

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

**Wednesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mike Powers, (in Chairman Vein's absence), called the February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:00 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Gary Malm, Warren Strandell, Clarence Vetter, Al Grasser, Marc DeMers, Jeannie Mock, and Mike Powers.

Absent were: Ken Vein.

Guest(s): Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering.

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

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Powers declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 17<sup>TH</sup>, 2018, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 17<sup>TH</sup>, 2018, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

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

Kouba reported that this is a request from the City of East Grand Forks. She explained that they have been talking to MnDOT and FHWA, who are encouraging the Cities of Minnesota to do a written transition plan, so they have asked for our assistance in accomplishing this.

Kouba stated that we have put together a Request For Quotes, and are following NDDOT's process, and will send it to their approved list of engineers. She said that it is hoped that by doing this we will get several quotes from which to choose from to help us do the plan.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT RFQ FOR THE EAST GRAND FORKS RIGHT-OF-WAY ADA TRANSITION PLAN.***

*Voting Aye: Malm, DeMers, Grasser, Vetter, Strandell, Powers, and Mock.*

*Voting Nay: None.*

*Abstain: None.*

*Absent: Vein.*

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

Haugen reported that included in the packet are the actual project listings that are being amended. He explained that East Grand Forks was going to construct a larger area of Rhinehart Drive, near its intersection with Bygland Road; but as they were doing further work on the potential round-about in 2022, they have discovered that more of Rhinehart might be impacted by it, so instead of building a new Rhinehart, and four years later having to tear part of it out, they would like to transfer a chunk of the funds for the Rhinehart project to do some sidewalk ADA right-of-way compliance on 17<sup>th</sup>, so they are shortening the length of one project that is already in the T.I.P. and shifting the monies to a new project on 17<sup>th</sup>. He said that they did hold a public hearing at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting, but there was no one present for discussion, nor were any written comments submitted, thus both the Technical Advisory Committee and MPO Staff are recommending approval.

Powers asked if this will come back up in 2022. Haugen responded that nothing that we are doing today will come back. He added that if the round-about is built than that segment of Rhinehart that is not being done now it will be done with the round-about. He added that if the round-about is not done, then that segment of Rhinehart will need to be addressed.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE AMENDMENT #2 TO THE 2018 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM SUBJECT TO PARTNER AGENCY REVIEW.***

*Voting Aye: Malm, DeMers, Grasser, Vetter, Strandell, Powers, and Mock.*

*Voting Nay: None.*

*Abstain: None.*

*Absent: Vein.*

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

Haugen reported that we received guidance from Minnesota Federal Highway; however we typically get all of our guidance or direction from our North Dakota partners, but this particular time we have a Minnesota only T.I.P. document that is separate from the North Dakota T.I.P., so Minnesota believes that they are the proper agency to give guidance.

Haugen commented that at the end of May, of this year, if we are going to make any changes to our T.I.P. document, as we just did with the last agenda item, after May we have to incorporate a write-up of how these performance measures are being used in our decision making, and Minnesota Federal Highway is suggesting, along with MnDOT, that instead of waiting for a time when we have to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018**

address a T.I.P. action, that we go ahead and amend our existing T.I.P., whether there is a project or not, and just amend the write-up to include this framework of the performance measures into the T.I.P.

Haugen stated that a couple of agenda items from now you will be acting on Safety Targets, so by May we would have to incorporate how we are using our safety measures into our decision making.

Haugen explained that this is a guidance document, it is not mandatory, both the Technical Advisory Committee and Staff feel that since it is just guidance, that we could hold off and wait to see if we are actually going to do any amendment to the T.I.P., and if we are at that time we would address and incorporate this guidance at that time. He said that the question is do we want to go ahead and follow the guidance and write something up and amend our T.I.P. before May or do we want to wait until there is an actual project that forces us to amend our T.I.P. and address it then, and we are recommending we wait.

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO APPROVE WAITING UNTIL AFTER MAY TO INCORPORATE PERFORMANCE MEASURES INTO THE T.I.P., UNLESS THE NEED TO ADDRESS A CHANGE TO THE T.I.P. OCCURS FIRST.***

***Voting Aye: Malm, DeMers, Grasser, Vetter, Strandell, Powers, and Mock.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Vein.***

**MATTER OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO WORK PROGRAM TO UPDATE  
WASHINGTON STREET UNDERPASS ANALYSIS**

Haugen stated that the NDDOT has finally set aside and programmed the roughly \$18,000,000 to reconstruct the underpass on Washington Street. He commented that the next agenda item you will see that they have tentatively programmed it for 2022. He added that the next agenda item we are soliciting candidate projects for the next T.I.P., and one of the projects was a \$100,000 project to make sure that FY2022 is the proper year to do a reconstruction of the underpass, and as the Technical Advisory Committee discussed, an agreement that we should go ahead and not fund it with pavement dollars but instead fund it with planning dollars instead.

Haugen said that, as you are aware, we do have some extra planning dollars waiting for projects, and the way this is worded the MPO would initiate the planning study, because the project is programmed in 2022, the project development process will happen. He added that typically that wouldn't happen for a year or more, however on this project the NDDOT is saying that they want to get it going right away because of right-of-way acquisitions and also coordination with the railroad.

Haugen commented that, normally, because they would be doing the project development right-of-way, they would be going through their process of making the selection and funding of that work, but due to congress's continuing resolutions on appropriations, the flow of federal funds to the State of North Dakota is not optimal, so what we are proposing here is that we will start the study, take it as far as we can go with planning dollars, and then it will transition then over to the NDDOT to do the project development that is not fundable from the planning dollar side. He added that this isn't our normal

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018**

practice, however it has been done this way elsewhere in North Dakota, and so we are just trying to get this timed so we are not waiting for the flow of federal funds, and do something with the funds we have sitting that can do it.

Haugen stated that the Technical Advisory Committee and Staff are recommending that we amend, or program assigned dollars to this activity. He added that we still have to go through the process of the Request for Qualifications, and that will take a few months to do, so he is just offering that there might be a possibility that by the time that we actually can execute a contract, NDDOT's federal funding flow might be resolved to the point where they may just take it from the start and not really utilize us, but we are getting this framed-up so that we aren't being delayed just because of appropriation dollars on a continuing resolution.

Haugen said that there is a question about an exact scope-of-work that we would be writing up. He explained that it would be worked out if we move forward with this, but generally it is look at the concrete on the structure itself, it has an irreversible non-repairable chemical reaction taking place that is further complicated by the freeze thaw action that takes place, so that is what we are recommending here, and, again, it is a little atypical, but it keeps something in motion. He added that this may not end up us doing any part of the study, it may end up with us starting the project and then handing it over to the NDDOT.

Grasser commented that it seemed to be a good process that got worked out, trying to keep things moving there, otherwise we tend to wait and then something happens and then we wait some more; as managers of the system of the DOT we want to know how much longer that bridge may last, so we felt it is very important to have this study, and he thinks that putting planning dollars into that is a good move.

***Voting Aye: Malm, DeMers, Grasser, Vetter, Strandell, Powers, and Mock.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Vein.***

Haugen commented that we are using a budget number of \$80,000.00 in our work program; the request was for \$100,000.00, but because of the trade-off, the exchange of what we can do and what the NDDOT will take over, we are using a lesser amount. He added that we had been using \$250,000.00 as the federal funds that are available, so with your action today that leaves us roughly \$140,000.00 left and we believe there is probably another \$200,000.00 now that we got the audit out of the way, so there is probably close to \$400,000.00 left to be assigned to activities.

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

Haugen reported that, with the decision earlier this year on how North Dakota was going to fund the Main Street Initiative, now called the Urban Grant Program, we were in a position to solicit for the rest of the North Dakota Federal Funding Programs. He stated that at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting, he highlighted in the staff report, there were differences between the MPO Staff and the Technical Advisory Committee recommendations that he will go over. He added, however, that typically we have our responsibilities, and you have seen the front of this power point every year, to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018**

make sure that things are consistent with our plan, and that they are prioritized within the funding constraints that we have, the area that we look into, the type of projects (not just federally funded one). He said that we still have some unknowns of what FAST is going to do, just as we talked about earlier regarding incorporating performance measures into our T.I.P. document, there are still more unknowns coming down the road.

Haugen commented that, year of expenditure, we also have to make sure that as projects are programmed in the out years they are inflated appropriately for what that outer year expenditure will be.

Haugen stated that with the Main Street Initiative, and the impact on the Urban Local side, it is still more dollars than we had prior to FAST-ACT coming into that program; so with that there are the three separate programs that we will have candidate projects from; Urban Grant, Urban Local, and Urban Regional.

a. Urban Grant

Haugen said that, just as a refresher of what is all intended to be done with these funds; the City and UND have worked out an application, one for each year, and are tying it into both UND's concept of Columbia/Coulee Revitalization, and there is an already programmed project to do a mill and overlay of University Avenue. He said that UND is going to provide all of the local match.

Haugen stated that the first application, for 2019, the first year the funds are available, is a median focus on University; and the second application, for 2020, is to do ornamental lighting, bus shelters, etc., so included in your packet were a detailed cost estimate for each of the two applications, plus some renderings of what might happen.

Haugen referred to the first rendering, and explained that it focuses on what median treatment might occur and trying to address conflicting turning movements and ped movements crossing almost anywhere possible, to focus them on specific points. He said that you will also notice some ornamental lightings, banners, etc., that will be done with the second application.

Haugen commented that the last thing is that they are pricing out for three new bus shelters. He said that the current bus shelters are standard bus shelters that are throughout the community, these would be architecturally integrated into the rest of the campus corps concept.

Powers asked what the capacity is of one of those bus shelters. Haugen responded that that isn't identified, but typically there is room for five to six people sitting, however the one that is currently in front of the Memorial Union, are two large ones that offer mostly standing room, and they probably hold ten each, so ten to twenty people.

Haugen commented that both the Technical Advisory Committee and MPO Staff recommend you find the two applications consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan, and also give them both priority ranking, successively.

Grasser stated that, by way of maybe some additional information just for the Board's knowledge; this is a program that the Governor rolled out last fall, and everybody is in kind of a reactionary mode. He said

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018**

that part of what, from the City and UND's perspective is that we didn't think we really wanted to try to do a downtown project in FY2019 and FY2020 because we will be looking at reconstruction of DeMers in FY2019 and FY2020, plus 5<sup>th</sup>, and the mill and overlay on University is in FY2020, so we thought a good candidate project would be to tie into the ideas that are being generated by UND, the President's Concept.

Grasser reported that there is a detailed cost estimate there, and we need to make sure that that doesn't give a false impression, that that is exactly the work that is going to get done. He explained that they had to come up with an estimate for a grant, and UND is still working on the scoping of all these things, they just really formulated some of the committees and working groups by which they are going to start trying to flesh out the President's concept on Coulee to Columbia.

Grasser commented that another thing they looked at from the City's side was trying to target concepts for the Coulee to Columbia, are quite a bit more dollars than they are showing in here, because the whole thing could be a \$3 to \$4 million dollar potential project. He explained that what they did was to try, given the limited dollars that we have on a statewide basis, and the fact that they have to compete, was to try to taper the projects down to roughly a \$1 million dollar project. He said that they didn't want them to get too big because we probably wouldn't be successful when we are competing against the rest of the State.

Grasser stated that they targeted the FY2019 project for one that might have more impact on curbs and things like that, and the FY2020 project that wouldn't likely interfere with the mill and overlay project, as lighting and such can be done on the side.

Grasser said that this is just a philosophical background as to why some of those projects got selected, and what they are about. He reiterated that it is really early, and in a normal year we wouldn't have made these applications yet because the concepts are so ill-defined, but working with the circumstances we've got, that is what they came up with for FY2019 and FY2020 projects.

Powers asked if the need to rank these long range plans. Haugen responded that each of these T.I.P. projects do need to be ranked, prioritized, and this particular program has one for each year, so they aren't really competing against each other, they are each the number one prioritized for each successive year, and that is what both the Technical Advisory Committee and the MPO Staff are recommending, that you find them consistent and prioritize them as number one for each identified year.

***MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE FY2019 AND FY2020 URBAN GRANT PROGRAM CANDIDATE PROJECTS AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING FOR EACH SUCCESSIVE YEAR.***

***Voting Aye: Malm, DeMers, Grasser, Vetter, Strandell, Powers, and Mock.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Vein.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018**

- b. Urban Local
- c. Urban Regional

Haugen commented that the next two programs are ones that we are familiar with because we do them every year. He stated that, typically what we do is to first look at the current three years of the T.I.P. that have been programmed for a while to see if there are any proposed changes, and then we look at the last year of the T.I.P. for new projects.

Haugen reported that this year, the theme through our agenda today, is that things are a little different, if you haven't noticed. He said that the very first agenda item we are doing quotes instead of proposals, we are doing a work program amendment to keep the ball rolling that we typically wouldn't be doing. He pointed out that here, in our program, we are starting from not the adopted T.I.P. but from a tentative programmed document the NDDOT released to show the results of the Main Street Initiative decision.

Haugen pointed out that this is the program that was released to show what they are actually programming in FY2021, and also, in the case of the underpass, in order to get the full \$18 million dollars they are programming it in FY2022, so this is something that isn't adopted yet, but it is what they are basing their programming decisions on as we submit the candidate projects.

Haugen referred to a slide and explained that it shows the two new projects that are in the tentative program. He added that the rest are all current projects that we have programmed; there is one exception to a change on this project here, on North Washington there are three separate segments that were scheduled to be done; in the current T.I.P./S.T.I.P. they are programmed in FY2020, but in the tentative program, to balance and get the Washington Underpass fully funded, they had to shift some projects statewide, and they are recommending this get shifted to FY2019 instead of FY2020, and we will talk about it a little later because there is another change being proposed for that particular project.

Haugen stated, then, that instead of typically going off of an adopted document, we are starting from a tentatively approved document because of the indecision on FY2021 projects the last T.I.P./S.T.I.P. cycle; so these are just being identified and reaffirming what the 2021 project is, it is here on North Washington, the overpass, is just reconstruction through 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and University Avenue, that was our request for this cycle, and they are showing they will fund this program.

Haugen commented that last year we requested, in FY2021, an underpass project, but they could only program it in FY2022. He referred to slides offering some renderings of what that structure could look like. He said that there are some right-of-way impacts, and one of the bigger decisions is on the shoe-fly, which side of the current tracks do you allow train operations to be maintained; if you go on the north side you have some property acquisition impacts, on the south side you might be able to squeeze and not impact a building, but you may have to impact it, so that is one of the reasons why, in our previous discussion we talked about normally the project development wouldn't start for an FY2022 project, but with issues like this, North Dakota is trying to get ahead of the game and make sure they can deliver in FY2022.

Haugen referred to a slide and stated that, with this as our baseline, this highlights the changes that we received from the City and the NDDOT District Office on candidate projects, and so you will notice that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018**

instead of moving that three segments of North Washington to FY2019, the request is to delay it to FY2021, and they did adjust the cost estimate for the extra year of expenditure.

Haugen commented that also in FY2020 there are two new projects being requested, the first one is for some other segments of Washington Street, one on the southside of DeMers to Hammerling, to mill and overlay that; and the other is the northside of the underpass, to mill and overlay that as well.

Haugen stated that the second request we have for FY2020 is to start the NEPA document for a potential 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Interchange. He added that this is a \$2 million dollar project, but you will notice that there is only \$80,000 in federal funding, as the City is proposing that they will pay half of the \$2 million dollars, so the federal would only go towards half of the NDDOT share of \$1 million dollars.

Haugen reported that they are still programming the regional projects in FY2022; the study may or may not change that, but there are two new additional projects that are related; redoing the traffic signal system in Grand Forks, there are signals on both the regional system, which would be the larger dollar value, and there are signals on the local system, which would be the smaller dollar amount.

Haugen stated that when we review these changes we need to make sure that we are consistent with our planning documents and also that we are consistent with the fiscal constraint issue that is placed on the T.I.P./S.T.I.P., and this is where we had differences between the MPO Staff and the Technical Advisory Committee; particularly when it comes to the South Washington Street, between DeMers and Hammerling. He explained that what is being suggested is a mill and overlay, what is in the Transportation Plan is a full reconstruction. He stated that the mill and overlay will address the surface, the reconstruction would fix a lot of the other issues that are along that stretch including off-set intersections, driveway consolidations, and both transit and pedestrian issues along the corridor.

Haugen commented that some of these projects are trying to squeeze more lemonade out of lemons that have been long squeezed, so fiscal constraint is a concern, specifically whether there are funds available to put some of these projects in the years being requested.

Haugen referred to a slide and said that, just to give you a sense of those projects, this is the FY2020 request of the two segments, the mill and overlay, the NEPA documentation with the cost split, \$2 million with \$1 million from the City and \$80,000 in federal funding. He explained that for the NEPA project the federal funding source, if the NDDOT decides to fund the project, it wouldn't really be coming from the same construction dollars, so the T.I.P. program is more addressing construction dollars and not other types of fund; and the urban signals and regional signals are for information; and so, again, we had a difference of opinion between the Staff and the Technical Advisory Committee as to whether or not these are consistent with the plan, and we have two recommendations before you on these applications.

Haugen reported that we always do one and beyond on the North Dakota side for the Regional System, so there is an FY2023 request to consider the actual construction of the 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Interchange. He stated that normally on this we don't take formal action, it is just informing us that that might be the next candidate project.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018**

Grasser apologized, stating that maybe staff, he isn't sure how they titled some of the documentation that was submitted, but the NEPA document is technically going to be a document on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South, it is trying to resolve those problems on 32<sup>nd</sup> based on the I-29 Study, which gives a strong indication that the resolution is going to have to be an interchange, but the study is actually going to be for 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South, with, again, the likely outcome that we will end of having to do an off-system improvement for the 47<sup>th</sup> Interchange, so they aren't applying for the interchange with the NEPA, and this might be a play on words, but it is actually a study for 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South, that is his understanding with discussions with the State, and that is why it is using regional dollars because 32<sup>nd</sup> is on the regional system, but the 47<sup>th</sup> Interchange is not on any classified street system. Haugen added that he knows the Mr. Kuharenko is reworking. Grasser agreed, and said that he would talk to him about that and make sure that he gets it titled correctly. He added that they are presuming the conclusion, but the document is actually not studying the conclusion, it is still studying the problem. Haugen commented that they are just noting that, with the new Land Use Plan, there has been some shifting in how the City is forecasting its housing and employment, and they are now showing that 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue will have roughly 20% less traffic in 2045 than we were forecasting in 2030.

Grasser said that he thinks part of the issue is that we have growth growing basically right up to the boundary at this point in time, and they need to have some level, probably of better assurance, whether an interchange is going there or not, and part of the issue is when the DOT's current idea is that they don't want any intersecting side streets within a minimum of a half mile from an interchange, so on the Grand Forks side that means, if you can envision where 34<sup>th</sup> Street is, that is technically less than a half mile itself, and the concept plan on both sides, the developers concept plan on both sides of 47<sup>th</sup> would envision, potentially, access points closer than that, basically 38 would be maybe a  $\frac{3}{4}$  intersection and 34 would probably be the first signalized intersection, so, again if they are going to reroute streets to accommodate something, there is a potential DOT decision that they might not even allow a 38<sup>th</sup> Street connection to go in there, obviously that changes a lot then for the developer concept, so they kind of need to know whether they can move forward on this and under what conditions, or if we are going to put ten lanes on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South to fix the problem.

Powers asked if we need to approve this. Haugen responded that approval is needed as these are projects that are due to the NDDOT on Friday, and they need to have a decision from the MPO as to whether or not they are consistent with the plan, and also the priority owner and fiscal constraint.

Mock commented that she is a little concerned about pushing that work on Washington back two years to FY2021 when we are already getting complaints. Grasser said that he would invite anybody to drive it, they would see it right away. Haugen agreed, but added that conversely what we discussed at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting was pushing back the other issues, another considerable number of years, and then in FY2020 all of the money is already programmed elsewhere in the State so we aren't sure there is even a fiscal ability to do a project in FY2020.

Grasser reported that part of the discussion at the Technical Advisory Committee was if we reasonably expect to be able to get those kinds of dollars for reconstruction in that timeline; the DOT rep strongly suspected that we would not being we are getting programming in for the bridge and that part of the underpass, that is a pretty big ticket item, and if we fail to get the money what will we do with Washington Street, we need to do something with it, FY2020 is too far out, really. He stated that, philosophically, at the Technical Advisory Committee, and we should have maybe more discussion on

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018**

this than just today, but to simplify the discussion; five years ago, when we created this we created a list of projects, and the question today is, are we following the list or are we reacting to changes in conditions, understanding that the intent of the document is state of good repair to keep your system running; and in FY2018 the system managers feel that given the existing conditions, and the current financial constraints as opposed to the long-term financial constraints, means that our best tactic is to do the mill and overlay. He added that the mill and overlay also goes beyond what the reconstruction piece was; and if he remembers correctly that would have been from Hammerling to 8<sup>th</sup> Ave, and accepting that piece at the intersection of DeMers and Washington, it would have been two separate projects, the mill and overlay addresses both those pieces, with the idea that that is going to buy us some times, again pursuing the concept that we would look at a reconstruction in that FY2030 timeline, or less. He said that at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting we felt that outside of the list of the projects, the Long Range Transportation Plan, we are meeting the goals and we are meeting the financial constraints, basically, at least at this point in time, so that was the guidance that we had on the regional side from the District Engineer, and that is what the City Council approved.

Haugen stated that you have the two options for a motion; you can agree with what the MPO Staff is recommending, or you can agree with what the Technical Advisory Committee is recommending. He said that with the staff recommendation we have a lot of projects that would be forwarded without favorable review, and with the Technical Advisory Committee recommendation you would have projects being submitted with favorable review.

Haugen reported that we are in this transition period where we are at the end of a five year cycle, about to, at the end of this year, adopt a new transportation plan of new projects, so we are at an odd time in our plan as well, it is toward the end of the life of the plan, and that is just where we are at whenever we have to do it every five years, there is this programming out four years out, and identifying things that are past the five year cycle of the plan.

Grasser commented that he thinks part of the complications on the financial constraint, if he remembers right, on the Long Range Transportation Plan, when we did the Kennedy and the Sorlie we didn't know what year, and such, and both those projects came through here in the very recent past, and the Kennedy we are still working on, so, again, there were a lot of dollars expended, and if you look at the State of North Dakota, the City of Grand Forks, it is a spot on the map, so now it gets down to how many dollars we can expect to get. He said that he thinks they are inferring that we might have gotten, we've gotten a substantial share of the state resources in the recent past, so we might have to take a breather, and, again, these are all decisions that would be going on in Bismarck, and whatnot. He added that when you look at the dollars it seems like the most reasonable effort might be to get the mill and overlay on there, and get it back up and running, and then figure out how to fix it in FY2020, and then start planning for the reconstruction.

Vetter said that, if he understands correctly, both Staff and Technical Advisory Committee agree with these projects, it is just whether are consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan or not. Haugen responded that they can't disagree that the pavement on South Washington is poor, it is just that we had identified that we weren't going to just address the pavement on South Washington, we were going to invest in a full fix once we had the two bridges done and the underpass program, our next big project was the reconstruction of that South Washington Street.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018**

Powers asked is this would be similar to what was done on DeMers last summer. Grasser responded that he thinks this project would be more extensive than what was done on DeMers because right now the concept of reconstructing DeMers we don't need any property, and one of the things that really worries him about South Washington, some of the problems that we need to fix, we've got street lights in the middle of sidewalks and we have driveways and accesses very close together, and offset, and those types of things, in his mind he translates that into time and money because we need to work with property owners, we need to acquire property, we need to negotiate, and those are all very time consuming type issues, and expensive type issues, because there is no place to move a light, if you move it out of the sidewalk you are moving it onto somebody's property so part of the concern is, the dollar amount is really what is driving it, but he thinks in his mind, time. He added that the DOT, we are putting pressure on them to get DeMers Avenue done in FY2019, but it sounds like it might slip to FY2020 if we do reconstruction, and then we are putting pressure on them to get going on the underpass, so again how many of these things can the DOT crank out and if we make this request and it gets delayed or taken off the list, now what do we do, now we, as the MPO, are sitting there saying "Washington, we gave it a shot but it didn't work out", and he wants to make sure we can defend that we implemented a strategy that we think is successful; he thinks there is a substantial likelihood of failure if we go through the reconstruction because of the discussion of the cash flow of dollars, and we are going to have a riot if that street doesn't have a good solid plan in place.

DeMers asked, with the mill and overlay, would you be looking at 15 years before you would have to address structural changes to South Washington. Grasser responded that Mr. Noehre has been looking at a ten year cycle on his, because we might use 20 years on a local street, but on a street like Washington the life isn't going to be there. DeMers asked if you would seal coat it then in ten years, he was thinking seven to ten years and then you would seal coat it and then another seven to ten before you would look at redoing the surface in its entirety. Grasser responded that on Washington, specifically, would be mill and overlay in FY2020, and then around FY2030 we would still be trying to hard program the full reconstruction.

Discussion ensued.

***MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE FY2019-2022 URBAN LOCAL AND URBAN REGIONAL CANDIDATE PROJECTS AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING, AS PRESENTED.***

***Voting Aye: DeMers, Grasser, Vetter, Strandell, Powers, and Mock.***

***Voting Nay: Malm.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Vein.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL TO ADOPT SAFETY TARGETS**

Haugen reported that this is the time when we need to make a decision if we are going to adopt the Safety Targets that each State has adopted, or if we are going to adopt targets that are specific to the MPO area. He said that they have been keeping this body as informed, as best they can, as to what the State's five targets are.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018**

Haugen referred to the staff report, and pointed out that included in the staff report is the action that the Technical Advisory Committee took, and that is to recommend the local targets. He added that the support materials still lists what each State has adopted as their targets, so that is where we are at and both the Staff and Technical Advisory Committee are recommending the adoption of the safety targets that are on this list.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE ADOPTION OF THE MPO SAFETY PERFORMANCE TARGETS, AS PRESENTED.***

***Voting Aye: Malm, DeMers, Grasser, Vetter, Strandell, Powers, and Mock.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Vein.***

Haugen commented that these are annual targets, so we will have to address these, if not before, twelve months from now.

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

Haugen reported that there are three things that we will touch on, probably spending more time on the third item, but we did have a public meeting last December, and we did have a financial survey that we asked people to take part in. He said that we received about 70 responses to that survey.

Haugen stated that we also have had goals and objectives out for comment, and have asked for our local staff and state and federal staff to review and provide their comments. He said that the timeframe for those comments has expired so what is included in the packet are the draft goals and objectives and standards that are being proposed for public comment.

Haugen said that the last thing is that tomorrow night we will be holding a Joint Future Bridge Location meeting with both City Councils, County Commissioners, the Technical Advisory Committee, and others to go over the analysis that was done on the four additional river crossings; and, again, this is just reviewing them from the impact our travel demand model forecast will have on the traffic.

Haugen commented that in our 2045 Plan our model is showing that the three river crossings are going to have a Level of Service F or worse traffic conditions on them, and if we do nothing we will have some intersections that will be failing operational service, missing several cycles of green to get through them, so we looked at four possible crossings; 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and Merrifield. He stated that each of these locations has a stand-alone additional bridge.

Haugen reported that included in the packet are the volumes, how they change key intersections in and around, plus the traffic beyond the bridge itself. He pointed out that as we go further south we have less local traffic crossing the bridge. He added that all four of these bridges are going to take traffic off of U.S. #2 and #220, on the east end of our metro area; because of the more direct line than either going through the congested Sorlie Bridge or Kennedy Bridge, so all four of these bridges have regional traffic, the difference between them is the type of local traffic being attracted to them.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018**

Haugen referred to tables, and explained that they give us some sense of how these locations will affect the traffic flow. He went over each briefly, pointing out that it does show that the further south we go, fewer cars are diverted. He added that the bottom table gives us a sense of the plus/minus that is occurring, and, for him, it gives some sense that, again, all of these crossings are going to attract some regional traffic, or traffic that is out on U.S. #2 and #220, but which ones are impacting the local traffic and from we have been hearing is that that is what we need to be looking at, so it seems that the further north we go, the better it performs in that regard.

Haugen reported that all four of these locations impact the Washington corridor, so we are sort of having some shift of the problems on the Point corridor, 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Bygland Road, to having a spot problem at 32<sup>nd</sup> and Washington in particular.

Haugen commented that there is some other information that we will get into with the next level of analysis, and that will be benefit/cost and cost and effectiveness.

Haugen said that what they are trying to get a sense of is, if we want to go to the next level of analysis for these, are there some that we can drop and not spend money on because we can see from the traffic side that they aren't doing what we hope a new bridge would do. He added that if we are going forward with more work on the bridges, it would be looking at the benefit/cost ratios, looking at the touchdown points on both sides of the river, what intersections we may have to address, whether they are penetrating the flood protection system or if they are high and dry; so a lot more work will need to be done if you want to move forward, but we are trying to reduce that amount of work to maybe not all four of these locations.

Vetter stated that he won't be at the meeting tomorrow night, but he would like to say that his preference would be to study the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and the Merrifield Road locations. He added that he feels that 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue is just too far south and won't move enough traffic off Bygland and Rhinehart, and while the study says that 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue will move a lot of traffic off of Bygland and Rhinehart, he thinks it impacts the residential side more than the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue location; so, again, his preference would be to keep the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and the Merrifield Road locations in the study. He explained that if you go with 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue you will have the residential impact plus you will impact Washington from 24<sup>th</sup> down to 32<sup>nd</sup>, but if you go with 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue you still have the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue issue, but you take Washington Street off of it.

Vetter commented that he doesn't think you will see any more traffic on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue with a bridge than you do now, not significantly because the traffic is already going that way anyway, and you are going to take it off of Washington and put it on 32<sup>nd</sup>, and you will take it off of Belmont and Reeves Drive and put it on 32<sup>nd</sup>, so he doesn't think there will be much of an impact, the only impact will be from Belmont to the new bridge, that main road will have the biggest impact, less vehicles will be going that way.

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

Haugen reported that since the Kennedy Bridge Project discussion, the MPO Board has been keenly interested in a separate bike/ped bridge between the Kennedy and the Sorlie, crossing the Red River. He said that, as mentioned back then, we did do a study when the flood protection system was still under

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018**

design, and the recreational feature of additional bike/ped bridges were being scoped out, he included the pertinent pages from that study in the packet.

Haugen stated that they looked at four total bridges, two of them have been built, the third was a bridge on the Red Lake River that was dropped, and the fourth one was a downtown bridge. He said that this was all based on the assumed flood protection design criteria, so the results are based on assumed data, so if you wanted, we could amend this into the work program to revisit the location. He added that at that time we were looking at utilizing the center pier that stands there today, but we could update the scope if you wanted the study to include additional crossing locations between the Kennedy and the Sorlie, but the biggest obstacle would be that we would be introducing new obstructions into the floodway instead of utilizing the obstruction that is there.

Powers asked, if we use the old pier from the old Northern Pacific Bridge, that would still impact the flood plain by half a foot, correct. Haugen responded that these are, again, the assumed impacts based on the assumption of what the flood flow and hydraulic analysis were assuming at that time during the whole design of the flood protection system. He said, though, that if we do a new study we would take actual data instead of assumed data, so it could be somewhat different.

Grasser stated that some part of the challenge of the bridges has been how do you get your touchdown points to be compatible, so if we are going to look at a bridge we should try to look at how that really configures because if you are high it takes a long time to get back down, and the same with low, so how might that work out; and the other thing he is wondering about is that our best available information right now, for flooding, is based on the Fargo/Moorhead period of flow, so are we going to be analyzing using that data. He added that even the wet weather flow, when they talked to FEMA, and he is trying to paraphrase some of the discussion when the Governors met, is that when FEMA comes back at some point in time, they are going to develop their own period of record, and they have a fair idea of what it might be, but they are going to use whatever the best data is. He said that he thinks the only thing we know for sure is that those flows keep going up, and he doesn't know how their new period of record might match with the wet period of record, but he knows that either one of those is different than what was used here. Powers asked if that wasn't the mentality that Fargo is using right now, to kind of wait and see what FEMA says. He added that Fargo is struggling with this because the conundrum they are in is, Minnesota DNR primarily wants to design for the 100 year flood, and Fargo, based on what FEMA told them, is fairly sure that the next FEMA review the 100 year flood is going to be higher than what we are looking at now, so they can spend \$2 billion dollars and then find out that they can't be certified because the new flows are higher than the old flows and that is why Fargo needs to have a project higher than the current 100 year flood to have some assurance that it isn't going to be out of date before it is even completed.

Powers commented that what Fargo does will impact this. Grasser agreed, adding that Fargo's flood protection project definitely has an impact up here. He said that they did a very rigorous analysis to make sure that the elevation of the 100 year flood didn't change, and he doesn't want to blow your mind but after you accept the fact that the 100 year flood goes up a foot from where we are at today, there is no change from the Fargo project because they are saying that the new hydrology basically raises our old 100 year flood by a foot, but what impacts us is as they are moving that water north earlier and longer, our bridges may be under water more often and longer at the 50 year and 25 year events, so the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018**

regulatory piece, remember is only that one single point, that 100 year event, or a curve, so we there are impacts there.

Haugen stated that we are looking for direction, whether or not you want us to pursue this as a work activity this year or not, and prepare the document. He said that, based on your last discussion you wanted to try to work with both State DOTs on siting and reaching an agreement on another bike/ped bridge between the Kennedy and the Sorlie, and you exchanged letters to that effect with both States.

Powers commented that, personally, he thinks that a different location other than the old railroad bridge is going to be very spendy, so he would just as soon utilize the pier, although we may need to make it smaller so it doesn't impact the river so much. Vetter said that he could see a fourth option of utilizing the pier as it was originally intended and swing the bridge so it is perpendicular to the river during a flood event. Powers agreed, adding that it is there.

Grasser asked if it would be possible to look at these three elevations and see how the timing would go, and maybe if there is an option for turning the bridge, before getting into the hydraulics because the hydraulics and flood flow is going to just be a mess, and he is just wondering if we can at least figure out if there is an alignment that makes all the touchdown points work, and maybe just split that workload up a little bit to move it forward.

DeMers asked what the timeframe of potential funding for a project like this would be. Haugen responded that that is not known. He added that, you remember how this was brought forward, there was a strong desire not to have the current bike/ped accommodation be put on the Kennedy, and there was some discussion that if we were to get a separate bike/ped bridge, perhaps we could repurpose that space on the Kennedy back to vehicles. He added that he doesn't know how much you want to repurpose that space on the Kennedy, how much each State wants to repurpose that space. DeMers stated that he asks this because we have a couple of other bridge projects we are looking at, and he doesn't see either State having any money so he doesn't know why we are going to try to program something that isn't going to happen, so I guess we will see what happens with the Kennedy, but he isn't too fired up about putting two bridges down there right now, that isn't where his focus is.

Malm stated that he thinks you need to leave this off for a year and see what happens with the Kennedy, it may be a disaster for bike traffic, so we need to get an idea of how it is going to operate, and if it can handle it, and he doesn't think it will, then we won't have to do anything, but he doesn't think we should do anything until we know.

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE TABLING THIS ITEM UNTIL ONE YEAR AFTER THE KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECT IS COMPLETED, THEN REVISIT IT TO SEE IF IT SHOULD BE PURSUED AT THAT TIME.***

***Voting Aye: Malm, DeMers, Grasser, Vetter, Strandell, Powers, and Mock.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Vein.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018**

**OTHER BUSINESS**

- a. 2018 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that the 2018 Annual Work Program Project Update is included for review.

- b. Bill Listing For 1/13/18 to 2/16/18 Period

Haugen reported that the list of bills for the January 13, 2018 to February 16, 2018 period was included in the packet for your review.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO ADJOURN THE JANUARY 17<sup>TH</sup>, 2017,  
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:25 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager