

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the February 14<sup>th</sup>, 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; Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning; Ryan Riesinger, Airport Authority; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Local District; Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineer; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; and Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning.

Absent were: Nels Christianson, Darren Laesch, Brad Bail, Lane Magnuson, Richard Audette, David Kuharenko, Brad Gengler, Paul Konickson, Ali Rood, 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: Jesse Kadrmas, NDDOT-Local District; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Local District; Al Grasser, Grand Forks Engineering; and Mike Yavarow, Grand Forks Engineering.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 10<sup>TH</sup>, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY RIESINGER, TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 10<sup>TH</sup>, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF DRAFT RFQ FOR EAST GRAND FORKS RIGHT-OF-WAY ADA  
TRANSITION PLAN**

Kouba reported that East Grand Forks recently submitted a request for assistance from the MPO to do an ADA Transition Plan for them, and the project was amended into our Annual Unified Work Plan, and are now bringing forward the RFP (Request For Quotes).

Kouba explained that, although the MPO typically uses an RFP (Request For Proposal) process for its projects, it was decided that because of the low budget, we would instead seek quotes from pre-qualified consultants so that we can have at least three options to choose from.

Kouba commented that the scope-of-work for the RFQ is very similar to what it would be for a RFP. She added that we are only looking at City Right-Of-Way, sidewalks, curb-ramps, policy review, and those are the basic scope-of-work points.

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY EMERY, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE DRAFT RFQ FOR THE EAST GRAND FORKS ADA TRANSITION PLAN, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Lang, Ellis, Emery, Halford, Johnson, Williams, Bergman, West, and Riesinger.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Christianson, Laesch, Bail, Hanson, Kuharenko, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, and Sanders.***

**MATTER OF AMENDMENT TO THE 2018-2021 MINNESOTA SIDE T.I.P.**

Haugen reported that this agenda item is the proposed amendment to our T.I.P. on the East Grand Forks side and will affect their current 2018 programmed projects.

Haugen explained that previously East Grand Forks had decided to delay the round-about at Bygland and Rhinehart until perhaps 2022; so they had to fill in some projects to use the federal funds this year so they identified, and we amended into the T.I.P. several projects. He stated that one of those projects was to address a poor pavement segment on Rhinehart, but now that they have done a more conceptual rendering of the round-about, it was determined that it may impact more of Rhinehart, so they want to amend the project scope to affect less length of street reconstruction, resulting in a reduction in cost. He said that they would like to move the roughly \$230,000 in extra funding to 17<sup>th</sup> Street to do some sidewalk improvements.

Haugen pointed out that included in the packet is the more current information on the transition from a mini round-about to a modern round-about, which shows how it may extend more into Rhinehart Drive, and also where they are identifying to shift the roughly \$230,000.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Haugen stated that they did advertise this as a public hearing so he would open the public hearing.

There was no one present for discussion.

Haugen closed the public hearing and added that no written or verbal comments were submitted by noon today either.

Haugen summarized that, again, this is a project that is going to be done this year, utilizing the federal funds that are available to East Grand Forks this year.

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE FY2018 MINNESOTA SIDE T.I.P., AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Lang, Ellis, Emery, Halford, Johnson, Williams, Bergman, West, and Riesinger.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Christianson, Laesch, Bail, Hanson, Kuharenko, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, and Sanders.***

**MATTER OF FHWA/MN GUIDANCE ON INCORPORATING PERFORMANCE MEASURES INTO T.I.P.**

Haugen reported that by the end of May of this year, if we take any action on our T.I.P., whether it is approving a new T.I.P. or amending the current T.I.P.; that T.I.P. needs to address the requirements of the FAST Act in regards to performance measures. He added that in May the only one that the MPO will have in place would be the safety targets, then any action we do after May on the T.I.P. would require us to have something in the T.I.P. document regarding the safety performance.

Haugen stated that North Dakota is typically our lead agency, and we take guidance from the North Dakota side for both State and Federal, but in this particular instance, because of the delay on the North Dakota side on the development of a T.I.P./S.T.I.P., we had to produce separate documents; a Minnesota side T.I.P. and a North Dakota side T.I.P., so Minnesota Federal Highway has provided guidance, which MnDOT has supported it, that states that we should be proactive and amend our T.I.P. so that if we have to do anything after May it is already taken care of.

Haugen commented that Federal Highway MN provided; and included in your packet were the support presentation and the draft document, which is out for comment; that included in the T.I.P. you would see the four frameworks and introductions to performance measures. He stated that the anticipated affect are investment priorities, and then a conclusion section.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Haugen said that we have not gotten any guidance from the North Dakota side, this is guidance from the Minnesota side and it is “strongly” encouraging the MPOs to do this prior to May, and so one of the questions that he would ask this body is do you feel the need to be proactive to get the Minnesota side T.I.P. into what the Feds and State might consider as good status in case any future action is needed, or, since this is a guidance and not a requirement, do you want to wait until you actually need to do something to a Minnesota T.I.P.

Williams asked if the NDDOT is working on something like this that we will be seeing shortly. Johnson responded that they have been visiting internally about what they need to do to get any documents that need to be updated by May figured out, in terms of which documents it applies to; and also to what level of detail they need to go into. He stated that they are getting close to the point where they are going to have something drafted up to share with the Feds and the MPOs, but they need to figure out a couple of things, like if they will go with full-blown compliance, because there are different deadlines of MAP-21 and FAST for when you are going update documents or authorize project and knowing what is in effect, so they haven’t completely figured it out yet. Williams asked if it would be released in time for the Technical Advisory Committee to take action at our May meeting. Johnson responded that they will have to.

Bergman asked if this is only for highway dollars, or is it for anything. Haugen responded that it would be for anything. He added that the amendment to the T.I.P. is the current issue right now, and he isn’t anticipating, or he isn’t aware of any amendment to the Transportation Plan, and this would be an amendment to our T.I.P.

Haugen commented that he knows that amendments to our T.I.P. are more common and frequent than planned, and we know that typically, come fall, when we adopt a new T.I.P., and in fact we are talking about the new T.I.P. today, and have the last several months, so at some point we will have to address, in some fashion, incorporating performance measures into our T.I.P. He added that right now the uniqueness is that we have a separate Minnesota T.I.P. and North Dakota T.I.P.; and we don’t know if this fall we will have a unified T.I.P., or if we will be in the position to have two separate documents because of scheduling; but since we currently had a separate Minnesota T.I.P. the Minnesota Feds and State are strongly recommending to all their MPOs, which does include us, to take action in May to address these things so there isn’t anything in the way of a possible amendment in June or July, but from a requirement point of view, we really only have to address this after May, so we may not have to address it until we adopt the next cycle of T.I.P. Williams said, then, that it isn’t due in May it just needs to be included in anything that is approved after May. Haugen responded that that is correct, but that we are being highly encouraged, so we have to have a discussion as to how we want to respond as a group, do we want to say that it is good guidance if we want to be proactive, but perhaps we are fairly confident that we won’t have any more amendments on the Minnesota side after the one next month, and therefore we will just say thanks for the guidance but we will just wait.

Haugen commented that it also gives some framework as to what the federal perspective is of what it is to comply with the incorporation into the T.I.P. Bergman stated, though, that it doesn’t list the performance measures that you have to meet. Haugen responded that because in May of 2018 the only performance targets that are in place would be the safety targets, so if we were to draft for the May timeframe, it would only be addressing the safety targets. He said that if we

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

are active, the PM2 and PM3 targets, the State has to adopt theirs by the end of May 2018, but the MPO has another 180 days, so that would get us to about October, then we would have to address all of them, but for now, until October, it is only the safety targets.

Haugen stated that, though, that after this year, when we have these two different timing issues, our T.I.P. will be addressing all the performance measures from this point forward as long as they are still required.

Bergman once these targets are in there is it something that we will need to throw additional money in for a project, is this something that we currently don't do that we are going to have to throw more money at or lose out on a project. Haugen responded that we won't, not with what we are talking about here. He explained that this would just be identifying, in our current T.I.P. we have projects, almost every project has a safety component to it, some are funded solely out of the safety program, others are funded with other funds but there is still a safety component to it, so we are talking about the project that are currently in the T.I.P. and even though we may or may not be doing statewide targets, we are also expected to focus on those targets that impact our Metropolitan Planning Area, so we do have to drill a little bit down into how targets are affecting the MPO area.

Haugen reported that he asked, from a T.I.P. point of view, if they were to give guidance on a plan document point of view what that might look at, and they said that this would probably be the framework.

Williams said, though, that at this point we could proceed, but then North Dakota might come in with something a little bit different, would we have to go back and amend it. Haugen responded that we would only be addressing the Minnesota side T.I.P., so in this instance it isn't totally being viewed as solely North Dakota led because we have these two separate documents. He added that he doesn't believe that North Dakota formally vetted through the Minnesota side T.I.P, it was done by Minnesota.

Ellis commented that, from her point of view, being on the Minnesota side, she would say "thank you, and we will keep these in mind for when we have to start doing it in May, but no I'm not going to proactively do it until I'm required to do it". She added that if the State is really looking at things, but they haven't started it, why would we, these are all things to keep in mind so we will be fully prepared for when we have to do that for amendments after May, but thank you for your guidance. Haugen agreed that he isn't looking to do extra work, but we have to discuss and respond to this.

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY VIEW THIS AS GUIDANCE, AND THAT IT BE INCORPORATED WHEN NECESSARY AND NOT BEFORE.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

***Voting Aye: Lang, Ellis, Emery, Halford, Johnson, Williams, Bergman, West, and Riesinger.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Christianson, Laesch, Bail, Hanson, Kuharenko, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, and Sanders.***

**MATTER OF 2019-2022 NORTH DAKOTA SIDE T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS**

Haugen reported that we are still implementing FAST, and the last agenda item did talk about how things might be impacted by FAST; so as clarification or a qualifier, what we do today might be subject to additional action in the future regarding the outcome of FAST.

Haugen pointed out that there are three specific programs, and each one has a separate staff report. He said that the three grant programs are as follows:

a. Urban Grant (Main Street Initiative)

Haugen stated that we received two applications from the City of Grand Forks, who was also working with the University of North Dakota. He said that both projects are in the Columbia/Coulee area of the UND Campus.

Haugen reported that one project is to address the median that is along that corridor, and make improvements/modifications to possibly reduce the access and turning movements allowed as well as other items. He said that the City and UND are requesting that be funded in 2019.

Haugen stated that the second project is to follow-up in 2020 to install pedestrian ornamental lighting, some bus shelters, and some other receptacles and things along the corridor to create that unique character that is being conceptualized between Columbia to coulee.

Haugen commented that there is a document, a Master Plan, that was done by JLG Architects. He showed some of the graphics from that document, and stated that they give us a conceptual sense of the median, and then the possible construction of the bus shelters.

Haugen reported that when reviewing these applications there were some questions that came up; the first was if Phase 1 isn't done does it preclude Phase 2, and if Phase 2 isn't done does that preclude Phase 1. Williams responded that they are free standing projects, so one would not require the other.

Bergman asked where was CAT brought into this project. He said that he sees they are replacing shelters, which of the five existing shelters in that area are they planning on replacing. Williams responded that they just had to put something in for line items for some dollars, so this is just a very very preliminary concept level thing to get the ball rolling because they had a very short timeframe on it, but there will be many more meetings held and CAT will certainly be included in them.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Grasser stated that he would add that the City was reacting to, in a relatively short timeframe, alternatives for the grants program. He explained that UND was in the process of formulating the concepts, and they are still concurrent with this, and actually preceded this and was hiring a consultant so that they could start analyzing traffic counts, alternatives that they might want apply to a street or to the area; so we need to look at these concepts as features that were costed out as potentials in the project, they are not a defined scope saying that we are going to do three shelters, or do one, or which ones we are going to do, but for the grant we had to have some way of coming up with a cost estimate, and, literally they were still getting cost estimates from the consultant that UND hired, the day they were preparing the report, so philosophically the idea was that if UND wanted to pursue some of those things that are going to be more environmentally impactful, which would be moving curbs and doing work on the median, those would precede the mill and overlay project in 2020, and with the idea that some of the other things that might be less impactful, like lighting and such, could probably go either concurrent, or as part of the mill and overlay project so that we don't have any environmental issues associated with it.

Grasser reported that the project that UND is envisioning is actually quite a bit larger than what they are portraying here; what they did, from a strategy standpoint, was to try to target roughly a million dollars or so because their understanding was that the programs would probably be in the \$6 million dollar range, at State, so it would be foolhardy for them to ask for \$3 million dollars on a six million dollar project, so right or wrong with what little information they had to go by they kind of targeted these things around that \$1 million dollar range. He added that this is more a financial concept, and what it is that they are going to do is still being developed by UND, but it is too early in the formative stage, UND literally at this point in time doesn't know exactly what they want to do, so this is a financial concept more so than what is going to be done.

Bergman asked if this is really kind of putting the cart before the horse, so to speak. He said that the reason he is asking is because if you are going to be doing Phase 1 with the road repair, they would be looking at if there is some way of putting a cut-away in there to get those buses off the road and keep traffic flowing. He added that he was kind of stunned looking at what you are going to put in for bus shelters. He said that there is a bus shelter in front of the Student Union that was \$92,000; and then you are looking at \$62,000 for one replacement. He stated that the other question would be what amenities are you going to be looking at because if you start putting signage in there, benches, and heat, which is what they have in there now; to him it is like someone is throwing this project on the plate and saying "I need some money here" and "I need some money there", how soon are we going to start looking at the real cost the project is going to be, that is his only concern.

Grasser responded that they are in the process of starting that, they have hired a consultant, and they will start having some meetings. He added that these cost estimates have not been vetted through the City, there isn't a second set of eyes on these things, they are literally an architect's rendering and thoughts, so bear that in mind; and as we go through the public vetting process those things will be brought to the table and figured out, but right now there are too many unknowns, although what they think they know is that if we are going to do this anywhere in the realm of the mill and overlay project, which is a 2020 project, the UND area has one strike against it because it isn't in the downtown. He said that once we get done with the downtown

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

area in 2019 or 2020, then he thinks we will want, as a community, to focus those dollars back downtown, so if we are going to try to get money into this area, this is probably the one shot; and it is messy and it is sloppy, but otherwise they really don't have any other projects to utilize these monies.

Bergman reported that another thing to note is that they have been contacted by the University to take over their buses, they want out of it by July of 2019, so they are in the process right now to try to figure out the cost of doing that before saying yes or no.

Noehre asked if this would be one potential funding source, or are there multiple sources such as City funds, University funds, or such; this wouldn't be the entire project would it. Grasser responded yes, no and maybe. He explained that the actual project they are envisioning is probably twice what this application is. He said that they have talked about that they have raised some monies internally, and the President has targeted some dollars towards their campus architecture and promotional activities, that is one source of dollars; and they have talked to the City about if they are going to do curb and gutter and the median work, can it be special assessed, so special assessments may come into play, so if the Urban Grant request were to be turned down, UND and the City will have to decide how many of these things do we pursue and do we do it under special assessments or some other locally funded program. He stated that he thinks there is awareness and appreciation, they are trying not to mess with the 2020 mill and overlay project, but again we should recognize that curb and gutter work and some of those things should be done before we do the mill and overlay, so the general idea is targeting 2019 to construct those types of activities that could impact the roadway, and things that wouldn't directly impact the roadway could be pushed back a year to give us more time to develop cost estimates.

Discussion on additional proposed UND projects ensued.

Haugen reported that this may be the time to look at some things Transit has been trying to get along University Avenue. He explained that they would like to see additional and updated shelters. He said that this is where some of these questions have been coming from; the first question was that Transit has been trying to get additional shelters, there are five there now and they would like to have seven; and he thinks the answer is that you are capped at one million.

Haugen stated that the other thing is that there is a need for some clean-up in the application, correcting some inaccurate information. Williams asked if he had received the e-mail stating that there would be some updated pages coming soon.

Haugen commented that this is a brand new program; our typical actions when we get T.I.P. candidate projects is to review them for consistency with our Long Range Transportation Plan, and to prioritize the projects. He said that, since this is a brand new program it wasn't contemplated with our list of projects in our transportation plan so it we did not have the ability to do a really good job of consistency. He stated that our transportation plan is a multi-model plan, and it does address more than one mode and is trying to provide a corridor that provides transportation choices for different types of users, so from that point of view staff agrees that it is

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan, and that both projects should receive top priority ranking.

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE URBAN GRANT CANDIDATE PROJECTS AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING, SUBJECT TO INCLUSION OF FORTHCOMING AMENDED PAGES.***

***Voting Aye: Lang, Ellis, Emery, Halford, Johnson, Williams, Bergman, West, and Riesinger.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Christianson, Laesch, Bail, Hanson, Kuharenko, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, and Sanders.***

Haugen commented that this is now a permanent program of the NDDOT, and the anticipation is that it will become an annual solicitation similar to the TAP program, so what we will have to wrestle with is that when we fiscally constrain our transportation plan how do we scope out projects that might be able to make use of these things, and then also do we try to identify which corridors are the candidate corridors, or which areas in town. He pointed out that there is a map that he included in this, so how do we shape this up for our list of projects in our transportation plan.

Williams asked if he anticipates that in the future they are all going to come out at the same times as the HSIP and other programs. Haugen responded that that is the hope.

Grasser reported that the City Council has talked about doing a Downtown Master Plan, hopefully by next year, that will offer, from the City's standpoint, guidance as to what kind of projects we might be looking at. Haugen said that it would help in the short term period, but this is twenty-plus years of trying to scope. Grasser stated that, in any event he thinks one of the guiding documents that the City will go by will be that Downtown Master Plan. Haugen agreed that it can certainly set aside revenue sources separate from the other ones. He added that it is only funding certain things in certain areas; it has a focused area but it also has said it will fund other areas in the community, just won't do roadways in the greenfield areas.

Grasser stated that we don't know yet from a statewide basis if there is \$200,000,000 worth of demand in the core area statewide, and \$20,000,000 in funding; so he doesn't want to spend a lot of time developing projects that are questionable because they happen to be outside the actual regular funding programs. Haugen responded that Mr. Johnson is listening and taking good notes as to how to help us with this conversation the next several months. Noehre added that once the first application process goes through there will be some indication of that; will it be a final answer because everybody will take that as some indication and will make adjustments the next year, so it might take three or four years to really get down to a full answer. Grasser commented that his guess is that we will probably be the one application that is probably outside of the designated area, so we will see.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

b. Urban Local

Haugen commented that, if you will recall, the FY2021 in both the T.I.P. and the S.T.I.P. identified zero programs, but when the NDDOT released the solicitation for the FY2022 year they did identify in that release their tentative program of what FY2021 would be and he included a list of projects for Grand Forks/East Grand Forks in the staff report. He stated that our current FY2021 T.I.P. document has zero projects for the Urban Local Program, but in this tentative list they are showing the project that was requested as our candidate project our last go-around as being tentatively programmed in the year we requested, FY2021, and the dollar values are the same, so our FY2021 request appears to have already been preliminarily chosen for funding.

Haugen pointed out that there were no other changes in the rest of the years so we are only looking at the new year of the T.I.P., FY2022. He stated that the City of Grand Forks is requesting 23 signal locations to be updated/upgraded. He said that one of the challenges we have is that when go back to our reference document we don't see this project showing up in the plan, so as staff, we are struggling with how it competes against those projects that were listed and vetted through the process.

Haugen reported that when you read through the document, this is just getting us signals that are like what we have; there are no statements incorporating the new technology that we do identify in the plan that we want to progress towards as we make major investments in our signal system. So those are the two projects that we have to consider; one is the North Columbia Road reconstruction that we vetted through last year and that looks like it is tentatively programmed for FY2021 as requested, and the second is how do we address the FY2022 request with the fundamental issue of consistency with the plan.

Haugen commented that he couldn't read anything in the document that gives him a sense of whether the new technologies are being incorporated. He said that the document does talk about how many of these signals haven't been touched for tens of years, so this might be the one time we invest in signals for quite a number of years into the future, so how do we, some of this technology is already capable of being done out in our corridors with just a few added components, so that is something for the Technical Advisory Committee to decide.

Williams asked, when you talk about "the plan", in the Long Range Transportation Plan we have ITS and all of that as part of the plan; or are you talking about specific line items in the financial plan. Haugen responded that we have an ITS Regional Architect document that identifies some projects, and if they were done this is the architectural components that have to be in place for them, but that is not a fiscally constrained document. He stated that the one that is fiscally constrained is the one that lists street and highway projects, there is the TDP that is fiscally constrained that lists the transit projects, so, again, when we listed those projects at that time we didn't have any discussion about traffic signals to the magnitude of this upgrade, so we assigned another project to spend the money that this project is not trying to be prioritized, so that is the discussion we are having. He added that we are in the midst of updating our Metropolitan

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Transportation Plan by this fall, through that process we will have identified it's a higher priority than what the other projects were that weren't identified in the place.

Bergman asked if what he is looking for, then, is clarification on the application to upgrade the signals to meet the technology. Haugen responded that he thinks the first one is that there were projects that were identified that were a higher priority at the time than this one, this one wasn't even discussed as he recalls, looking back at the minutes there wasn't anything that showed doing twenty-three traffic signals on the local side, but we did discuss a way, he prioritized projects that would spend the money, and so those ones would be consistent if they came forward and requested monies, this is a project that is not one of those projects that is in the plan, so that is the struggle. Grasser commented that that is a good question because back when we adopted the plan we talked about the new rules that hadn't been invented yet; new standards requiring the flashing yellow lights and all those new regulatory features and new technology that wasn't even envisioned yet, and so philosophically are we trying to be bound by the list or are we looking for plan consistency to be consistent with the goals and objectives of the plan itself because we are trying now to bring the system up to compliance with the new technology and regulations that are out there. He added that he thinks these lists, recognizing that, how do you handle things at the time you got the list, and he struggles with having some of the specificity of a list in the first place, but what is consistency of the plan, to him this would be consistent with the plan, it just isn't consistent with the list.

Noehre commented that the plan is really a state of good repair, and that is what this project is trying to do, it puts the signals in a state of good repair, and if you look at how it fits among all the other available things, would you prioritize it above or below, it should go to achieve that state of good repair, so we amend the T.I.P. and S.T.I.P. and all of that, and there are opportunities to amend the plan as well. Grasser asked if this needs to be amended into the plan or would it just be recognizing that it is consistent with the plan. Haugen responded that in the middle of updating the Transportation Plan it seems odd to amend the plan and four months later have a new plan in place, so it is an interpretation of consistency, that is what is before the Technical Advisory Committee. He added that there were projects that were prioritized that this is going to shift, and as projects shift and get delayed, they increase in cost so when there are other projects that get shifted because of less dollars being available, at some point there is a project or two that we previously prioritized that may now not be in the plan. Grasser said that he would disagree with that because if you can bring the system up to speed and get all the newest hardware and software into it, as a general plan, now we don't have to tackle the traffic signals that would otherwise be addressed as part of individual project, so to him it should pretty much work out. He added that in the world of electronics we want to be careful that we don't have over the course of ten or fifteen years three or four generations of computers and those types of things, we want to get all the software and upgrade all the controllers to be compatible, because otherwise those costs are increasing our current projects as we are integrating the ITS and the interconnect and communication within the system. He stated that he doesn't know that he would say definitively that that increases the cost.

Noehre reported that this also suggests that in developing the plan we did the best we could, four or five years ago, to figure out what the future held; and for the most part did very well, but there are still some little bits and pieces that we need to plug into the plan, the reality is that even

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

though we plan we still have to make adjustments because we didn't perceive things, and new technology becomes available, etc.

Haugen commented that when we get to the end of our five year cycle of the plan, and we are programming projects for another four years beyond, what we did five years ago, now we have the odd situation where we are still trying to be consistent with our plan, updating our plan to reflect new things, and program projects that are beyond the short-range of our current plan, so there is this skewism in the system process that we have. Noehre stated that five years from now we are going to be doing the same thing on a similar schedule. Haugen said that he would suggest that maybe we look at a plan amendment in four years to address this issue if these are things that are coming down that, on the regional system we are rescoping projects considerably, in his opinion, that we actually try to get ahead of that question instead of being here at this moment trying to answer that question. Williams said that she thinks we did discuss that though during the last one, that was one of the things that they brought up and discussed; that this is the list right now, but we don't know what safety issues we may have to address next week or a year later. She added that she recalls that we all agreed at that time that there would be amendments to this list, as different things come up, and she sees that this can be consistent with that previous discussion we had. Bergman commented that he doesn't think that we even discussed the safety issues then. Williams agreed that it wasn't even part of it. Bergman said that it came up after. Williams agreed, adding that we have things to comply with now that weren't even there and we did it four or five years ago and it was based on information that was two or three years old.

Ellis stated that she thinks we do our best to try to see what your goals and objectives are, and what the plan is, but every year local government, elected officials, state officials, federal officials see different priorities and that becomes their goal, that priority, and that in fact changes your plans or what you want to do in five years because their priority has changed, so we are trying to address those changes from your board, council, etc. Noehre added that stuff gets older and starts breaking down faster. Ellis agreed, adding that that then becomes a priority. She said that she would love to put together a 20-year plan and then just throw it out at the council and say here you go, this is what we are doing this year, and have them agree to it and give her money, but that just doesn't happen.

Grasser cited an example, in that they adopted the last plan, and then the 35W Bridge collapsed, and that changed how both states repair their bridges, which is why we need a level of flexibility, to allow for changes that might come up.

Haugen commented that there is certainly a process that is in place to address these changes, the governing document is the Long Range Transportation Plan, and the T.I.P. is a short timeframe of programming projects from that transportation plan. He said that, given the documents we were presented, and the information we were presented in a timeframe where a short review had to take place, we probably took the most conservative route and said that it doesn't appear to be consistent, and placed it on the Technical Advisory Committee and the MPO Executive Policy Board to make the decision. Grasser said, then, that the MPO staff is saying that the list, that is what you are basing your inconsistency determination on. Haugen responded that that is correct, adding that there are other projects that were identified and deemed in place that were going to use these funds, as these projects that are now being requested replace those projects, that scope

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

out, ideally it wouldn't be at a T.I.P. time where we have to make a decision that we are switching projects, or switching scopes of projects, in his opinion.

Noehre stated that he would then ask for the analysis of your comparison of those, why you would not agree that one is better than the other, or how you are making the determination. He asked if that analysis were available. Haugen responded that it would be the analysis of the minutes and everything else we went through with the Long Range Transportation Plan process to identify the projects that we did, that is what he would have. Noehre said, then, that it is just what Mr. Grasser said; okay it is not on the list, that is the only analysis that was done to come to the determination that it doesn't meet the transportation plan, you'd think the plan would be more than just the list. Haugen responded that those projects were based off the plan, there wasn't just a plan document here, and the list goes here, they are joined; and as we discussed, the scope of projects, and the fiscal constraint issue, we discussed are we going for this type of scope for those projects or to try to squeeze out the fiscal constraint issue and get as much done, then we would go with this scope for the project. Noehre said that we should do a plan amendment then, isn't that the solution. Haugen responded that that is what he is suggesting, that unless you want to find it is consistent, that is fine too.

Noehre reported that he always thought that, philosophically we don't know which project is going to go out beyond, but it seems like it is consistent for state of good repairs to him, keeping the signal system working, our entire transportation system is important. Williams said that there is also safety issues with the Opticon too. Noehre stated that if the signals go down we are in trouble.

Ellis asked which other projects these are replacing. Haugen responded that they are replacing overlays on collectors and things of that nature. He added that he would think that maybe the sales tax increase will take care of those projects.

Bergman commented that he just doesn't think that this project is part of the state of good repair.

Noehre stated that would be how he would look at it, that it would be part of the state of good repair because it is consistent with the plan. Grasser added that it is probably also consistent with the technology as well. He suggested that it is starting to sound to him like at some point we will need executive guidance from MPO Board on how to govern some of these determinations; are we on the list or not on the list. He said that he struggles with trying to identify the cost and which is the best project to be done ten to fifteen years from now; that just isn't possible. Ellis added that it also seems like funding will wholeheartedly going to adjust what our list looks like and what we are going to be able to accomplish and whatnot, and not just from a federal standpoint; if you've adopted a tax, if we are holding firm to a five year plan then nothing better change in those five years, and that isn't the way it works. Bergman commented that we are seeing the federal dollars being cut back and having to shove projects back because of it, how does that affect the plan. He added that a plan is just a guide, we have it in there, but he thinks we need to look at it and update it every year.

Noehre commented that we just talked about the Urban Grant Program, which is affecting dollars that go into the plan. Haugen said that financing the Urban Grant Program causes a negligible

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

effect on the Urban Local program. Noehre added that there wasn't new money from anywhere, it was taken from the entire plan and put into Main Street. Grasser said that the State Legislature may weigh in on that yet as well.

Noehre stated that the board could look at it the opposite way, that would be hamstringing their ability too, because once they approve the plan, its done that way for the next five years. Haugen commented that, again, there is always the mechanism of amending the plan in-between the five year, it isn't a one and done and wait five years and don't react to change, in-fact we are required to act if there is significant change. He cited that if the feds decrease the 5307 Program dramatically we would have to change our plan, we don't just sit with a plan, we have to change.

Noehre said that there is no policy that says that changes cannot be made the last year of the plan either, is there. Haugen responded that there isn't, but within three to four months before the plan expires it wouldn't make sense to make an amendment, it would be way too messy to do so.

Noehre asked if they can find these projects consistent and roll them into the new plan. Haugen responded that they would be rolled into the new plan if they are found consistent with the current plan and programmed.

***MOVED BY NOEHRE, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MP EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE URBAN LOCAL ROADS CANDIDATE PROJECTS AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING.***

***Voting Aye: Lang, Ellis, Emery, Halford, Johnson, Williams, Bergman, West, and Riesinger.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Christianson, Laesch, Bail, Hanson, Kuharenko, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, and Sanders.***

c. Urban Regional

Haugen stated that the Urban Regional Program had quite a bit more changes, more projects being impacted. He said that the maybe the easy question would be about the North Washington Street segments that are already programmed for FY2019, but have been submitted for consideration in FY2021 and he is wondering how they are different, are they the same, what is going on, maybe that is the easy one to talk about. Noehre referred to the staff report from the City of Grand Forks, and pointed out that on the spreadsheet there is an asterisk by this project, and that the footnote says that is anticipated to dual fund this project, approximately 1/2 of the federal funds for the structure will be funded outside of the Urban Program. He added that this project was basically requested earlier, with the 2018-2021 S.T.I.P. it is shown for construction in 2020, but they are now requesting this project be delayed and that funding be increased based on change in year of expenditure. Haugen commented that he did not receive that information, so based on what he received it just said "these three segments of North Washington should be

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

moved to FY2021”. He said that he asked but did not get a response, but now he hears that it is being delayed. Noehre responded that that is the request.

Noehre commented that he doesn’t understand the table; what is “application answer”. Haugen responded that one of the last questions we have in our application is whether it is consistent with the plan or not, and so how you answer that question is how he is reflecting it in the table. Noehre said then that it is a yes or no on consistency, and what does the MPO staff comment “concurrence or nonconcurrence” mean. Haugen responded that we agree with how the application answered that question. Noehre said, then, that if they check no it doesn’t meet the plan and you agree. Haugen responded that that is correct.

Haugen stated that, again, consistency with the plan for the South Washington Underpass Reconstruction, we have been trying to finance that for too many years, but it looks like the State now has programmed it as reconstruction in FY2022, using half of the money from the Urban Program and funding the other half from another program in their program of projects. He said that the regional request also has a reconstruction going on, there is a small study request to be done prior to that of \$100,000; and, again, it is unusual for the Urban Regional Program to be funding studies, and he isn’t aware of any other time when we studied something out of the Urban Regional pot.

Grasser commented that, based on our earlier discussion, and taking from the City side the South Washington Underpass Study, consistent with the plan, it probably actually should be answered “yes” as opposed to “no” as the “no” would have said “no it’s not on the list”, but, number one it is still part of the state of good repair and both keep transportation systems open, and number two he would hope that we aren’t trying to program \$100,000 projects necessarily in our Long Range Transportation Plan. Haugen responded that we aren’t, but added that we are probably not also trying to program \$100,000 out of the Regional Program.

Noehre said that he would like to go through a little history on this project. He stated that it used to be that in order to do anything with the pavement you had to address the structure, guardrail, everything. He cited the Sorlie Bridge as an example, explaining that they kicked that can down the road a number of times because they wanted to upgrade the bridge rail and fix the bump more than twelve years ago but they couldn’t because they would have to address the bridge and everything along with it, but those rules have since changed and this project came into focus primarily because of the pavement, not because of the bridge, and so now there is the potential of addressing the pavement without addressing the bridge as well. He reported that when the corridor study was done cores were taken, and found ASR in the newest part of the bridge, but it just identified that it was there, it didn’t identify what the rate of deterioration is of the structure, if it will last 6 months or 60 years, so local government has been asking him how long it is going to last, and he can’t answer that, the MPO can’t answer that, so we need to answer that question and before we spend \$18,000,000 on something we probably should know if it is the right time so that is why in their discussions on the regional system it was determined that we maybe should spend a little bit more money and determine how long it is going to last.

Noehre reported that the report that KLJ did last time was good, their technical report on the structure was good, but we didn’t ask the question, and they didn’t answer the question of how

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

long it is going to last, what is the rate of deterioration, and that is what this attempts to do, to look at and answer the question “where is that deterioration of the concrete and how long is it projected to last”. He said that the answer could lead us down several paths, probably spending the dollars, it might last us another 30, 40, 50 years, maybe it is time to address the pavement only, but if it isn’t going to last that long then let us address it all, but without knowing the answer we are just simply spending \$18,000,000.

Haugen said that he would ask a couple more questions; are you going to do a NEPA document, a project development, do nothing is always an outcome that you have to look at; and isn’t this core sample outside of doing the project development, wouldn’t that be included in this cost that is already priced out here for the actual tentatively programmed project. Noehre responded that he would guess that is an option, it is just the only option.

Grasser stated that he thinks part of the question is how are you affecting your timelines, if you do this as part of your project development work, and you find out you need to replace the bridge, now did you price rehab the bridge or did you not price replace the bridge and the shoe-fly and all of those activities in your project, if you did you are going to have a really high cost project so you are back to the issue of financial constraint. He said that with the bridge, in his opinion, if you wait and discover during the project development, it creates another project then that has to be done five or six or seven years out, and if you’re not going to do a bridge project in just a couple of years you are going to need to buy property, you are going to need to do all those things, so part of this is, to the people that are working the projects you need to understand what is a reasonable course of action as opposed to what is in a planning document, because you can do any of those things but you need to understand what the consequences are, and we think that it is better to understand whether this bridge has got a five year life or a fifty year life so you can properly program both that project and any of the other projects, again without turning it into a \$50,000,000 project because we probably can’t handle that in the short-term. He said, though, that on the other hand we also don’t want to delay it and have a structural failure either, and have the public wonder why we weren’t doing our due diligence.

Noehre commented that the only precedent that he may have dealt with, MnDOT was the lead on the Kennedy and they did a study prior to project development. Haugen said it was funded with State dollars. Haugen stated that it could be funded out of the Regional program, but it has never been funded that he knows of out of the Regional Program. Bergman asked, though, if it isn’t a regional road. Haugen responded that it is on the State Highway. Noehre asked if the MPO would want to take it on using planning dollars. Haugen responded that we do have unallocated monies, but he doesn’t know how much more of an in-depth analysis can be done than what was done. He said that the reason he asks that is because there is an end to where our planning dollars can go, it went as far as it did to get you what got in the current report, and it identified the chemical reaction that is irreversible. Williams said, then, that the rest of the study would come out of the regional dollars. Noehre agreed that that would seem logical.

Williams stated that it would also make sense from a standpoint that the core samples and everything would actually have a date when the first ones were taken and a date when the second ones are taken then they can look at a rate of deterioration because it is very difficult to develop something off of one data plan.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Noehre said that in the staff report you say that it is looking at 50% of funding from outside sources; so bridge dollars, rural dollars; bridge division has already been asking him for the last couple of years, how long is it going to last before they are really interested in replacing the bridge, and, again, he can't answer without doing something like this, he doesn't know how else to do it but he is open to any suggestions.

Johnson asked about the condition of the planning study of the structures, what year is that being proposed for then what is the plan of the FY2022 project, leave it as is, move it out, he didn't hear that part. Haugen responded that they are asking for regional dollars for FY2018, and that dollar amount is \$100,000 with an 80/20 split; and then the FY2022 project is still being programmed as a reconstruction at the cost that is in the tentative program of projects that was released with the solicitation.

Johnson commented that the one thing he will note is that they have already been working, internally, on the FY2022 project to determine who would take the lead on the project development task, but they haven't gotten the decision back yet from their design and bridge departments, but it was their intent to get that project moving yet this year if at all possible, not only to investigate some of the stuff that Mr. Noehre and Mr. Grasser are bringing up on the structure, but also to get going on their coordination with BNSF. He explained that they have had some real hurdles to cover with the coordination on railroad structures with BNSF, so the sooner they can start the project the better. Noehre responded that he is fine with starting on the project development, as Mr. Haugen said, and we start on it in FY2018, so we can complete the investigation and get an answer to those questions, he is fine with it not being a regional project, but he is not fine with leaving it until FY2020. Grasser added that under the understanding that that process will start in FY2018 we will accomplish the same thing we are trying to accomplish as a separate project, so he is fine with it as well. Johnson stated that that is their goal, and the document, the OPD is up for a decision right now; if they come back and say that they are going to keep it, then they will act accordingly, but if it goes out to a consultant the plan is that they would start working on the RFP and get it going as soon as they can. He said that the one caveat he would throw out there is that they are limited on how much money they have gotten so far this year, they only have their extension and appropriations through March sometime, so we might have to wait until we get a little bit more money so we have enough for the project, but their goal is to get it going so they can start the coordination as soon as possible.

Haugen stated that he doesn't know if you want to pursue the MPO financing part of that or not. He added that we could get started on it sooner than perhaps federal appropriations, continuing resolutions.

Discussion on funding ensued.

***MOVED BY NOEHRE, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE AN AMENDMENT TO THE MPO ANNUAL UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM TO INCLUDE THE SOUTH WASHINGTON STREET UNDERPASS STUDY, AS SUBMITTED.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

***Voting Aye: Lang, Ellis, Emery, Halford, Johnson, Williams, Bergman, West, and Riesinger.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Christianson, Laesch, Bail, Hanson, Kuharenko, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, and Sanders.***

d. 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Interchange

Haugen reported that the next item on the table is the 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Interchange request. He said that, again, one is starting the NEPA document and the other is, in FY2023, to try to construct the interchange.

Haugen commented that the first request is a \$2,000,000.00 request, 50% would be financed by City funds; so it is a \$1 million dollar request for the Regional Program.

Grasser said that, to be clear, this is to study the traffic issues on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South. He pointed out they are identifying the interchange, based off of the I-29 report, but it is technically a resolution of the traffic issues on 32<sup>nd</sup>. Haugen agreed, adding that our Long Range Transportation Plan is revisiting the I-29 study, with the new travel demand model results, to give us some sense of did the new travel demand model provide significant changes to what the I-29 Study used as data. He commented that the first look at this shows that there was a considerable drop in demand; 6,000 to 7,000 ADT on 32<sup>nd</sup>.

Haugen said that this is all a matter of timing. He explained that, we all remember the document and graph that says that at 30%, 40%, 50% development we start to have issues, well that timing from the current demand model is showing a less steep trend of increase. Grasser stated, then, that instead of major problems on 32<sup>nd</sup> in 2025 it might be 2028 or 2030 or something like that instead.

Haugen stated that his conversation with Mr. Kuharenko was, you are going to spend money on I-29, this model result shows that the issue isn't as immediately imperative on 32<sup>nd</sup> right now, you still have your immediate issues at DeMers and at Gateway Drive to address however.

Bergman asked how the future Red River Bridge crossing would figure in with this. Haugen responded that if it comes at all it would be the recommended fiscally constrained project in our next MTP, but we aren't trying to finance it, we are just trying to get it in our programming document right now. Bergman asked how it would affect the interchange and the traffic patterns on 32<sup>nd</sup> now, wouldn't it affect all of that was well. Haugen responded that, just as the I-29 Study showed, there is weak correlation between additional river crossings and the I-29 Interchange traffic, so if we would place Red River Bridge it is not going to have a huge impact. He added that it is still showing that by 2045 there is a capacity issue on 32<sup>nd</sup>.

Grasser asked if the models indicate data relative to changes in accidents once we get rid of the left-turn offsets on 32<sup>nd</sup>, is it saying it will go away, or is it not addressing it, because he perceives that we have an immediate issue, from a traffic demand standpoint, level of service.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

He said that we may have one set of crash data and injury data and fatality data, but he thinks 32<sup>nd</sup> has a very immediate problem. He said that what he struggles with is, when you do the project in 2019 and align the left turns, how much of that will be solved, and that is an unknown to him; but he would be reluctant to assume it is going to make a huge difference, that why he is wondering if there is data out there that can answer that. Haugen responded that there is data that would suggest what range of reduction might occur with that.

Grasser reported that at some point in time you are going to be balance the level of congestion with injuries and fatalities, and that is going to be a difficult equation to try to balance. Haugen agreed, adding that the I-29 Study did identify, that based on the data it had, that there is going to be an issue at the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Interchange that can't be solved with small fixes. He said that the current model is saying that because of the City's planning/landuse changes, that that issue won't be as imminent in timing, nor will there be as great an amount of traffic trying to get onto 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, but it is still identifying that two lanes each direction may not be sufficient by 2045.

Noehre commented that we obviously use the I-29 Study to come up with these two projects and now you are using a different model to come up with new data. Haugen responded that I-29 Corridor Study states in there that it is all subject to the transportation plan update process and being fiscally constrained, which we are now doing so it identified how we were going to prioritize these projects from outside the I-29 Study, and that's where we are at.

Grasser said that he is struggling with, how do I move forward in any one project when we are doing the corridor planning and if these models are that divergent, holy cow how do you use a corridor planning level tool to start project level planning. He stated that that was kind of shaking him up quite frankly, and we are going to have unreliable information, and we rely on those things. Noehre said that he is struggling with the same thing, then why did we even look at it, why did we do it, we wasted or time and effort and dollars, seems like. Haugen responded that he can say that we weren't wasting time, effort and dollars, we identified the issues that exist on I-29, but there was a change in land use growth that is occurring in the southwest part of Grand Forks, so that has changed how the model is reacting to the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Interchange. He added that the model is not reacting too much differently than the other interchanges, so the study is still viable; there isn't enough diversion on the other recommendations to cause him to think that they have to be reexamined, but on 32<sup>nd</sup> there is enough of a change that it has to be looked at and it seems like the timing is being strung out further than the I-29 Study thought, and it is like the old analogy of the chicken and the egg, there has to be development to generate the demand. Grasser stated that that is concerning to him too; if we are showing that much model sensitivity to what he consider a not terribly big land use changes, then a developer could put something over there that we aren't seeing today that meets our land use planning, and then all of a sudden it has a big impact on the model. Noehre said that he thought we added time to this corridor study to incorporate the new land use plan. Haugen responded that they tried. Noehre added that we added time to it for that specific reason. Haugen stated that our best guess at the time was that it wasn't going to produce this big change in the result.

Noehre commented that ultimately these are models, they are not certain, they are not stiff or infallible. Haugen agreed, adding that the bigger issue is not doing the NEPA study is trying to squeeze \$36 million dollars. Grasser said that he would suggest, just from a strategic strategy

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

stand point that we still submit the request because it will be easier if we somehow get it on the list for all three years as opposed to taking it off the list and then trying to put it back on later. Haugen stated that it is the last year of the list, and the last year of the list is the wish list. Grasser agreed, adding that just because we ask for it doesn't mean they are going to get approval. Haugen stated that we typically, as an MPO, don't take any real action on that last year.

Grasser said that if we started down the path of approval, by the time we get something back next fall or next winter, we will be that much further through the process. He asked when the Long Range Transportation Plan is scheduled to be completed. Haugen responded that it is scheduled to be up for preliminary approval in October. Grasser said, then, that we will have much better information, so he would like to keep this in the pipeline, then the State will know that information too as they program projects by that time, they can do things behind the curtain that we don't see.

Washington Street Mill and Overlay

Haugen reported that the next project is the Washington Street Mill and Overlay. He stated that in our plan this is a reconstruction of the segment between DeMers and Hammerling; and again it is based off of the corridor study and is trying to address a multitude of issues. He said that he thinks this is where Mr. Noehre got the requirement that if we are going to replace concrete then we have to address all the issues in the corridor, because that was the guidance we got when we prepared the transportation plan. Noehre responded that that could be, but he thinks it was even prior to that, but things have changed since then.

Haugen commented that the transportation plan identified a project that is addressing more than just pavement preservation, it addresses other issues along the corridor as well. He said that, as he recalls the discussion we had in identifying it as a reconstruction project, was a lengthy discussion. He added that the issues discussed are just being delayed by the proposed project here today, and again, as we delay a project, the issues don't get cheaper, they get more expensive.

Noehre stated that this project is actually in the mid-term, and that's out to 2030; and the pavement is already, when we requested it, is out to 18-years in 2020, so that means the pavement is 18-years old and we are probably three years late already which means it could have been paved last year, so the question really comes down to, does the MPO want to leave that pavement in the condition it is in until 2030 or beyond before we address just the pavement. He said that he doesn't think that would be a good plan. Haugen responded that he thinks that is why the plan identified it as a mid-term project, and it is listed as one of the earliest mid-term projects to be done, and it addresses not just the pavement condition, but also to address all the other issues that are along that corridor; driveway access, intersection alignment, ADA issues, and some transit issues that were recommended be resolved in that project. He commented that those are all not being addressed with what is being proposed here.

Grasser said that, as he recalls, one of the challenges of these, and correct him if he is wrong, but it was engineering, utility locates, and property acquisition included in those particular estimates.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Haugen responded that there is an assumption of a percentage, yes, which is the norm with all project estimates. Noehre commented that they tried to address the issue of parking in the bus turn-outs, but it can't be done without additional right-of-way, which will cost more and take a lot longer to get done, otherwise we would have done it; but can they delay the mill and overlay, with the north segment might be done historically in the past, you'd be betting that you are going to get \$10.3 million dollars soon in the mid-term, but we already have a lot of high dollar projects already being talked about, so it would be a gamble; not approving it would be a gamble that would require residents to live with it the way it is until you can get \$10.5 million dollars for it to be constructed. He added that his choice would be to address the pavement now. Haugen commented that the MPOs staff choice would be to address the pavement and also do other issues that are identified.

Noehre stated that he thinks this is consistent with the Long Range Transportation Plan; and that is how he would evaluate it, and that it should be done with a mill and overlay with the segment to the north. He added that you talk in your staff report about it getting longer and the cost going down, and David did a much more detailed cost analysis estimate than he did. Williams added that, just from a practical standpoint, is that there has been so many repairs along the road that we are getting to the point that we can't repair it anymore, and then it becomes a safety issue.

Haugen said that, it is not in the staff report, what he heard is that this is a 2020 project, and you are looking at a 2025 project to do the reconstruction; or are you saying that you are doing this, addressing this pavement, but you are also looking at a project, soon, maybe not next year, 2030. Noehre commented that it is still in 2030, still that mid-term range; and you have a pretty good track record of implementing every one of them in the short-term range, almost down to the last project, so then we will just start with the mid-term ones and then go over to the new long range transportation plan; so he would answer that with "we had to get some years out of that pavement, but it certainly wouldn't need to be fifteen or eighteen years, it could be seven or ten years", and then plug the reconstruction into the new long range transportation plan.

Haugen stated that they would have to ask, are we comfortable with seven or eight more years of having all those other issues not being addressed; so is the pavement smoothness the top priority verses two years of waiting, and can we get the request in 2020. He said that you are asking for 2020 for this dollar value right now, not the bigger dollar value which would do all projects, so that is the trade-off we also struggling with, because we identify that we wanted to address all those issues, soon as there are a lot of crashes that are taking place along that segment. Noehre commented that he would prioritize it; in working with the City they have determined that the biggest issue is the pavement.

Grasser said that he would agree, adding that if we are going to have this as a 2022 reconstruction project, we should have been starting the project development about two years ago; similar to the discussion we had with the Washington Street Underpass, and if we are starting some of that concept level evaluation here in 2018, for a project that might be done in 2022, he doesn't know, it is a tough question because that would tell him that they need to take Washington Street in its current condition and try to live with it somehow until at least 2022 or 2023, he just doesn't know if the citizenry is going to be accepting that. He added that he isn't disagreeing with the need for all the other improvements, absolutely not, but amongst difficult

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

choices and probabilities, he thinks a mill and overlay might buy us some time; he thinks we should try to get the reconstruction in as early as we can, but he doesn't know what that means, financially, but certainly within the time band that it was originally targeted.

Noehre commented that the pavement underneath the Washington Street Underpass went downhill very fast, and he would bet this is on the cusp of doing that very same thing; it scares him asking for it in 2020, quite frankly, and we should have been asking for it earlier.

Discussion on project and project costs ensued.

Noehre stated that he would say that this is consistent with the Long Range Transportation Plan, and that it be requested for FY2020.

***MOVED BY NOEHRE, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE REGIONAL ROADS PROGRAM PROJECTS AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND THE REQUEST IS FOR FY2020.***

***Voting Aye: Lang, Ellis, Emery, Halford, Johnson, Williams, Bergman, West, and Riesinger.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Christianson, Laesch, Bail, Hanson, Kuharenko, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, and Sanders.***

**MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE**

Haugen reported that we have at least two items that we need to take action on; well one needs action and the other is a question.

Haugen said that a review of what we got with our second meeting and with our on-line financial activity is included in the packet, and indicates where the public would place emphasis on spending funding.

a. Goals/Objectives

Haugen stated that all the comments and feedback have been incorporated into the document, and the attached draft indicates the modifications that have been made. He added that he tried to highlight a couple of places in the document so that you can see how those are identified in the document.

Haugen referred to the document and pointed out that what is bolded and italicized is stuff that we received. He pointed out that the last one is stuff that is based on comments, and the one that is shown is the connected vehicles, autonomous vehicle addition.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

b. Safety Targets

Haugen stated that we have to make a recommendation today, and we all know what the choices are; we have the option of doing them all individually or do them all as one and we are either going to adopt ten targets, five for each state, or a minimum of five targets, or a combination between five and ten targets. He said that staff is recommending five targets. Williams asked when this has to be done. Haugen responded that the MPO Board has to make a decision this week.

Haugen commented that on the programming side neither State has been welcoming a discussion on how target setting affects programming. He added that there is still a lot of “black box” on the program side.

Haugen stated that if we ever get back to one single T.I.P., we will have North Dakota guidance as to how we incorporate that language into the T.I.P.; but it is clear that if we adopt both State targets we will have to have double the discussion to talk about how each side of the State is moving toward this; or if we do it as one target, we will have to address how it fits our MPA.

Williams asked if there was a list of each specific target. Haugen responded that each one of them are at the bottom of the sheet; pointing out that for fatalities North Dakota was at 138, Minnesota was at 375. He added that the draft we are recommending is three or fewer. He stated that each one of these sheets has what each state did adopt as well as if there were one MPO one. He added that, again, there are five of them; the minimum we can have as targets is five, and the maximum is 10, or we have the ability to say that we want to adopt a local one for fatalities, but we want to adopt both States’ for the rest, for instance, so we don’t have to be all State or all MPO, we can combine them.

West asked how this really correlates into actual projects; do we set a goal for how many deaths we want to have, of course it’s nice to say the lower the better, but what does it really mean in the end. Haugen responded that for the Highway Safety Program, part of the black box is that we never know what year projects might be funded from, but typically we are programming 2022 to 2023, just as we discussed on the last agenda item; and these targets are for 2018 and so, at the MPO level these targets don’t have any fiscal impact, how we are reporting just to our public ourselves, then the State DOT reports their numbers to the feds, and they have five different check boxes, the Feds do; if they are not showing progress in three of the five then their next T.I.P. cycle they have to spend 100% of the safety dollars.

Williams asked if the target that the MPO has more restrictive or less restrictive than what our State requirements are. Haugen responded that it isn’t more restrictive, but he doesn’t know if it is less, or if there is an answer to that.

Grasser asked if Ms. Williams had showed the research she had that showed increasing accidents with levels of congestion. Williams responded that she did. Grasser commented that he is struggling with the inconsistency that on a general scale the guidance says that we are going to start accepting LOS D on intersections, which in his mind is going to have more accidents, and yet our goal is to decrease accidents, to him those two thoughts go in opposite directions from

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

each other, and he can't reconcile, in his head. He said, though, that if we think that a strategy we are trying to go for is to fail our goals, with the idea that then would generate more dollars, okay he understands that, but if you don't think it is going to generate more dollars, then he isn't sure, his sense is, and he argued this from day one when we had this discussion six months ago, is that he thinks, from an ability to meet targets, he still thinks we are better off adopting at the State level because we amortize all those things over a much larger area; and he still hasn't seen an argument, in his mind, that changes that. Haugen responded that he doesn't think that is the argument being put forward, he thinks the argument he is putting forward is that by having our own targets, as far as programming, it forces them to maybe open up that black box more; does it become 100% transparent, possibly not, but the way it is now it is really a block box, and each State has a different sized black box, and how much is transparent, so what you experience on the North Dakota side isn't necessarily the same experience on the Minnesota side. Grasser said that he knows that that is part of the issue, is he thinks the Minnesota might be more willing to bring money to the table to take care of those issues than North Dakota.

Haugen reported that one thing is that Minnesota has stated that 70% of their safety dollars are for the pro-active, they aren't waiting for injuries, they are trying to prevent them, so failure of this doesn't necessarily automatically bring in more dollars, they are trying to program those dollars before you get to a point where you are failing. He added that on the North Dakota side they went as far as, when they created the Local Road Safety Program, they said 50% of the safety dollars now goes towards the locals, and 50% stays, but they haven't said whether they reserve, like Minnesota said, 70% towards pro-active ones. He commented that they have gotten success out of the Local Road Safety Program for the projects that were identified there, but we were also successful on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, which was a massive project, out of the Highway Safety Program, so that is the black box that he is trying to make lighter.

Grasser asked, if we made a choice here, and we start not getting the results, or we get unintended consequences, would there be an opportunity to revisit and say that we don't want to do it on this level. Haugen responded that this is action today is an annual action. Grasser said, then that he has much less objection if we are going to do this on an annual basis.

Williams asked if there was any significance, as she noticed that the State targets are a percentage, whereas the MPO isn't, shouldn't we have a percent in there someplace as well. Haugen responded that it could be if you want, but it doesn't have to be.

West commented that he would take the smallest step possible, try to be the least restrictive on ourselves as we can. Williams agreed, adding that we can then look at it again next year.

***MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY WEST, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE MPO IDENTIFY FIVE OF THEIR OWN SAFETY TARGETS FOR THE MPA.***

***Voting Aye: Lang, Ellis, Emery, Halford, Johnson, Williams, Bergman, West, and Riesinger.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Christianson, Laesch, Bail, Hanson, Kuharenko, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, and Sanders.***

c. Future Bridge Scenarios

Haugen reported that you have the travel, you have the graphics, you have had the chance to look at them ahead of time, you also had access to the actual overall travel demand model, not just what each four of these bridges are but also the 2015 and 2045 numbers as well on the website.

Haugen stated that the anticipation, as we thought, is that the further south we go the less local traffic connection is. He commented that if we do nothing, the corridor that has always been the corridor of concern, remains a corridor of concern. He added that something that is new is that at 32<sup>nd</sup>/Washington it is now popping up as an intersection of concern; even if we don't do an additional bridge, but if we do additional bridges there is more concern on some of the options.

Haugen said that they tried to identify, versus the functional class, if there was really any great separator, and there is some differentiation. He added that when they look at trying to decipher what is regional traffic, what is local traffic crossing the bridges, we are using a couple of points in East Grand Forks to help guide us, and that is the change in traffic that occurs just north of Rhinehart Drive on Bygland Road and also what happens when the Mallory Bridge, which is 220 on the East Grand Forks side connects into U.S. #2, and you can see that the further south you go the more local traffic or traffic that would normally be diverted up Bygland Road, occurs further south and the further north you go there is less regional traffic coming off of U.S #2 and 220 Mallory Bridge to reach that bridge the further north you go than there is the further south you go, as a percent of total bridge traffic, so it seems that as we kind of, at least from past plans' information, the further north the more it serves more local traffic, and the further south the more it serves more regional traffic and less local traffic.

Haugen summarized that he thinks what you are attempting to do is; there are four sites, and we want to see if we want to reduce that amount to do the next set of analysis, which will update our cost estimates; identify those touch-down points, whether they are high or whether they are low; look at the first intersections to see if they need to have changes to the geometry, and we know that we will probably have to look at 32<sup>nd</sup> and Washington; so start looking at those key intersections and such to start the next step if we are serious about trying to identify a local bridge.

Haugen commented that you have all been invited to, and it seems we have a strong attendance, a meeting on Thursday, February 22<sup>nd</sup>, to go over the same information with the MPO Board, the two City Councils, and the Two County Commissions, and yourselves.

West stated that in his mind it remains a question of two different types of bridges; you have a city bridge and you have a regional bridge. He said that there are two separate needs, and serves two separate functions, so it is really a matter of if you are going to put one in the city you have three spots to choose from to move city traffic versus if you want that regional, bypass corridor then the Merrifield Road, County 6, provides that.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Williams said that it is really, then, a matter of prioritization rather than elimination. West responded that that is correct, adding that that is what is going on, and what are we trying to accomplish. He stated that if money was not a factor it would be great if the City built one at one of those three locations, and the County built one a few years later at County 6, that would be great.

Haugen stated that the question we would ask Kimley-Horn and MPO Staff is, based on the information you received, is there something that needs to be clarified, is there anything else that could be added to the information. He commented that for a local bridge he hopes everybody can see that Merrifield is not really functioning that way. West said that this report substantiated exactly what he thought would happen, it just put numbers to it.

Williams asked if they were going to look at the feasibility of actually building something in these location, is it actually feasible to put a bridge on 32<sup>nd</sup> and try to route truck traffic and everything else through an established neighborhood, two schools, twenty-five mile per hour speed limit; are they going to look at the actual feasibility matching a project with what is out there right now. Haugen responded that it will go as far as the MPO Board, and others want it to go. He added that from the discussions he has been a party to they are trying to replicate the Point Bridge in function, so that would prohibit large trucks, it would prohibit certain types of traffic. Williams said, then, with that in mind we can still plan on having all the trucks run through the downtown areas, trucks are prohibited on the Point and they would be prohibited on the new one, how is that going to work. Haugen responded that, again, they are trying to replicate the Point Bridge.

**MATTER OF FUTURE NON-MOTORIZED BRIDGE BETWEEN DOWNTOWNS**

Haugen referred to the staff report and commented that the MPO Board has expressed an interest in looking at, as part of the Kennedy Bridge discussion, to locate a separate bike/ped only bridge between the Kennedy and the Sorlie.

Haugen reported that back when the flood protection project was still being designed, in 2001, we were assisting that discussion process of where such a structure should be located. He said that it looked at four bridges, two of them were built, and the one that wasn't built is on the Red Lake River. He added that there is information on a downtown area bridge, it has focused in and around the old Railroad Pier, and so the question is is this enough information to satisfy what the Board has been asking for or do you want us to update this information. He explained that this current information was all based on assumed design hydraulics, assumed other things, but we now have reality out there so information can be updated.

Haugen stated that there is a question in to the NDDOT as to whether or not the MPO can fund this type of study again. He explained that the MPO Board, both City Councils, and to some extent the MnDOT are the entities interested in this issue. Williams commented, you said there is a question as to whether it can be funded again through the MPO, what if the area was expended. Haugen responded that it isn't a question of the area, it is a question of the hydraulics.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

West stated that in his mind, actually constructing a project like that seems like a very low priority. Lang agreed.

Haugen reported that the context of this was, should the Kennedy have anything or not, and part of it was that they didn't want it on the Kennedy but would rather have something elsewhere. He said that he thinks there is a thought that if we can do something elsewhere, can they remove what is on the Kennedy and reallocate that space. Williams stated that she hadn't heard that before.

Haugen commented that some of our funds are being ate up by this new possible Washington Street Underpass project, and this is currently not in our work program, and he doesn't have a scope of what it would cost; so the real question is whether our State and Federal Partners say it is something that the MPO can fund, or if there is a percentage of the costs that the MPO can fund.

West stated that he feels we have way bigger issues than this to deal with, so it would be hard for him to support it. Haugen said, though, that there is a very strong desire of the MPO Board, which is being fueled by City Council members, to do this.

***MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY YAVAROW, TO APPROVE DEFERRING THIS ITEM TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD FOR THEIR REVIEW AND DECISION.***

***Voting Aye: Lang, Ellis, Emery, Halford, Johnson, Williams, Bergman, West, and Riesinger.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Christianson, Laesch, Bail, Hanson, Kuharenko, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, and Sanders.***

**OTHER BUSINESS**

a. 2017 Annual Work Program Project Update

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

b. Special Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

Haugen reported that there is a Special Technical Advisory Committee Meeting scheduled for Tuesday, February 20<sup>th</sup>, at 1:30 p.m. at Grand Forks City Hall, Conference Room A102.

Haugen stated that there are two agenda items; to start discussing financial forecast and also they assembled a list of projects that we will be considering as part of our plan, so we will start looking at a massive list of projects to make sure that we are identifying all possible projects.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

c. Special Joint Future Bridge Meeting

Lang asked about the Special Joint Future Bridge Meeting scheduled for next Thursday. Haugen responded that it is being held at the Grand Forks County Office Building, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor, at 5:30 p.m.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY YAVAROW, TO ADJOURN THE FEBRUARY 14<sup>TH</sup>, 2018, TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 4:07 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager