forks Service and Safety Committee, and to the MPO Executive Policy Board. He said that in general there have been, he would say, three or four things that have come up that both cities are interested in if there was any roadway work that was still going to be done, that wouldn't be a necessity anymore with the project, but it certainly could still be included with the project as it is in our study area and some work has already been potentially identified.

Bakkegard commented that they did get a specific question from the City of Grand Forks asking if the project could go from flood wall to flood wall, and fix those areas, and then the Cities would look at the areas outside the flood walls, so that is one question that has been raised.

Bakkegard stated that beyond the roadway pieces the main questions they have been hearing are if the bridge is going to be repainted, and if so what color will it be; can we add lighting to the bridge; and can we widen the sidewalks on the bridge to bring them up to the current width standard.

Laesch asked if the sidewalks are ADA compliant right now. Bakkegard responded that they are ADA compliant for pedestrians, but wouldn't necessarily meet the standards for bicycles. Haugen commented that there aren't curb ramps from the street on the north side of the bridge. Bakkegard stated that their general answer to all of those questions is that they really aren't, other than taking new structures off the table, they aren't taking anything off the table today, but they will make a commitment moving forward that when you drop down to the CATEX type projects you aren't going to step into areas that might rise to the level of a significant impact, so a lot of those will revolve around just working with the SHIPOs and the local historical groups to make sure that what we do isn't changing the current view of the bridge, so lighting could still be looked at, the sidewalks could still be looked at, but he thinks the range of options that will be considered will be narrowed down and then what ultimately comes out of the project might look a little differently than if we were doing a full EIS.

Williams asked if the bridge was originally stripped like it is to facilitate being able to move traffic from one side to the other for inspections and stuff, is that why it was painted with that median. O'Leary responded that it wasn't originally stripped like that, just from having lived here forever, there used to be tremendous pileups at certain times of the year, especially during beet harvest, and she thinks it was stripped like that just to separate traffic.

Haugen referred to a slide and asked, on the DeMers side, from the bridge to 6<sup>th</sup> Street, it was originally part of the EIS process, and he is wondering if that is still going to be carried through or is it going to be separated out under its own project development. Bakkegard responded that he doesn't know if that decision has been made final yet. Noehre said it hasn't, but he thinks that if we are going to be impacting traffic, we should do impact traffic and roadway at the same time.

O'Leary asked, in regard to that stretch of roadway, whether or not you expand or look at widening or any of those things which certainly would be beneficial, what about economic impacts on the Downtown Historic District, wouldn't that bring this into something that is

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

slightly higher than a CATEX, or not. Bakkegard responded that not typically for a roadway reconstruction project since the road is already there, so even though it is reconstructing the roadway, it is still considered more of a maintenance activity. O'Leary asked if that is true even if it is shut down for an extended period of time. Bakkegard responded that in his experience, and he has seen projects that have been more extensive than this in downtown areas, typically what you see is that it gets built and you're still maintaining some level of traffic, but it certainly is an inconvenience. Haugen said, then, that you're probably focusing just on curb-to-curb replacement. Bakkegard agreed that for the most part they are, but no matter what they do it will probably produce some level of ADA compliance issues so there would be some need to look at the sidewalks, curb-ramps, but generally speaking they are thinking curb-to-curb.

Williams asked if they had any idea of the duration of the project. Bakkegard responded that he can't say with certainty yet as they haven't pinpointed all of the prep work that might be done, but to him it certainly fits within one construction season now, and then depending on how much work they accomplish with the bridge, it could mean several few months, or even an entire construction season, but if it is limited to just painting, or doing some other cosmetic work, it could be as short as a few months, but if they do some of the plate work or member repair work, which might not be considered critical but may be worth doing now, it might take longer. He added that they could do a few repair things that would increase capacity a little bit, but it hasn't been decided yet if they want to go that extensively with a maintenance project.

Information only.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen said that the first basic question on the Kennedy Bridge is whether or not there has been any movement from the Corps of Engineers that someone can report on. Laesch responded that he has not heard anything.

Haugen stated that, as we discussed at the last meeting the MPO Executive Policy Board wanted us to hold a meeting or public open house, and we did hold that on September 29<sup>th</sup>, and presented some concepts that were already in play, and discussed some additional things that could be considered. He said that they had nine people attend, and all were either an elected official or staff person.

Information only.

**MATTER OF MPO SELF CERTIFICATION**

Haugen reported that this is traditionally done when we do our T.I.P., and is done as a separate action from the T.I.P., which is why it is a separate agenda item. He explained, however, that as part of our T.I.P. document we do have this resolution certifying that we are meeting all of the requirements, and we also provide documentation of how we are meeting those requirements.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen stated that MPO staff is requesting that the Technical Advisory Committee approve forwarding a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board that they approve the Self Certification document.

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE 2014 SELF-CERTIFICATION DOCUMENT, AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF THE FINAL NORTH DAKOTA SIDE 2015-2018 T.I.P.**

Haugen reported that he has a power point presentation that he would like to give on the Final North Dakota 2015-2018 T.I.P. (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request).

Haugen reiterated that this is the North Dakota only side of the T.I.P., covering years 2015-2018.

Presentation ensued.

Haugen commented that there are still some unknowns for the future; MAP-21 was extended to the end of May, appropriations for 2015 are on a continuing resolution through sometime in December this year, so what we do today is still subject to change as we implement MAP-21, or as Congress appropriates levels of funding. He added that this document isn't so new anymore; revenue and expenditures have been this way.

Haugen referred to the project tables and stated that these are the projects that we will discuss on the North Dakota side. He went over the projects briefly:

Haugen reported that right now the 5339 solicitation is open, the applications are due to the MPO at the end of the month of October, and next month the Technical Advisory Committee and the MPO Executive Policy Board will determine consistency and priority ratings and submit them to the State for consideration.

Haugen said that he isn't sure when the 5310 solicitations will be opened. He asked Mr. Johnson if he had any idea when that would happen. Johnson responded that he didn't.

Haugen stated that the transportation alternatives, for those of you who aren't quite familiar with that, it is a consolidation of the old Transportation Enhancement, Safe Routes To School, and Scenic Highways Programs, and only the City can submit projects to the MPO for consideration, so all those other agencies that used to be able to directly submit now have to go through the city process to the MPO. He commented that we viewed these projects in December of last year, there were four projects submitted, and these are those projects, however none were awarded funds.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen reported that two of the HSIP (Highway Safety Improvement Program) projects that were submitted came through, in this priority order; 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue turn lane and City wide school sign replacement. He stated that both were awarded funds; the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue turn lanes at the 31<sup>st</sup> Street and 34<sup>th</sup> Street intersections in 2017, and the school signs are all over the city and will be done in 2018.

Haugen commented that projects that are in the current three years of the T.I.P., when we adopted the draft T.I.P., at that time we thought a couple of things were slipping, but now in the final draft you will see that DeMers Avenue moved back, or stayed at 2016 as it is in the current T.I.P./S.T.I.P.; and the University Avenue Overpass also is staying at 2015.

Haugen pointed out that the North Washington Street project remains delayed until 2015, but the cost has not been increased in the T.I.P. He stated that the 2016 project on Columbia Road, our current T.I.P. had \$4,280,000.00 available in federal funds but that has now been increased to reflect the year of expenditure of two years to \$4,803,000.00, however our other Columbia Road project, which slipped one year, hasn't been adjusted to its year of expenditure yet.

Haugen stated that for 2018, the 42<sup>nd</sup> Street project was funded as requested, as was the regional project on North Washington.

Haugen said that beyond 2018, North Dakota has notified us that North ? to Business 2, Gateway and DeMers is proposed to be scheduled for a mill and overlay.

Haugen said that, in summary, these are the new changes from our current T.I.P. He added that the public hearing notice mentioned that the actual hearing itself would take place on October 22<sup>nd</sup> during the Executive Policy Board meeting, and public input is available until 11:00 a.m. that day.

Haugen commented that a couple of questions he asked regarding our Illustrative Project list; we do have 42<sup>nd</sup> Street Grade Separation still shown as an illustrative project, but it appears that that doesn't achieve much in terms of the environmental signatures that are needed, so the question is do we want to continue this project as an illustrative project or not. Williams asked what the alternative would be. Haugen responded that we would no longer carry it as an illustrative project. He explained that we included it as an illustrative project because we thought that was the direction needed to get us a signature, but it isn't going to get the signature we thought it would. Williams said that she thinks it should stay in as an illustrative project for now. She added that she doesn't know of any reason to take it off, because if you take it off then it falls off the radar. Haugen stated, however, that it has no reason to be on the illustrative list anymore, nor does it have any reason to be taken off the list, it is kind of in limbo land. Williams reiterated, however, that it is still needed. Haugen commented that there are a lot of projects that are needed but they don't show up on the illustrative project list. He explained that, again, the purpose of this was to get a specific signature. Noehre asked if there wasn't a resolution to getting it into the S.T.I.P. Haugen responded that he wasn't aware of any. He said that the only resolution is, he guesses, is that it needs to have a federal amount attached to it to get it into the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

T.I.P. and S.T.I.P., so it needs to either show some phase of the project, which might be right-of-way or some purchase of that nature, or it's doing the full whatever tens of millions of dollars project with assigning a small amount of federal funds to it and the rest of the money coming from local resources, but the key is that whatever project is in the T.I.P. and S.T.I.P. not being illustrative but as part of the regular program has to show that there is a full commitment that that project will be done the year it is programmed to be done. Williams said that she doesn't think there is enough information in the staff report to do that because that wasn't even discussed, so they didn't have any type of internal discussion on this at all, it's not even listed in the staff report as an action or anything. Haugen stated that he sent an e-mail to Mark Walker and Mike Johnson asking if this should still be an illustrative project or not. He explained that it was placed in there specifically to get a signature, that signature won't happen while it is an illustrative project, so the purpose of why it is here as an illustrative project has sort of gone away. Bergman asked how long it can be left on there as an illustrative project, can it remain on it for a couple more months until more information can be gotten. Noehre asked if it is easier to do an amendment on a brand new project. Haugen responded that being an illustrative project isn't achieving anything that he is aware of, so what needs to be done is to amend it into the regular program, but that will have to be done as an amendment in the future. Williams said, however, that if it is left as an illustrative project it remains in the T.I.P. document, if it is taken off the illustrative list then it is no longer in the T.I.P. document at all, correct. Haugen responded that that would be correct. Williams commented that she always looks as the illustrative projects being one of our priority projects that we haven't received funding for, but one that is a priority to us, and this one still is a priority.

Consensus was to keep the project in the illustrative project list at this time.

Haugen said that the other question he has is, our current T.I.P. had a lot of dynamic message signs in it and he carried those over to this year, where they were at last year, and he is wondering if it still accurate to reflect it that way. Noehre responded that it is.

Haugen stated that this T.I.P. is consistent with the Draft S.T.I.P. and staff is recommending that the Technical Advisory Committee approve forwarding a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board that they approve it contingent on public input.

Noehre commented that we might be amending this document in the future. Haugen agreed, adding that there is a good chance that we will be amending this document early, and perhaps often. Noehre said that this is especially true considering the status of the funding shown, and with the legislative cycle coming up. Haugen added that they are also still carrying, for the Sorlie Bridge, the \$29,000,000 project in this document even though you just heard that it will probably be scaled back considerably.

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE DRAFT FINAL FY2015-2018 NORTH DAKOTA SIDE T.I.P., CONTINGENT ON PUBLIC INPUT.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

**MATTER OF MINNESOTA FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION**

Haugen reported that this has been discussed previously, and staff met with the East Grand Forks City Council for their input, talked to District Staff for their input and review, talked to the Regional Development Commission for their input, and this is the outcome of that process that will be submitted to the Central Office.

Haugen referred to a map illustrating the current functional classification and explained that the percents shown are what was calculated based on the urban side and the rural side. He stated that it shows what MnDOT, as part of the process proposed, from their Central Office point of view, feels the functional class should look like. He pointed out an example of this on the map, and commented that their mileage reduced the principal arterials considerably. He went over each change/recommendation briefly.

Haugen stated that the next step is for staff to submit their recommendations to headquarters for their review. He said that they will review it and let us know if they agree with our recommendations or not, if they don't agree and a resolution can't be reached then we will go into a mediation process consisting of representatives from various statewide organizations that will make a determination that we will all live with.

Haugen commented that the East Grand Forks did grant preliminary approval to this at their meeting last evening subject to the outcome of the review process.

***MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY ROOD, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY GIVE PRELIMINARY APPROVAL TO THE MINNESOTA FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION REVISIONS, SUBJECT TO REVIEW AND APPROVAL FROM MNDOT HEADQUARTERS.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF ADOPTION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MANUAL**

Kouba reported that, basically, they have done all the updates to the manual, have held public hearings, and did not receive any input.

Kouba stated that there are basically no changes to the manual. She stated that there have been some changes for the simple reason, for mathematical reasons, to keep everything in the same geographic framework, being all block groups and they are separating out and looking at just the minority and the low income, they aren't looking at them combined anymore.

Kouba commented that she has started looking at the significant projects in the Long Range Transportation Plan, which are shown on the map included in the packet.

Kouba reported that at this point in time the review is pretty simple, they start touching into some areas, but most of those projects of any significance are mostly within the same framework as

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

what is currently there, such as any reconstruction on 32<sup>nd</sup> will be staying the same, they aren't adding any capacity; they aren't adding any capacity to the downtown area, they are just basically doing maintenance; as well as the Columbia Road, and those are the areas that start touching into any of our environmental justice areas.

Kouba stated that she just wanted to show everyone this just to give you a preview because she knows that they will be looking at this next month, but other than that she has no feedback from anybody on the environmental justice manual itself, so they are looking for approval of the manual and not the Long Range Transportation projects, just the manual itself right now.

Haugen added that approval would be contingent on the public input that is still out until October 17<sup>th</sup>.

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE PROCEDURAL MANUAL UPDATE AS DRAFTED, CONTINGENT UPON PUBLIC INPUT.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF 2015-2016 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM**

Haugen referred to the financial summaries for each year of the work program, included in the packet, and went over them briefly.

Haugen pointed out that in 2015 we have programmed in the \$300,000 we received from our MPO neighbor to the south. He stated that they have formally released those funds to us, and through the adoption of this work program we will be accepting that \$300,000, so for 2015 our total budget will be just shy of \$1.3 million dollars, which is, he thinks, the highest we have ever had, so it will be a rather significant program.

Haugen commented that you will also notice that from past work programs you never saw the NDDOT Local Match line item, so there is a project that he is trying to program in 2015 that the NDDOT has stated they will consider providing 10% of the total project cost.

Haugen stated that for 2016, without the significant help from Fargo/Moorhead, the budget is reduced almost in half, which is more typical of what we usually have to work with. He pointed out that he has also identified a NDDOT project that he hopes they will provide local match assistance for as well.

Williams commented that this is where she is getting confused. She said that it is her understanding that there was some additional funding from NDDOT to support State Highway studies, so is that the I-29 Traffic Operation Study that you're talking about, and will that still require a 10% local match. Haugen responded that that is correct. He referred to a table and pointed out that if the NDDOT did not provide the \$19,000, which is 10% of that study, then the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

local match, meaning the two cities, with some help from the State of Minnesota, would have to increase the \$223,250 by the \$19,000; and in 2016 increase it by the \$8,500. He explained that with their participating they are contributing this amount that relieves that amount from having to be bore locally between the two cities. He stated that this dollar amount is shared 50/50 between the two cities and the \$19,000 is about \$5,000 more than what the State of Minnesota provides as a match, which they have done for decades.

Ellis asked if the other local match split is 50/50 as well. Haugen responded that it is, and has been for years. Ellis said, then, that their local match will go up next year. Haugen responded it would. Ellis stated that they don't have that budgeted.

Haugen referred to the Funding Sources tables, and went over them briefly. He explained that the first two categories; 100.0 Program Administration and 200.0 Program Support and Coordination, and their line items basically do not change much, if at all, each year. He said that the individual study projects, and he hasn't formally received any requests from either city, so based on e-mail exchanges he believes he has plugged in the top priorities for everybody.

Haugen pointed out that the land use plans were both cities' number one request, so he plugged them in and set aside a certain amount for consultants to assist with them. He stated that he included the I-29 Traffic Operations Study, which was number one in working with the District Office. He said that the dollar value shown is based off similar studies done by both the Bismarck/Mandan MPO and the Fargo/Moorhead COG, although ours is a little smaller as we have less mileage. Williams asked if that is an operation study within what boundaries. Haugen responded that it would encompass the area from the Merrifield Overpass to the North Washington Interchange. Williams asked if it would include looking at the 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South Interchange. Haugen responded it would be included.

Haugen commented that they did beef up MAP-21 implementation for 2015 as they expect a lot more rules and regulations to come on us than we have to date so we expect to have to put out a little more product related specifically to MAP-21.

Haugen stated that they included the Bygland Road Study, which is something that East Grand Forks has been asking for for several years; and also a 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Timing Plan for that corridor. Williams said that they had actually requested a Corridor Planning Study that would look at a whole lot more than just timing; something that would look at right turn lanes, left turn lane needs, deficiencies at the turn, so it wouldn't be just a signal timing plan it would be a corridor study. Haugen responded that this is what he can afford. Bergman asked if they didn't just do a signal timing plan a couple of years ago. Haugen responded that they have done them several times. He explained that with their new count program they are hoping to get better data to do a better job with signal timing. Williams said that it is recommended that you update your timing plan every three to four years and we are at about five and a half years since ours was updated. Haugen commented that he isn't sure if the \$20,000 for consultant costs will be used up, so there may be money available to do some of the other timing plans as well, at least take a look to see if there are any modifications that need to be done.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Williams asked if the pavement management is included in the program. Haugen responded that it is not. He explained that we are currently finishing up pavement management, Teri is trying to schedule training here at the end of October, and we are rolling out our Pavement Management Update in October as well. Williams asked when we are due for new pictures for our pavement management. Haugen responded that the pictures were taken last year so it won't be until 2017 before we need to do them again. Williams asked if they ever went back and retook those that were done so late in the evening that we were unable to see anything. Haugen asked if Ms. Kouba had distributed the 2013 photos yet. Kouba responded that she had given them to Adam Jonasson.

Williams commented that Belmont and Reeves was on their list of things to study, and she is wondering if they were going to get rolled into the review of the Long Range Transportation Plan. Haugen responded that he was not able to program them into either of the two years. Williams said, then, that for sure they will be in the Long Range Transportation Plan. Haugen responded that he can't say for sure, but his best guess would be that they will, however he isn't sure what MAP-21 will require we change, or what we will need to focus on that we aren't already focusing on, now does he know what our funding will be in 2017 and 2018. Bergman said that he knows that transit safety is one thing that we will be focusing on as they are really starting to push people to attend those training classes.

Haugen stated that in 2016 we will begin updating our Long Range Transportation Plan, focusing specifically on the transit section. He pointed out that they also included the Point Bridge slide issue on the East Grand Forks side, to determine if that can be fixed so we don't lose our third bridge.

Haugen reported that the 2016 NDDOT funding request was the U.S. 2/U.S. 81 Intersection Skew.

Williams asked about the additional \$300,000 we received from Fargo/Moorhead COG, and whether it is something that is looked at annually, or every two years, or how do they review their finance structure to determine unused funding. Haugen responded that he believes that, and he can't speak for Fargo/Moorhead, but he believes that their strategy going in to the end of SAFETEA-LU and the beginning of MAP-21 was to sort of build up a pot of money in case authorization didn't occur on time, or appropriations were drastically different than expected, and also based on advise they were getting from their federal and state partners. He said that in the end he thinks the pot got too big for them to sufficiently spend down, and so that is why they were able to release \$300,000 at this time.

Haugen commented that others might think that our annual appropriation formula is skewed where they might be annually getting more then, perhaps they can use and it builds up over time as well, but from Fargo/Moorhead's perspective when they released the \$300,000 they expressly stated that they were not thinking that the distribution formula needed to be fixed.

Ellis asked if the East Grand Forks City Council Representatives on the Executive Policy Board aware that by accepting these funds that their local match will go up, that it will double. Haugen

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

responded that when they talked about the \$300,000 they talked about the \$75,000 match necessary to spend it. Ellis said that \$223,000 would make it about \$110,000 for East Grand Forks and they budget \$50,000 every year so for them it goes up \$61,000, and she isn't sure they are aware of that because they are already \$500,000 in the hole for their budget, so she isn't quite sure they are aware that \$61,000 additional dollars are going to have to be added on top of that, so she can't make a motion to approve the work program at this time until at least her City Council members are up to snuff on where these funds are going to come from because she doesn't know that. She added that this may require they pull out of a couple of studies. Haugen commented that from his end the communication was that we accept the \$300,000, and \$75,000 needs to be released to match.

Williams asked if this was presented to the City Council in a staff report, to explain what it is. Haugen responded that he doesn't know what each City Staff does for budgets for MPO match. Ellis said that it isn't in her budget. Williams agreed, adding that she thinks this is more of an advisory thing to let everyone know that if this happens, then there needs to be some additional matching funds. Haugen commented that it isn't like they haven't been discussing the fact that there will be \$300,000 in additional funds going in, they have been discussing it for a couple of months. Williams said that that is why she was asking about that study because at one time you told her that the state would then pick up the local share, and the city would not be contributing anything. Haugen disagreed, stating that they have always discussed that they would pick up 50% of the 20% local share, that they would pick up half of the local match. Williams said that she would have to check her e-mails to verify that. Haugen stated that it is probably better relayed as an 80%/10%/10% with the NDDOT.

Ellis commented that they found out in East Grand Forks that the way it has always been done hasn't really been working for them because there has been a lot of confusion as to where it is going, which is why she made this comment. She explained that as they dove into the budgets this year, she will bring this to the City Council members' attention and they can discuss it at their next meeting. She said that their budgeting process has been a mess, and the MPO budget has always just gone through administration and they found ways to pay for it, but no one has ever really known where it has been coming from, so that is kind of her issue, that now that they are making distinct line items, that the council members now are going to know what portion is paid to the MPO rather than just throwing it under "other required funding" in the general fund so she wants to make sure that, before it was just paid and they didn't pay attention to it much. She said that they probably knew that the \$300,000 was coming, they probably knew that we were going to have a local share, but they probably haven't really thought about where it is going to come from at this point because it has always just been paid, but now she thinks the additional funds, being where they are at now, might be more of an issue for them.

Williams asked if the \$300,000 requires a local match. Haugen responded it does. He added that the \$300,000 are Consolidated Planning Grant Funds, which are federal combined funds of the FTA and Federal Highway. Ellis said that they do have the original one budgeted, just not the additional \$300,000.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Williams asked if this has to be approved today. Haugen responded that it does, that we need preliminary approval subject to our federal and state partners' review and comment, but it will probably come back for final approval in either November or December, once we receive their comments. Williams commented that she doesn't see anything in here where it is requesting additional funds from the Cities, for additional local match, or anything. She said that she doesn't know if the funds have been approved or not, she is in the same situation as Ms. Ellis is, she doesn't know whether that additional funding has been approved or not. Ellis said that she knows it isn't in their preliminary budget. Williams agreed that it isn't in theirs either because theirs was done back in July.

Ellis commented that she completely understands that it has been talked about, and she has no doubt that their councilmembers were aware that we are getting these additional funds for additional studies, and that it is going to take a local amount, but she is just saying that seeing it and getting excited about it, and then putting it in the budget are two different things, so that is why she struggles with approving this document, and then having them wonder where the money coming is going to come from, so she has to make sure they know where the money is coming from. Williams agreed that she doesn't know if they have enough money in their budget to cover this either as they are going through the budget right now, and she does not have the authority to spend the additional funds unless it has been budgeted with the City, so that is her quandary, that she doesn't have the authority to say that they can give you whatever the additional dollars will be.

Ellis stated that she will absolutely talk to her City Council members and they will have something for the MPO before your meeting on October 22<sup>nd</sup>. She said that she doesn't have any issues with them approving it, but she doesn't want to approve it today and then have them come back and ask her where she is going to find the funds for it.

Williams asked if it could be approved contingent on the confirmation of available funding. Haugen responded she can certainly make that motion.

***MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO GRANT PRELIMINARY  
APPROVAL OF THE 2015-2016 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM SUBJECT TO  
CONFIRMATION OF AVAILABLE LOCAL FUNDING.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF UPCOMING AMENDMENTS TO THE LONG RANGE  
TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

Haugen reported that he just wants to make everyone aware of some upcoming amendments to the Long Range Transportation Plan in November and December. He stated that they have been working with the primary staff people from both Minnesota and North Dakota on these issues. He explained that on the Street and Highway they are integrating the local safety plans, plus they are revisiting the Environmental Justice portion of the Street and Highway section. He said that on the Transit side there are significant changes to the financial plan so they meeting with staff to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

reach agreement as to how to redraft the Transit Financial Plan. He stated that at one time they thought there would be some Bike/Ped stuff, but that is not going to happen this year. Haugen stated that in October they hope to have the draft distributed for review and comment, and then begin the preliminary approval process in November, and the final approval process in December.

Williams said, then, that on the agenda, under item eleven there is no bike and ped, it needs to be stricken. Haugen responded that that is correct, that was a miss on his part. Williams said that she just wants to keep it straight so that if someone else ever goes back looking for something, they will know that it wasn't supposed to be there.

Haugen commented that you will soon be getting drafts of documents from our lead staff people for review and comment. He said that the intent is, sometime in late October to hold a general public open house on the proposed changes, and then present to the Planning Commission, City Councils, Technical Advisory Committee and MPO Executive Policy Board in November and December, and finalize everything by the end of the year.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

**T.I.P. Solicitation**

Haugen reported that we are identifying T.I.P. solicitation. He stated that, currently, and we previously noted that the 5339 in North Dakota is open for projects; on the Minnesota side the TAP program is open for projects; and also there is a Minnesota State funded Safe Routes To School solicitation going on right now.

Haugen stated that soon the MPO will release its formal letter soliciting for the Street and Highway projects and TAP projects on the North Dakota side, safety projects on the North Dakota side, and the transit will wait until January for the 5310 program.

Haugen said that most of these programs will need to have their submittals to the MPO by the first couple of days in December on the North Dakota side and the first couple of days on the Minnesota side, with a few specific programs having slightly altered time frames.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO ADJOURN THE OCTOBER 8<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 3:03 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, November 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014  
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the November 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:45 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit Supervisor; Ali Rood, Mobility Manager Cities Area Transit; Mike Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division (via Conference Call); Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks District (via Conference Call); Mike Yavarow, Grand Forks Engineering; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Nick West, Grand Forks County; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; and Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning.

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

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 8<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 8<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS**

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that since our last Technical Advisory Committee meeting there has been discussion to possibly move the Sorlie Bridge Project to 2015 as more of a painting project. He explained that they are waiting for cost estimates for the base project first in order to ensure there is funding available in 2015 to be able to do the project.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, November 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

West asked if anything was being done with widening of the sidewalks for bikes. Haugen responded that this would be very challenging in that there may not be enough local funding available to cover the local cost of such an amenity in 2015. He added that they still want to do this project as a CATEX as well.

Information only.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that next Monday at 10:00 a.m. in the East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room the MNDOT Historical Staff person from the Bridge Division will be in town to give a presentation on concepts her office has developed, such as lighting, bump-outs, signage, etc.

Haugen commented that the RFP is still open, but it is out for consultants to review. He added that the scope-of-work states that there will be two meetings held to discuss the sign fixture issue.

Haugen stated that he did include information concerning MnDOT's proposal to raise the road on the Minnesota side almost a foot. He went over that information briefly.

Kuharenko asked if there has been any response from the Corps of Engineers on this yet. Haugen responded that it is his understanding that they had thirty-days to respond, and that was over November 5<sup>th</sup>, however he has not yet heard if a response had yet been given.

Yavarow reported that he talked to Roger Hille recently and was told that he was going to place an instrument on the grids to check the level of stress, however he needs electricity to be able to do that and he isn't sure how he will accomplish that at this time. He added that this will take place over the next year.

Information only.

**MATTER OF ND SIDE FTA #5339 APPLICATIONS**

Haugen reported that the deadline for FTA #5339 applications was the end of October, and only one application was submitted from the Cities Area Transit for the replacement of five of its fixed-route vehicles.

Haugen stated that staff reviewed the application and found that it was consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan, that it be prioritized as submitted, and that the Technical Advisory Committee forward a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board that they approve it as such.

Bergman commented that one of their buses has a split frame, thus they may need to reprioritize the list to move the second request up and move the first request down. He explained that the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, November 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

bus is currently being looked at and they will not know if it can be repaired for a couple of weeks. Haugen stated that they have a little time to make the adjustment, but that it should be done soon.

Johnson explained that the process they follow for #5339 funds is that they look at all the applications received and determine whether or not they meet their criteria, then they look at how much funding is available and try to balance their decisions the best they can. Haugen added that there is a total of \$1.7 million in funding available, and Grand Forks' request is for \$1.3 million.

***MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE APPLICATION FOR THE 5339 BUS AND BUS FACILITIES GRANT AS SUBMITTED, SUBJECT TO A POSSIBLE AMENDMENT IN PRIORITIZATION.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON SCHOOL SAFETY REVIEW REPORT**

Erickson reported that over the summer she reviewed all of the ATAC School Safety Studies and developed a summary of the findings for each of the schools.

Erickson stated that the Stakeholders were given the report to review and she did receive some feedback from them, however she would like to get more if possible.

Erickson commented that Grand Forks received funding for citywide sign replacement in the amount of \$46,000.00 (\$41,000 federal and \$5,000 State). Williams commented that the City's Public Works Department has been updating the signs.

Ellis reported that all of the signs have been updated at New Heights, and that their Public Works Department redid all the markings this fall. She said that they will be putting in additional crossings as well.

Ellis said that a lot of updates have also been done at South Point, and more will be done soon.

Haugen asked who the Stakeholders are. Erickson responded that they include representatives from Engineering on both sides, school personnel, members of the PTA, and staff. She added that she would like to get additional feedback in the next couple of weeks, and hopes to have a final document for approval in December.

Information only.

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON U.S. #2 ACCESS MANAGEMENT STUDY**

Haugen reported that NDDOT released its High Crash Locations map. He referred to a slide showing this information and pointed out that the intersection of Airport Drive/GF County #5

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, November 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

and US #2 is highlighted, and is the only intersection highlighted in the eastern part of the state. He said that the data supports a need for improvement at that intersection. Williams commented that she agrees it needs to be reviewed, but also thinks that sometimes you can't stop some accidents from occurring. She stated that the accident where there were two fatalities was caused because the driver of the truck felt he could make it through the light even though he knew it was going to be turning red. She said that you just can't stop driver error.

Haugen pointed out that he also included a copy of the Draft NPN Traffic Generation/Distribution Report in the packet. He referred to it and went over it briefly.

Information only.

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT STUDY**

Kouba reported that training on the Pavement Management Update has been scheduled for Monday, November 24<sup>th</sup> all day, and Tuesday, November 25<sup>th</sup> for half a day in the East Grand Forks City Hall Training Room.

Williams asked when the contract is scheduled to be completed. Kouba responded that it was supposed to be completed by the end of August, but they are behind at this time. Williams asked if we include penalty clauses. Johnson responded that we do not, but that he would check with Federal Highway to see if this is something they do.

Kuharenko asked when we were supposed to get the product. Kouba responded that, again, we were supposed to receive it in August.

Information only.

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON SAFETY INTEGRATION INTO LONG RANGE  
TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

Haugen reported that we previously talked about narrative changes, but now need to make changes to the revenue portion of the plan to integrate HSIP funds.

Haugen referred to the information in the packet, and explained the changes needed to the financial plan.

Johnson commented that NDDOT just finalized a memo on how HSIP funds will be distributed annually; 50% local road safety plan projects and 50% county/city/state projects. Williams asked if there is monies left will they be rolled over to the next project. Johnson responded that that is the intent, that LRSP project would be the first priority, then everything else would be considered for funding.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, November 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

**OTHER BUSINESS**

TAP Funds

Haugen reported that a letter of intent was sent October 31<sup>st</sup>. He said that they submitted two projects that are being reviewed for Minnesota funding. He added that North Dakota is now soliciting for TAP and HSIP projects as well, with a January sub-target date.

Information only.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO ADJOURN THE NOVEMBER 12<sup>TH</sup>,  
2014, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:35 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014  
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:30 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Ali Rood, Mobility Manager Cities Area Transit; Mike Johnson, NDDOT/Local Government Division; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Rick Audette (Proxy For Patrick Dame), Airport Authority; Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; and Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning.

Guests present were: Kim Greendahl, Greenway; Steve Emery, WSN; and Mohammad Smadi, NDSU-ATAC.

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

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

Haugen asked that because there are some new faces here today that everyone please state their names and the organization they represent.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 12<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 12<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

**SUSPEND AGENDA**

Haugen said that, at the discretion of the Chair he would like to suspend the agenda to act on Agenda Item 6 at this time.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF ITS REGIONAL ARCHITECTURE UPDATE**

Smadi referred to a power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and went over it briefly.

Presentation ensued.

Smadi gave a brief overview on the history of the ITS Regional Architecture Plan, explaining that it is a process the MPO first went through in 2005. He stated that it was mandated by Federal Highway that certain MPOs and the States would need to develop an ITS plan. He explained that ITS stands for Intelligent Transportation Systems, and is basically the application of computing and communication technology to the transportation system in order to increase the safety of the system.

Smadi commented that the ITS Architecture actually deals with the provision of a framework for the deployment of ITS in the region over a planning horizon. He said that it also is a tool through which the Stakeholders in the region that own and operate ITS can come to an agreement on a vision for the region that everyone can work towards.

Smadi stated that the architecture also bridges the gap between strategic planning efforts and the deployment of ITS products.

Smadi reported that they have several ITS service areas in the Grand Forks/East Grand Forks region, with the main one encompassing travel and traffic management, public transportation management, emergency management, achieve traffic data management, and maintenance construction management.

Smadi stated that within the service areas they have different services that they revisit to ensure that they still need the architecture and then they can update their status. He commented that some of the updates highlight some very high level changes that happened in the region since the last update.

Smadi explained that they have some new software for both traffic management and also for transit management. He added that they also have a new effort for collecting data from signalized intersections in the region, specifically for the City of Grand Forks. He stated that they have more deployment of the usage of automated vehicle location, GPS technologies on a variety of vehicles including transit vehicles, emergency vehicles, and also maintenance construction vehicles such as snow plows.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Smadi said that they have an update on the way transit signal priority and emergency vehicle signal pre-emption is done at signalized intersections. He commented that this process is automated now that we have the GPS vehicle location on a lot of the vehicles. He added that they also had some new installations of devices such as the DMS or Dynamic Message Signs, which are the message boards you see along highways that provide travel information. He said that each of these things will affect services in that area, and are part of the update process.

Smadi reported that the tasks that were completed with this project were updating the ITS Services and their status; updating the information flows for each of the services; updating the system inventory; updating the functional requirements of a lot of the systems; and bringing the overall architecture into compliance with the National Architecture. He added that in addition, something they did in this version of the Regional Architecture was to link it to the Long Range Transportation goals and to specify how some of the ITS services identified were achieved.

Smadi commented that there were three main deliverables as a result of this project:

- 1) ITS Architecture Report.
- 2) Turbo Architecture Database.
- 3) Web Access.

Haugen reported that a Stakeholder meeting was held over the lunch hour today, and that is where some of the final edits were done to the document. He said that staff is seeking approval of the ITS Regional Architecture update today.

***MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY ROOD, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE ITS REGIONAL ARCHITECTURE UPDATE, AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**RESUME AGENDA**

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS**

Sorlie Bridge

Noehre reported that since our last Technical Advisory Committee meeting it has been decided that the Sorlie Bridge project will be moved up to the 2015 construction season, and the bid letting has been scheduled for April 10th. He explained that we will need to process a T.I.P. amendment to make this change. He added that the project will now be primarily a bridge painting project, however there may be a few additional minor things done on the bridge itself such as repairing a crack in the pier, replacing a rivet or two with high strength bolts, but essentially that will be all, there won't be any roadway work, approach work, it will strictly be a bridge project.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Gengler commented that both the Downtown Development Association and the Public Arts Commission have asked about the potential of incorporating, they are using the term “Art”, but essentially they are talking about lighting features and such. He said that he knows the report mentions it a bit, but how probable is something like this. Noehre responded that he can’t speak for Minnesota on the funding portion of that, but North Dakota will allow up to \$100,000 for enhancements that don’t change the environmental document and are allowed under the historic guidelines. Gengler asked if the Historic Preservation Commission have to okay enhancements on the Sorlie. Noehre responded that they do.

Erickson asked about the bike and pedestrian facilities on the Sorlie, will anything be done with them. Noehre responded that nothing will be done with the bike/ped facilities on the Sorlie. Erickson asked if the railing isn’t too short, and the path too narrow, for it to be considered a multi-use path, and to allow for bikers to ride across because the railing is too short. She asked, because it is on the Historic Register, can nothing be done to the railing. Noehre responded that he doesn’t know if the railing can’t be changed, but it would have to be approved.

Kuharenko commented that another question is, because the Sorlie is being reduced in scope to a simple painting project, is there any thought to looking at the 2019 project to shift the scope of that project to incorporate the approaches, or the approach on the North Dakota side, has there been any discussion with MnDOT as to doing the approaches on their side around that same period as well. Noehre responded that that would be up to East Grand Forks to have that discussion, not the North Dakota DOT. He added that it certainly is a possibility that they could look at it, but it would depend on what type of project it is in 2019, if it is a mill and overlay he wouldn’t think they would be very interested in doing an Environmental Assessment, but if it is a reconstruction project it would probably make some sense. Kuharenko stated that he asks this as it was brought up at the Service Safety meeting last night.

Haugen asked Brad Bail if East Grand Forks has had any communication with MnDOT on this. Bail responded that they have had some conversations with them about signature features on the Kennedy, and if there is money available etc., but they haven’t heard back from them yet. He added that as far as the roadway and things with the Sorlie are concerned, unfortunately it is going to be hard to do much to fix the East Grand Forks side unless the bridge were going to be raised, which is obviously not happening, so that means making much change on the East Grand Forks side improbable, there will still be a problem with it flooding on a regular basis. Noehre agreed, commenting that doing anything inside the flood protection is challenging. He added that it is a long process, and an expensive process.

Haugen summarized that ultimately we will be getting a new paint job, and some touch-ups on some of the nuts and bolts and plates; and there is \$100,000 available on the North Dakota side to enhance the structure, again focusing just within the structure itself not outside the structure. Noehre commented that he would like to add two things to that; the \$100,000 is the total enhancement funding so that is what the NDDOT is offering, and this will also have to include local match. Haugen asked if the split for this would be 80/10/10 just like the structure itself. Noehre responded it would. Haugen commented that he would think that if the City wishes to contribute more than the 10% required to bring the total up past the \$100,000, and as long as it

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

stays within the parameters of a CADEX, and wouldn't lengthen the approval process, they can. Noehre responded they can.

Noehre gave a brief overview on why they made the decision to just do more or less a paint job on the Sorlie.

Haugen asked if Mr. Noehre could give an update on what transpired at the December 4<sup>th</sup> Public Open House. Noehre responded that he wasn't able to attend the meeting, but from what he heard one person asked if they were going to do anything like widen the sidewalks, and when he was told no he was happy about with that answer. Haugen commented that he wasn't at the open house portion, but was present for the presentation. He said that another question was about lighting, and at that time the answer was that it was possible, and was being looked at.

Noehre commented that he thinks the City is working with the MPO and the consultant and that a meeting will be scheduled, possibly next week, to talk about enhancements. Haugen stated that that was the second issue he wanted to bring up. He reiterated that the bid letting is scheduled for April 10<sup>th</sup>, so between then and now when do the enhancements need to be vetted through the necessary processes for approval/agreement. Noehre responded that plans have to be completed by the first of February, so it needs to be vetted, designed, drawn, etc., by the end of January.

Johnson asked what the plan is for the DeMers stretch, from bridge structure to N. 6<sup>th</sup> St., that is already in the T.I.P. and S.T.I.P., are you going to go forward with that or what are we doing. Noehre responded that they are, but they aren't sure at what level at this time. He said that he would defer this to the City, as they just submitted this to the City and MPO, and took it to Service Safety Committee on Monday, and moved it to 2019. He added that they left the dollar amount in for reconstruction just as a placeholder.

Noehre commented that another driving force for moving the Sorlie up so quickly is the Kennedy Bridge. He explained that the scope of work on the Sorlie has been dramatically reduced, but the scope of work on the Kennedy has increased somewhat, so they have been somewhat nervous about the risk of moving the Sorlie from 2018, and bidding the Kennedy in early 2016, and then doing all the work that is required on the Kennedy, with having that Sorlie potentially being painted, or having some work being done to it in 2018 it puts us in a box that creates some risk for both DOTs, both communities, contractors, etc., and drives up cost, so by getting the Sorlie done first in 2015, it opens that box up and greatly reduces the risk to practically zero of them interfering with each other, which is a good thing for all of us, and why they were anxious to get done with the Sorlie quickly.

Haugen said, then, that in January it is expected that we will be asked to process a T.I.P. amendment. He added that financial constraint is, of course, the paramount issue, so does Grand Forks have the 10% funding available; and how it adjusts our T.I.P. document to show fiscal constraint.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen referred to the packet and pointed out that a copy of the power point presentation on the signature aesthetic feature meeting that was held on November 17<sup>th</sup>, which he will go over briefly in a bit, but first he would like to discuss the low area on the East Grand Forks side.

Haugen stated that they were originally hoping that the Corps of Engineers would have a report addressing its impacts, or no impacts. He said that he received an e-mail yesterday that indicated that the Corps of Engineers understood that Houston Engineering, as a sub-consultant to a recent planning study that took place on the Kennedy did some modeling of a potential raise of the low spot, and so they asked for a copy of that report, so they are waiting to receive that information, thus they have not released a report of their analysis at this time. He added that it is his assumption that MnDOT will be providing that information as the Kennedy Bridge is a MnDOT led study.

Noehre commented that he doesn't recall that issue being done in the MnDOT study. Haugen agreed that he doesn't either. Bail commented that he doesn't remember a kind of rising model running, but maybe they did, he doesn't know; but he does know that with all the changes to the Sorlie it should make any modifications we want to do to the Kennedy easier to model.

Noehre asked who said that Houston Engineering did a random model of the low area. Haugen responded that it was the Corps of Engineers. Noehre stated, then, that someone must have told them about it.

Haugen commented that when the request was made to the Corps of Engineers, as to what the impacts were, he believes the Corps wouldn't normally say you hire someone and have them run the model and let us analyze it, but they said that they were updating the model so they would go ahead and run that as a good trial and error on their update, and so they said they hoped to have their report out by December 5<sup>th</sup>, but then on December 6<sup>th</sup> they said that they had been informed that Houston Engineering, as a sub-consultant, did a study and they would like to see the results of that study before we proceed any further.

Haugen stated that the rest of the information is just what was shared with the group of people that attended the November 17<sup>th</sup> meeting on the Kennedy.

Haugen reported that the things to focus on are that MnDOT is offering a cost participation and maintenance sum of \$300,000 and North Dakota \$200,000, for a total of \$500,000. He said, however, that everything that is installed would be maintained by the locals, the State DOTs themselves would not maintain or operate anything, so the budget was more or less established as far as the DOTs are concerned, however the locals, if they want to go above and beyond, yet stay within the parameters of the project and the environmental documentation, can do so.

Haugen commented that the railings are part of the deck, and so will be done in conjunction with the deck resurfacing. He said that they have decided to go with LED lighting; to make sure it is above the flood elevation; that it is dark sky compliant; and be within the setting of the historic

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

district, context sensitive; so there are a couple of different lighting styles that were presented and discussed, with the wash style being the preferred option.

Haugen referred to slides illustrating the different types of lighting and other enhancements, and went over them briefly.

Haugen commented that a MnDOT staff person was going to take this presentation and further refine it for the groups' consensus, however he has not seen it yet, but they were able to accomplish narrowing things down so that when MnDOT does hire the final consultant to do the design they have a bit of a head start on where to go with this part of the project development. He added that they also have a budget now, at least from the State DOTs financial resources.

Noehre reported that they have completed the consultant selection process, and have selected a consulting firm. He added that MnDOT is currently going through a pre-contract meeting with them, and have begun the negotiation process, so they will hopefully have a consultant on board soon. Haugen said that he believes the scope of work should include at least two meetings with the community to go over these features as part of the project development. Noehre agreed.

Information only.

**MATTER OF EAST GRAND FORKS FUNCTIONAL RECLASSIFICATION**

Haugen reported that Minnesota, the MPO, and the City of East Grand Forks, and the District 2 Office have counter proposed, proposed, and counter proposed changes to the functional class system. He said that they met with the East Grand Forks City Council last night, and here is a slide illustrating the latest counter proposal. He pointed out that there are still some areas where they are still in disagreement on; the first one is on Rhinehart Drive.

Haugen referred to the slide, pointing out that area on Rhinehart Drive being discussed, and explained that MnDOT was using some ADTs that he isn't sure where they got them because when you look at their existing volume maps you see that we are well above 1,000 vehicles, particularly on the northern stretch of that roadway, so originally MnDOT was indicating it was below the threshold so they didn't think it would be a major collector, and we are saying our traffic volumes indicate that it is, so we are requesting it be a major collector.

Haugen stated that the other area of concern deals with a stretch of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.W. He said that it is currently classified as a collector, but MnDOTs response is that until it is connected with U.S. #2 they don't feel it should be classified as such, but our response is that puts us in a catch 22 in that in order to get full access we need funding assistance, and if it isn't classified it isn't eligible for that funding, so on that one we are still trying to work out an agreement to assure that if MnDOT insists it not be classified it doesn't prevent it from being eligible for funding, and to accomplish that we would probably need some kind of agreement that says that at such time a full intersection is warranted, that reclassification will occur and it will be eligible for funding.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen commented that the big one, which has more of a statewide debate going on, has to deal with what MnDOT identifies as these Principal Arterial Stubs. He explained that Central Avenue is an example of this, as is Bygland Road, where they are saying that from a statewide perspective they would rather not see stubs, they would rather see their highway, or a roadway have one functional class, particularly when it comes to Principal Arterials, to stay as that functional class throughout the state and not change, just because it links to an urban area.

Haugen reported that on Highway 220 the MPO's stance is that it really does change function; it goes from a rural two-lane, high speed rural highway to a four-lane, urban, curb and gutter, controlled access, signalized roadway, so it does change function, and the whole premise of this was not to focus on other things, but just on how the road functions, and there is no doubt it changes function as it goes past 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Haugen commented that Bygland Road is a little different as it doesn't have those dynamics of where it really changes to four-lanes, it doesn't change to strong access control, but its saving grace is when we did the bridge intercept survey here, that there is a segment of traffic that isn't continuing on U.S. 2 or Business 2, it is coming in and using this as a gateway either to or from the metro area, so it does have a more state wide, or regional wide emphasis than just a local minor arterial.

Haugen reported that if MnDOT still does not agree with those changes, we would enter into a bit of an arbitration process whereby there would be an objective three-person body that would hear both sides and make a decision that we would both have to live with.

Haugen stated that staff is asking that the Technical Advisory Committee forward a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board to approve this counter-proposed functional class system

***MOVED BY BAIL, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE REVISIONS TO THE MINNESOTA FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM, AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM PRESENTATION**

Kouba reported that training on the Pavement Management Update was held just before Thanksgiving, and they are still looking, Grand Forks has all their information of the new, most current condition rating uploaded into ICON, but they are still waiting for word about East Grand Forks as they were supposed to be getting that done this week.

Kouba stated that there is also some additional information that needs to get put into both the Grand Forks and East Grand Forks data bases to make them work better, to give them more focus and more truer reports as to what is going on with their conditions and to give a better scenario of which areas need to be looked at for possible pavement conditions.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen referred to the staff report and pointed out that it indicates that for ICON, or Goodpointe to finish their tasks, both cities have to complete some tasks as well, all of which are listed in the staff report.

Haugen asked if there was any kind of timeline for the Cities to get their tasks completed. Kuharenko responded that there is a lot of work to getting these tasks completed, especially if they are looking at adjusting their deterioration curves, because right now their deterioration curves are just very generic and aren't based on data, they are very generic with ten, fifteen, thirty year life spans, that don't have any data behind them, and so if they want to make this as accurate as possible they will have to go back in and figure out where they are at with it, and right now they only have two data points to start pulling data from, and the most recent PCI data, only became available at the end of last week or the first part of this week. Kouba commented that it was available for Grand Forks during training in November. Kuharenko said, though, that they only have that information to compare with 2008 data, so there is a lot of information that they would have to go through to produce reliable curves for deterioration, and then, looking at a couple of other points in here; in entering these 2014 paving projects they have been trying to work on that, but because of the expansion they have there is a lot of things that need to be updated because right now they don't have any links, they don't have the segments of roads that have been constructed this year in ICON, so they are running into a disconnect there as well, so there are a number of issues that will end up taking a significant time to resolve.

Noehre said that he doesn't know if this can be done with only two data points. Kuharenko responded that you really can't. Haugen asked if there would be a third one from the first iteration from ICON. Kuharenko responded that as far as he knows they only have the 2008 and 2014 PCIs. Bail agreed that there should be one from the very beginning, 2003, so there should be three points.

Kuharenko stated that just looking at what all information you still have yet to put into it, how accurate the information we can get on this, as is, isn't going to be that accurate with two, or possibly even three points to work with, so it is potentially garbage in – garbage out for curves, and for figuring out where pavement is going to be for using this down the road for planning purposes, or incorporating it into the Long Range Transportation Plan, or what-have-you.

Haugen said that they will work on this next year to get the input in. He added that with the contract with Goodpointe they will have to work with what is available for them to finalize the contract so we can get them off this contract point and if we need them for future ones we can evaluate that, but we do have a contractual completion that we have to get them to do for us.

Discussion ensued.

Noehre said that he is trying to remember, but wasn't there something, before when you gave him the numbers for the state highways it was mixing and matching service roads with the main line, and putting in numbers from the service roads and the main line, or something like that because he remembers questioning the numbers. Kouba responded that it might have looked like they were, but she doesn't think they were just because of the shape files and the closeness of all

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

the road right there mashes them altogether, especially in a format like that, but once you get in closer there isn't a problem.

Information only.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Solicitation For Recreational Trails

Haugen reported that solicitation for Recreational Trails projects in North Dakota is out and about. He said that the deadline for the MPO is basically the same as the TAP program, or January 6<sup>th</sup>.

Haugen commented that since the packet was mailed out, we have also formally solicited the Urban Roads, and the Regional Road Projects are also due January 6<sup>th</sup> to the MPO, as is HSIP.

Solicitation For Minnesota Side T.I.P. Programs

Haugen reported that on the Minnesota side the T.I.P. program deadline is February 3<sup>rd</sup>, so all of the ATP Sub-targets will be due February 3<sup>rd</sup>, and the actual TAP that is out is due January 9<sup>th</sup>.

Cromnibus

Haugen commented that a government shut-down may be occurring tomorrow night unless the Cromnibus bill is approved. He explained that it combines a continuing resolution with the omnibus bill, which will fund all agencies except for whatever has to deal with immigration, as the immigration people would only get the continuing resolution until the Republicans get control of the Senate, and then they will figure out what to do with the rest of the appropriations for that agency.

Haugen stated that this seems to be what will be going through, however politics and congress is congress, so they do have to do something by Thursday midnight, so the word of the day is Cromnibus.

Stephanie Erickson Resignation From MPO

Erickson reported that she has resigned from her position with the MPO and has accepted a planner position with the City of Grand Forks. She said that her last working day will be December 18<sup>th</sup>, and she will begin her new job January 5<sup>th</sup>.

Bike Friendly Award

Erickson reported that we were awarded the Bike Friendly Bronze Medal for the Grand Forks/East Grand Forks area. She said that there will be a couple of announcements on this achievement at both City Councils, and during the Executive Policy Board meeting next week.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

She said that there could possibly be a commercial done with the Cities Area Transit, and there is a half-page article in today's Grand Forks Herald.

Greendahl commented that if they can find some funding they will also be doing some bus wraps for next spring. She added that this is a great honor, and recognition for both communities. She said that just the exercise of going through the application, she thinks, really tapped into some of the resources that we have, information that they didn't realize was out there gave people a bigger picture of what the needs are, and that we are going from recreational bicycling, which will always be there, but we are really seeing a shift towards commuter biking. She added that shared use paths are always great, but that doesn't meet the needs of all cyclists, so we need to look at some on-road kinds of things. She said that the really great part about the application, after receiving the designation, was that you get a report card back telling you about things that you can work on to reach the next levels; and, again, we received the bronze medal, but there are also silver, gold, and platinum, and the steps to reach silver are really quite manageable for us.

Congratulations were given to all involved.

Haugen said that, just to highlight the commuter issue, if you recall our intern this spring did a commuter profile based on the new ACS data. He added that there has been a new release of the five-year ACS data, and we have another intern that will update this information to see what the new data is showing. He stated that his quick look at it shows that it is continuing what Kyle had indicated, and that is that we have more residents, but less people relying on single occupant vehicles for commutes, and more using other modes. Noehre added that he didn't realize how many folks are out commuting until he started doing it himself, and was running into them.

2015 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Location

Haugen stated that, beginning next year, after 30 years of having the Technical Advisory Committee meetings here in Grand Forks City Hall, we will be holding future meetings, beginning with the January 14, 2015, meeting in the East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY ROOD, TO ADJOURN THE DECEMBER 10<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:31P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager