

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 10th, 2018
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the January 10th, 2018, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:34 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck (Via Conference Call); Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Richard Audette, Airport Authority; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Local District; Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Paul Konickson, MnDOT-Bemidji; Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineer; and Ali Rood, Cities Area Transit.

Absent were: Nels Christianson, Darren Laesch, Steve Emery, Lane Magnuson, Nancy Ellis, Ryan Riesinger, David Kuharenko, Mike Yavarow, Stacey Hanson, and Rich Sanders.

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

Guests present: Bobbi Retzlaf, MnDOT-St. Paul (Via Conference Call); Stephanie Erickson, Grand Forks Planning; and Jesse Kadrmas, NDDOT-Local District.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 13TH, 2017, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY LANG, SECONDED BY BAIL, TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 13TH, 2017, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Rood reported present.

MATTER OF 2019-2022 T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE MINNESOTA SIDE

Haugen reported that, as noted in the staff report, we did not receive any new projects from MnDOT or Polk County.

Haugen commented that every fourth year East Grand Forks is in line for the City's Sub Target funding, so 2022, which is the last year of this T.I.P. cycle, is the fourth year so East Grand Forks is resubmitting the project they originally had for 2018, and that is the Roundabout at Rhinehart and Bygland Road.

Haugen stated that included in the packet is the 2018 information that was submitted. He explained that they were working with MnDOT on getting what the year of expenditure calculations would or should be so this slide displays that updated information. He pointed out that it now identifies 2022 as the fiscal year and it does have project numbers. He said that the rest of the information is the same as it was before.

Haugen commented that there is an updated financial project cost shown, although the total project cost is very close to what the 2018 cost was as all of the individual components have changed enough to reach a similar 2018 cost/2022 cost.

Haugen stated that the only other newer information is that they have been working on refining the concept, and what this slide is showing is the most recent concept; with the major difference between the one in the packet and this concept is a wider radius, which does necessitate some expansion back to the intersections, so basically the footprint has increased.

Erickson asked why they went with this wider design. Haugen responded that he believes the main factor in going with the larger design to accommodate the larger designed vehicles, larger tractor trailers.

Haugen said that other than this, the standard report just reiterated that MnDOT has a 2021 project out at the U.S. #2/U.S. Business #2 intersection; so with one candidate project that was already programmed once, and that is now being reprogrammed, staff is recommending that it is consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan and is a top priority for the Sub-Target funding.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY ERICKSON, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FY2019-2022 T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECT FOR THE MINNESOTA SIDE, AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE MPO LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND TO GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING.

Voting Aye: Williams, Konickson, Gengler, Lang, West, Johnson, Audette, Bail, and Rood.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Ellis, Riesinger, Christianson, Laesch, Emery, Hanson, Kuharenko, Bergman, Yavarow, Magnuson, and Sanders.

MATTER OF AMENDMENT #2 TO THE ANNUAL UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM

Haugen reported that as we discussed last year, because of some grant constraints the NDDOT used 2014 monies to pay a lot of our 2017 operational costs so we have those 2017 monies available for us to program work activities with. He added that, also as we discussed last month, with the additional river crossing request that the Board approved, some of those monies would go to that project, and we have since received a request from East Grand Forks to assist them with an ADA Right-of-Way Transition Plan.

Haugen commented that this is a requirement under ADA law, and has been a requirement since 1991 or 1992 he believes; however not until MnDOT and Minnesota FHWA placed a strong emphasis on getting this done, and if it isn't they have indicated that they would freeze federal transportation funds to a community that doesn't have an active ADA Transition Plan in place, so East Grand Forks is requesting the MPO to do that activity with them. He said that this has gone through their City Council and a formal request was submitted. He added that they also indicated a willingness to provide the 20% match.

Haugen stated that this request has been added under the Special Studies category, and it will look at all the facilities within the right-of-way including curb ramps, sidewalks, bus stops, possibly parking lots that the City owns. He added that a scope of work will need to be done, which you will see next month, that will define all of the facilities we will be looking at.

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out the funding sources and the amounts budgeted. He said that you will notice that with the previous years, 2017 federal funds, we have roughly \$300,000 so far with this amendment, but we will only be budgeting 20% of those funds in activities.

Haugen commented that the East Grand Forks specific item is at \$50,000. He explained that what they are using as a basis for these estimates, and what we will use as an initial scope-of-work draft is from the City of Moorhead, who had FM-COG do similar work for them, so we are basing this off of what their cost was; and they had SRF under contract to do it, so we came up with \$50,000, and set aside \$35,000 for consultant assistance, up to \$35,000.

Haugen summarized that this is proposing to amend our Unified Work Program to fulfill the East Grand Forks request to assist them prepare and update their ADA Right-of-Way Transition Plan.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY ROOD, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE AMENDMENT #2 TO THE 2018 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM TO ASSIST THE CITY OF EAST GRAND FORKS IN PREPARING AN ADA RIGHT-OF-WAY TRANSITION PLAN, SUBJECT TO PARTNER AGENCY REVIEW.

Voting Aye: Williams, Konickson, Gengler, Lang, West, Johnson, Audette, Bail, and Rood.
Voting Nay: None.
Abstain: None.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 10th, 2018

Absent: Ellis, Riesinger, Christianson, Laesch, Emery, Hanson, Kuharenko, Bergman, Yavarow, Magnuson, and Sanders.

MATTER OF DRAFT RFP FOR 2018 AERIAL PHOTOS

Kouba reported that this is an item that the MPO tends to do every three years. She stated that the last time we did it was in 2015, so there are some people that are very excited about getting updated photos.

Kouba stated that this will be done at the same level it was done in 2015, all the specs are pretty much the same, we are just looking at an update, although there was some discussion about getting LiDAR as well, but there wasn't enough interest shown so it is not included in the RFP.

MOVED BY GENGLER, SECONDED BY LANG, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE RFP FOR AERIAL IMAGERY, AS SUBMITTED.

Lang asked if this will include the entire MPO study area. Kouba responded it would. Haugen referred to a slide illustrating the current aerial photo, and asked if they would be replicating this exactly. Kouba responded that there are a couple of little areas that are expanded out a bit to match up with some of the other things we have like the TAZs and such, but other than that it will be pretty much the same.

Johnson stated that, just to offer up a comment after reading the staff report, they have been broadening their allowance for the use of LiDAR on these aerial photo projects as long as it is something that is collected while they are also collecting aerial flight; if it is something that they are doing at the same time they have been allowing it to happen so if that is something that you do want to pursue further you can definitely look into it. He said that in the past they weren't as receptive to LiDAR, but they are not looking at allowing it in terms of collecting the static LiDAR topographic data with the aerial flights.

Haugen asked if Ms. Kouba had gotten any further into the cost of LiDAR. Kouba responded that she didn't. Haugen asked if anyone had a sense of the cost. He added that what he heard Mr. Johnson say is that our consolidated planning funds can be used for LiDAR. Johnson responded that that is correct.

Haugen commented that it is his understanding that someone has recent LiDAR available. Kouba said that there was LiDAR done of the Red River Valley a few years ago that is available on the U.S.G.S. site. Bail added that actually part of the study got into Red River basin and you can get all the LiDAR data from that, and the State of Minnesota flies the entire State with LiDAR and there is data available for that that is out there too, but how close you want it or how tight you want it is the question. He said that LiDAR is an amazing thing, you can actually see the leaves and branches on trees.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 10th, 2018**

Erickson asked what LiDAR is, is it just a crisper image, is that the difference. Bail responded that it actually reflects survey data, and they did the whole entire Red River Valley, every four inches, and it is amazing what you can get out of it. Johnson commented that what they have allowed in the past is the collection of data to potentially develop a one-foot contour outlook.

Haugen said that what he is hearing is that LiDAR is already available, that is fairly recent. Bail commented that the data is getting older, and if you don't fly it like everything else, obviously it changes over time as new things are developed, so some of the stuff in the Red River Valley was done about eight or nine years ago.

Haugen asked that Ms. Kouba expand on who was showing interest in LiDAR. Kouba responded that East Grand Forks Water and Light was possibly interested in cost sharing something of that nature, but they left it open. Haugen asked if she was able to ask any other agency if they were at all interested. Kouba responded that she did ask Grand Forks City Engineering if they were interested, but they weren't at the time.

Haugen commented that we have an opportunity with some unallocated, or unbudgeted federal planning dollars, so he thinks we are kind of time crunched to ensure that we get the flights flown before the trees leaf out, but he doesn't think we want to delay the RFP for a month, so if there is interest in LiDAR, or if we are hearing that LiDAR is already available, perhaps we just go with the original recommendation for this go-around and not pursue LiDAR, but keep it in the back of our minds for the next three year cycle.

West stated that the RFP could request that it be an option, at a separate price, and considered at the time when proposals receive as an add-on. Williams agreed that she thinks it would be a good idea to have an alternate in the bid item, to include it to see what it is going to cost.

Haugen said he has one technical question for Mr. Johnson; with us not showing it in our budget, asking for that option, is that a concern. Johnson responded that it isn't ideal; if you ended up wanting to include it before you could move forward with that portion of it you would have to do another work program amendment, so if that would cause any delays, that would be something to keep in mind.

After further discussion the consensus was to not pursue doing LiDAR this go-around, and to look into the possibility of doing it in three years.

Voting Aye: Williams, Konickson, Gengler, Lang, West, Johnson, Audette, Bail, and Rood.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Ellis, Riesinger, Christianson, Laesch, Emery, Hanson, Kuharenko, Bergman, Yavarow, Magnuson, and Sanders.

MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE

Haugen reported that he thinks we all thought that we would have five additional river crossings to have traffic analyses done, travel demand forecasting done; at the Technical Advisory

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 10th, 2018**

Committee Meeting that was the recommendation forwarded to the MPO Executive Policy Board, but at that meeting, after some discussion, the motion approved dropped 17th Avenue from the amended Scope of Work, so now the graphic shows that we are now just getting information for four additional river crossings.

Haugen commented that that was the motion, and that is the scope-of-work that was executed with both Kimely-Horn and A.T.A.C. He added that under Robert Rules of Order this motion can be visited at the next meeting of the MPO Board, so we will find out what happens next Wednesday. He explained that if the Board wants to add 17th Avenue back into the Scope-of-Work we would need to do another amendment and another contract scope, so it may or may not come back, but that is where we are at at this time.

Lang asked when it would be able to be presented. Haugen responded that it should be presented to the Technical Advisory Committee next month. He added that it should be distributed in two weeks for review.

Haugen referred to a slide and explained that it contains a section of the draft December 20th, MPO Executive Policy Board Meeting minutes whereby Commissioner Malm gave us some information on some supposed direction the Grand Forks County Engineer was given in regard to the Merrifield Bridge. He said that he hopes everyone had the opportunity to read these draft minutes; and he knows that in listening to the tape, and talking with Mr. West, there seems to be a disconnect in what actually took place versus what was provided to the MPO Board.

West explained that about a month ago he attended the first Grand Forks County Commission meeting in December and said that if we took two mills and saved them for twelve to fifteen years we would have enough money to pay for our half of a bridge across the Red River, just think about it; that is literally all it was, because if we would have done that back in 2007 when the County Commission approved a resolution to support a bridge, we would be there now, doing environmental studies, and moving ahead with a bridge. He said that this is all that occurred, just some general discussion, so he isn't sure how Mr. Malm's comments came about, but maybe there is something going on that he doesn't know about, but to his knowledge he was not given directive to do anything with this.

Haugen commented that he thinks the key thing here is if you took three mills and put it aside for eight years would there be enough money. West responded that it would be close, however he never ran the scenarios. He added that he did take our half of the bridge, which was recently updated in the I-29 Study, and applied a simple inflation rate, then took two mills to cover the cost. He explained that where two mills came from was that State law says that County Commissioners can levy two mills for road and bridge funds at their discretion; up to ten mills at their discretion for road and bridge funds, and we have historically been hovering around eight mills for quite a while, so that means there are two mills that the County Commissioners could levy without having to go to the people for a vote; and just pocket it away for a number of years then we can say, look here is the money; and then he applied two different scenarios of mill levy value increases, that's where the twelve to fifteen years came into the equation, when revenue got ahead of cost. He added that he isn't aware if Polk County is on board with anything, and to his knowledge there wasn't a motion made at that meeting directing him to do anything.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 10th, 2018**

Haugen said that there is some confusion, but there also seems to be some willingness to consider a county mill levy increase in the future.

West commented that his point wasn't specifically targeting Merrifield, although that was his thought, but it could be anywhere as long as the County Commissioners thought it was worthwhile to spend the county budget on it.

Lang stated that you wouldn't do this without getting Polk County on board first, correct. West responded that that would make the most sense of course, because if it is outside City limits then he wouldn't imagine the City would spend any money on it, therefore it would be up to the County to pay for it.

Bail said that if even if there wasn't a plan they could put aside for two mills, for the time being, and eventually down the road work with whoever they have to get it done too, so they would just be putting money away. Lang stated that we would want our funds to match up at the same time, you wouldn't want to say you can pay for half a bridge in twelve years when Minnesota can't, because you could be doing something else with those monies in the time being.

Haugen commented that you could either assess the two mills and have the bank account build until you have the necessary funds, or you could assess the two mills, bond it out and you pay the bond on an annual basis and start construction sooner than later.

Williams asked if the S.T.I.P. identifies any tentative date for a bridge. She said that she knows it is in our Long Range Transportation Plan, but is there any discussion at the State level as to when that might come back. Haugen responded that the S.T.I.P. is only out to 2021, and the current T.I.P./S.T.I.P. do not have any discussion about additional river crossings between Grand Forks and East Grand Forks. West stated that he doesn't know if it ever would, would it. Haugen responded that it would. West said, though, that it isn't a State Road, and there aren't federal dollars involved. Haugen responded that you would still need to have federal approval as it is regionally significant, so yes it would.

Johnson commented that the tie-in that might come is the permitting process you would need across the river will probably require some sort of federal nexus, and that will, even if you are using 100% local funds, that will tie it all back in to some sort of federal nexus that might require it to be in the T.I.P./S.T.I.P. in order for it to get a permit approved.

Haugen reported that the next item is Draft Goals/Objectives/Standards. He said that these were distributed out last month, asking for your comments by next week.

Haugen commented that since that meeting, we have been discussing, at various times, about autonomous vehicles and how they might be impacting the future of our transportation system. He added that if you read last month's minutes we state that it is too much of a wild guess, but there are some things that we are going to be doing to consider advances in autonomous vehicles and also connected vehicles; vehicle to vehicle and vehicle to infrastructure.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 10th, 2018**

Haugen stated that in 2019 we are going to be updating our ITS Regional Architecture, and at that time we will have to build a framework for the software capabilities of communicating back and forth so we added this language into Goal #6, where our current stuff that relates primarily to ITS Architecture exists. He referred to a slide showing these goals and objectives and went over them briefly, explaining that the reason we aren't keeping this right under the architecture as a standard is because a lot of this advances outside of the architecture itself, so we are trying to keep in mind what autonomous vehicles and connected vehicles can provide.

Williams asked if Mr. Haugen could send the document out again that he wants comments on to ensure she has the correct one. Haugen responded he would do that. He added that the only comments that have been received so far are from MnDOT.

Haugen reported that, lastly, they were going to try to take some time to talk about the programming side of target setting, but due to scheduling issues we are not able to do it at this time, but he is still hopeful that prior to our decision in February that we can schedule a special meeting to have that discussion take place. He said that they are also continuing to work with both States on PM2 and PM3 measures which are due in May at the State level.

Haugen said that you should be getting, from the constant contact e-mails, a reminder to do the financial tool that is currently on-line. He pulled up the webpage: theforksstreets2045.org, and asked that everyone please go to the site and participate in the activity. He added that they currently have around 50 responses to this on-line tool, so if you wouldn't mind sharing it, that would be helpful as well.

OTHER BUSINESS

- a. 2017 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that the monthly work program progress report was included for your review.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY LANG, TO ADJOURN THE JANUARY 10TH,
2018, TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:10 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager