

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Teri Kouba, Senior Planner, called the March 14th, 2018, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:35 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck (Via Conference Call); David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Local District; Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineer; Darren Laesch, MnDOT-Bemidji; and Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning.

Absent were: Nels Christianson, Dale Bergman, Steve Emery, Lane Magnuson, Richard Audette, Brad Gengler, Paul Konickson, Ali Rood, Stacey Hanson, and Rich Sanders.

Staff present: 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; Josh Benocken, MnDOT-Bemidji; and James Kiedrowski, KLJ.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Kouba declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 14TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY LAESCH, TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 14TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF AERIAL IMAGERY CONTRACT

Kouba stated that back in January staff brought forward an RFP for our Aerial Photo Update, with a February 19th deadline for submittals. She reported that they received four proposals,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

adding that all four were submitted before the deadline; and that the selection committee met and interviewed all four, and decided to go with Quantum Spatial. She added that they did come in well under budget, at \$39,515.00, so staff is now requesting approval to forward the contract on to the MPO Executive Board for execution.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY LANG, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD CHAIRMAN EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH QUANTUM SPATIAL FOR THE AERIAL IMAGERY PROJECT, NOT TO EXCEED \$42,000.00.

Voting Aye: Lang, Ellis, Bail, Halford, Johnson, Kuharneko, West, and Laesch.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Christianson, Emery, Hanson, Bergman, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, Reisinger, and Sanders.

MATTER OF MINNESOTA SIDE FY2018 T.I.P. AMENDMENT

Kouba reported that the City of East Grand Forks brought forward an amendment to the FY2018 T.I.P. for the purchase of a bus. She commented that we did advertise for a public hearing for this item so she would open the public hearing at this time.

Ellis stated that, just to clarify the reason for this amendment, they had five vans set for purchase with one of their federal grants, but Cities Area Transit keeps getting vans on the North Dakota side, so we felt it would be in our best interest to purchase another larger Dial-A-Ride vehicle for some of our larger pickup and have a back up vehicle for East Grand Forks City's bus, so in the T.I.P. it showed this having State monies programmed, so we are clarifying this by changing it to the federal dollars that we already had set aside for the vans, and moving from vans to one single bus.

Kuharenko asked what the difference is between a Class 500 and a Class 300 bus. Ellis responded that the Class 300 are smaller buses than the Class 500.

Laesch asked if this has all been approved by MnDOT's Central Office. Ellis responded that it has, adding that this is less money that the State has to put aside because we have that ten year CIP that she has to put into the Black Cat every year, so they are very familiar with what her plans are for the next ten years. She added that she doesn't like to lose federal dollars, and since she can't purchase vans off the Minnesota contract, she has to try to figure out a way to purchase vans independently, so it is just easier to purchase a bus with her federal dollars.

Grasser asked if this was the bus that would go back and forth between East Grand Forks and Grand Forks. Ellis responded that it isn't, that is a separate one. She added that they received new expansion dollars for a Class 500, that is one of the \$470,000 large buses that is going to be used.

Kouba closed the public hearing.

MOVED BY BAIL, SECONDED BY HALFORD, 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, Bail, Halford, Johnson, Kuharneko, West, and Laesch.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Christianson, Emery, Hanson, Bergman, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, Reisinger, and Sanders.

MATTER OF NORTH DAKOTA SIDE FY2018 T.I.P. AMENDMENT

Viafara reported that we are also seeking your recommendation for approval of this amendment, that has to do with the new overlay project that will take place in two stages; one on South Washington between DeMers and Hammerling, and the second on North Washington between 1st Avenue North and 8th Avenue North, both during this construction season.

Viafara stated that they are asking for this approval for two reasons; one is because that project has changed significantly, and then the issues such as ADA compliance will be considered; and then cost and sharing is another matter, so anything that is supposed to be done is within the proposed Long Range Transportation Plan, so the approval of this particular amendment does not in any regards affect the cost of the plan so it continues to be fiscally constrained, so in addition the public hearing is set for next week, March 21st, and comments are expected to be accepted until 11:00 a.m., so this is the overall information you have, and staff is seeking approval.

MOVED BY LANG, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE FY2018 NORTH DAKOTA SIDE T.I.P., AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Lang, Ellis, Bail, Halford, Johnson, Kuharneko, West, and Laesch.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Christianson, Emery, Hanson, Bergman, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, Reisinger, and Sanders.

MATTER OF SCOPE OF WORK FOR A.T.A.C. TRAFFIC COUNTS

Viafara reported that this item entails approval of the Scope-Of-Work for A.T.A.C. to proceed with the Traffic Count Program Study. He explained that we currently have a number of intersections that have video cameras located in the system; but those cameras are being used just for video kind of activities, and with this new information there is the potential for them to provide more recordings for decision making, so in that sense a number of intersections are being

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

considered around primarily the 42nd Street Corridor and the DeMers Corridor for new cameras to be installed.

Viafara commented that scope of services, the entire contract is for the amount of \$55,688.00. He pointed out that in the packet are the conditions and elements that the MPO is expecting to be delivered.

Ellis stated that it states in the report that there are some minor revisions that are being made to the Scope-of-Work, do you know what those are. Viafara responded that they have to do, basically, this is an overall, it is minor in that sense because when Mr. Haugen put this one in here we had already received some comments that the University needed to address, and the whole idea was to determine what else we can do with the traffic analysis as we want something more than just a simple report; we want more insight, so that is basically the revision, and the consultant agreed that they can at least give some consideration when they are doing their analysis. Ellis said, then, that the consultant is considering providing more data at the same price. Viafara responded that it will be within the same scope, that they will at least give us more insight. Ellis said, though, that they aren't changing the contract. Viafara responded that they would not be changing the contract at all, including the cost.

Laesch commented that he sees that they are going to provide some estimates for upgrading the East Grand Forks signals; as far as what is happening on the Grand Forks side, is that something that is the responsibility of the City and/or MnDOT to pick up these costs, or is there the ability for the State and MPO to do it. Viafara responded that he would ask that you please wait for Mr. Haugen to return to give you the answer to that question, as he doesn't have the answer at this time. Laesch stated that he is in full support of finding out what those costs are and looking at what is needed to make upgrades to those traffic signals. Kouba said that she thinks that's the main purpose, just to get the cost estimates so we understand what it will take, and also include all the stakeholders. Ellis commented that, typically, what she knows from an MPO is that they can only pay for planning activities, they can't pay for actual equipment; so it would just be an estimate and we would have to take it from there.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE SCOPE-OF-WORK FROM A.T.A.C. FOR THE TRAFFIC COUNT PROGRAM STUDY, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Lang, Ellis, Bail, Halford, Johnson, Kuharneko, West, and Laesch.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Christianson, Emery, Hanson, Bergman, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, Reisinger, and Sanders.

MATTER OF FY2018 SPRING FLOOD OUTLOOK

Kouba reported that as it currently stands it appears that we aren't looking at a flood forecast, but we have it in our plan that we will make sure that we continue to ensure that our contact list is

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

up-to-date in the event we were to have a flood. She asked that everyone please look it over and submit any changes by the end of next week.

Information only.

MATTER OF FY2018 BIKE MAP

Viafara reported that the whole idea behind the preparation of the Bike Map is; this map is based on previous efforts that the MPO has done through the years, and is really just a matter of tweaking what has already been done, which is basically the truss of the map.

Viafara commented that new information has been included; one is that we would like to provide efficient, directness and accessibility alternatives to most of the routes; safety and security of the bicyclists so what we try to do when we show and display this network is to tell the user that this map and the network corresponds to the principles of bicycle facilities that improve access to the system, the safety of cyclist and their enjoyment, so we believe those elements are also included in the map.

Viafara stated that the map is also related to key goals and objectives that are stated in the bicycle plan; one of them is that we would like, by producing this map, to foster economic vitality, we would like to foster access and mobility, and we also would like to foster environmental energy and improve the quality of life, and the final one is to integrate and connect the overall system in the cities.

Viafara said that one objective that has been new to us is also tourism, so in that case we have partnered with the Historical Society and have included historic neighborhoods for people to use their bikes and ride around. He stated that we have also included the two downtowns, the bridges that allow bike and ped traffic, and the railway crossings, the quiet zones, and crossings on safe route to school. He said that these are very important, at least we consider them to be important in addition to listing of the school, park and pools, and listing the bus transfer stops because we would like the bicycle map to also be related to the ability for people to ride their bikes, and whenever they feel, also to use the bus now that the bus offers the bike rack.

Viafara commented that in addition to that there are some panels, those are the panels that we have for your consideration. He stated that we list the existing type of roads and those roads bicycle facilities; we list the Red River State Recreation Area, the Bike on Bus Program, the Historical Preservation Commission Program; we have some points on Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety, and we have one panel dedicated to Rail Safety for Pedestrians and Bicyclists. He added that we are also encouraging people to participate by making available opportunities for participation and provide the acknowledgments and list the MPO Staff, so those are the elements that are supporting the drafting of the particular map for 2018. He said that at the moment we are envisioning that the map will be distributed widely next Friday at the Home Show.

Halford stated that she has a few comments. She pointed out that on the public participation part, where you say under the Bicycle and Pedestrian Greenway Advisory Committee to visit the Greenway Website, it should probably be www.bikingtheforks.com instead. Viafara said that he

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

would make that correction. She said that her other question was whether or not he received permission from the all these people to be on the front of the bike map, especially the children, as she knows that that has been an issue in the past, where you can't have their photos without permission. Viafara responded that these pictures are public, so that is how they got them, from the newspaper. Halford asked where, publicly, they were from. Viafara responded that they are in the public domain already, they are no longer private. Halford asked if the were from the City. Viafara responded that, yes, they are in the public domain. Halford stated that she knows that Safe Kids has brought this issue up, so she would still be careful about using these photos. Viafara responded that Safe Kids are already aware that we are using these photos. Halford suggested that he check with Aaron Kennedy, as you have him and his daughter's photos are shown on here. Viafara responded that they provided those pictures to us, Safe Kids provided those pictures to us. Halford said that she has one more comment; the bus stops that you have labeled on the bike map, are those the current bus stops or are those the ones that will be changed for the summer. Viafara responded that they are the current ones. Kouba commented that the finalized bus stops for the proposed routes have not been finalized.

Williams said that it is her understanding that this has already been printed, is that correct. Viafara responded that it has not yet been sent to the printer. Williams asked if corrections were wanted now then. Viafara responded that if she has some he would welcome them. Williams pointed out that there is a bike route that is missing from the map, adding that it is the one that is the parallel route for Washington on North 15th. She added that the street names are incorrect, so streets such as 42nd Street South should actually be South 42nd Street, so the nomenclature is wrong for the street names. Viafara asked if this was the case with all of the streets. Williams responded that as far as she can tell all of them are incorrect.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON BIKE/PED PLAN

Viafara reported that this item is just to give you an update on where we are at concerning the Bike/Ped Element. He referred to a slide presentation and stated that he will go over this quickly.

Viafara stated that vision statement has been prepared and has been accepted by consensus, so that statement is the one that has been guiding our activities. He said that what was considered in order for us to produce a vision statement, so safety was one, the need for friendly environments in the community was another, bicycles, buses and trains at the national level were included, whether bicycle or pedestrian activities are physical modes of transportation was also given attention. He added that other elements such as fostering mobility and efficiency, all of them were considered when producing the statement.

Viafara commented that they then went into developing a number of Goals and Objectives that were also approved, and now we are finalizing the performance measures, and saying that the majority of the performance measures are complete, they were reviewed, input was received from the stakeholders, and the one that are here, under consideration, are the ones that at the moment there are only three performance measures, supporting three goals that are at the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

moment being addressed. He said that once these are addressed we will move to finalize the other two sections of the plan that are already in the making.

Viafara stated that, concerning the performance measures, those performance measures are associated to the different planning factors:

- 1) Economic Vitality - we have determined that access to community destinations and access to jobs are the measures that we reflect the performance measures.
- 2) Security - Security is under consideration because originally we had thought all the measures back, even the ability for the stakeholders to conduct the data, this is a list to heed their advise and start seriously giving some consideration to them and to incorporate them into the document.
- 3) Accessibility and Mobility - is also a measure that is under consideration, but the other topics continue like access to transit stops or network crossing opportunities over barriers.
- 4) Environmental/Energy/Quality of Life – these are fine.
- 5) Integration and Connectivity – again this is under consideration because there is a need for us to define some performance measures connected to network completeness.
- 6) Efficient System Management - which is basically what happens to the CIP or grants that the stakeholders may apply to, or for, in order to support bicycle/pedestrian activities.
- 7) System Preservation - is fine, mostly aligned with the overall system preservation measures that are occurring now.
- 8) Safety – this is aligned to the other performance management measures.
- 9) Resiliency and Reliability – is fine.
- 10) Tourism – is fine.

Viafara said that this is based on performance measures that the overall plan has been developed. He commented that on the top of the table you will see “every year”, “every two years”, and “every five years”, and the idea is that all of those measures will be measured based on that frequency that is on the heading; so some measures will be considered every year, some every two years, but at the end – the five year of the plan there will be a report of the overall performance of this particular plan, so that is where we are.

Grasser commented that he would start by noting that you skipped over some of the introductory portion of the staff report, and he is kind of going by what they do, typically, with the City; and this report, looking at the background he knows that the bicycle elements and ped elements have kind of had a multi-year background and history on this already, but he doesn't think it is reflected in this particular part of the staff report, so just to kind of help out he is going to ask his staff to help write a background so he understands what the background is, and they can share it and maybe insert it as part of the staff report because he knows there is quite a bit of additional background that goes into the history of the whole project if that is okay.

Viafara responded that the Engineering Department is a stakeholder, and we heed your advice, we are here to work together so whatever you want to bring; would you like him to resubmit this report to the Executive Policy Board. Grasser asked if this was going to the Executive Policy Board as just information only. Viafara responded that that is correct. Grasser stated, then, that he thinks that if we just report what we are planning on doing it would be fine, but it

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

kind of depends on what you are planning on bringing to the board. Viafara responded that he was planning on bringing what was discussed today, but if you want some of this included then we can move it; so he will wait for their information.

Halford stated that she has a question on the analysis part, under 1, where it states: “approved by consensus by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee”. She said that her understanding was, during that meeting, that that is not true, that they did not approve the Vision, Goals and Objectives, but rather agreed that you should continue forward with the work we needed to proceed forward with, but that they wanted to see the document as a whole before they approved anything, so she doesn’t know if we need to make a motion as a group here that that needs to be changed, or it is just a simple correction to the staff report. Viafara responded that that is not the understanding, certainly it is yours, but his understanding was that we met a number of occasions, and in one of those, with the Steering Committee, we came to the decision that both the vision and the objectives were approved, and he can bring the agenda where this was approved. He added that when you guys requested that he please provide the parts to see where the document was, that request was met and three parts of the document were given to you. He said that as a result of this we got some insight from different stakeholders that helped to incorporate them into the final report, that is where we are at now, and he has been addressing some concerns brought to our attention by the Engineering Department, and, as a matter of fact the latest one is those three points, and that is where we stand.

Halford commented that she understands on some of the things your saying, but still, she thinks that is something that maybe needs to be asked of other stakeholders in that group because she is pretty sure that it was agreed that you should move forward with the work you need to do, but that they weren’t approving it until they see it as a document as a whole. Viafara responded that he cannot really work under those conditions. He said that the stakeholders are very important, but nobody will work on something and then wait for your approval, that is why we have taken a planning approach, which is more or less incremental. Halford agreed, adding that there were so just so many drafts back and forth and the timeline that they kind of came to the point where they said that they can’t keep doing this, we need to see it as a document as a whole instead of this piece-meal document, so continue to move forward, but they didn’t approve anything of what you have so far. Viafara stated, again, that that isn’t his understanding of what occurred.

Kuharenko reported that his recollection of what happened at that meeting is much in line with what Ms. Halford ended up saying; was that the general concept, or the general thought was that we need to keep moving forward on this plan, and so to keep making that forward process, but at the same time they were reserving the right to make comments later on so it wasn’t an approval process. Viafara said that he hopes that he never misunderstood you, but that is not the feeling that he has gotten from other stakeholders; like from Mrs. Crocker, or Bruce, or any of the others. He added that we came to a decision that they were also kind of concerned for the delays that the plan has been experiencing; and they were almost ready to abandon the process, so then they came to the decision that we move on or there is no point for us to continue here because addressing some of the concerns has become onerous for both the stakeholders and for the MPO, so when we had that meeting it was his understanding that they were really approving for us to move on, and if you read the minutes it states that we have come here to do this and to move on. Halford asked if he had minutes from that meeting. Viafara responded that he

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

doesn't have them here right now, but that is the spirit of those particular minutes. Grasser asked if those minutes go out and get approved by the group later on. Viafara responded that they are submitted to the group for further consideration. Kuharenko commented that he doesn't remember seeing these minutes. Viafara responded that if you look at some, in some cases when he has sent the invites the minutes have also been attached. Kuharenko asked that these minutes please be sent out again.

Viafara asked that we take this opportunity, also, for us to, in good faith, to move along because the whole process has become dragging, has become also onerous. He said that those are the comments that he has received from some stakeholders, that it has become burdensome. He stated that the plan is meant for the community, some people are representing the community and they would really like to see all, particularly the government agencies, working together in good faith and moving along, but answering the number of questions, that rightly so, we've done it and certainly we are happy receiving those insights, but it has taken a toll on the performance as a professional and also on the development of the plan, so we have to settle for something. He added that, nothing is perfect, but at least he believes that every effort has been made to accommodate your needs and desires, and also to address the desires of the community.

Kuharenko commented that he would like to give the Technical Advisory Committee a little background information on this. He stated that last time that the Bike and Ped Advisory Committee ended up meeting was back on December 18th, and at that point in time they ended up going through looking at the performance measures and one of the big things that was discussed was what departments or entities are responsible for the various performance measures. He said that he knows that the Engineering Department were assigned a number of these aspects as well, and they ended up sending the comments that you see within this report back on December 22nd, so we had a meeting on Monday and they sent the comments out that Friday, and here we are three months later and he believes they still haven't gotten a response yet. He pointed out that it states in the report itself that MPO Staff provided a complete response on addressing these concerns, so he knows that this has been a long process. He added that he also knows that at that December meeting some of the things they ended up discussing there was removing the two performance measures that you have on 2.1, and also about the concerns that were related with the 2.3 sidewalk inspections, just because of the amount of manpower that would take. He stated that, in looking at all of this, one of the things they do want to focus on is the Efficient System Management of this, making sure that what we are doing for these performance measures is something that we are either already doing or are not going to be overly burdensome and not take a lot of manpower to do, and that sort of thing.

Viafara responded that if you look at what is under consideration to the report, so this is under consideration so the things, you will see them. He added that, unfortunately, to tell you the truth, David, and this is very important, let him put it this way; sooner or later, one day, even if that costs a little money, we need to come to an agreement because plans are supposed to be measured, and sometimes the argument that things have not been done in the past, or that they require too much manpower, we need to try to address them because otherwise the system, it is part of the system, the system will never be accessed or enjoyed; for, for instance, just to say, sidewalk inspections, recently he was stopped by the police because he was walking on the roadway, but if you take a walk around Washington it is impossible to walk, and you probably

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

don't know it because he is the one walking, but if we were to do a neighborhood assessment, particularly now that there is a project happening, then those issues can be addressed. He stated that the problem is not only on the roadway, that is why we are pedestrians, and kids and others that are entitled to ride their bikes, at least in that area, on the sidewalks, so we need to come, he doesn't really know if it is a valid issue, but we cannot really let those things disappear just for, out of sheer needs, that we don't have to believe a network can be met.

Ellis commented that, you just gave Mr. Kuharenko the reason for his concern; we have a plan, that has to be assessed, therefore we don't want anything in the plan that we cannot measure or assessed accurately with the funding and the manpower we have, so you just, in essence, addressed his concern, which is; if we have a plan we have to measure it and follow it, therefore, we want to make sure the plan is something that we all agree to and can follow, do you understand that. Viafara responded that he can certainly understand that. Ellis stated, then, that you have to expect that we are still going to have concerns, and we are still going to want to make sure that we can see it as a whole, so we know what we are being held to in this plan, okay! She added that that is kind of the issue sometimes with some of the plans, that we get to a point where we are held to something that we maybe cannot follow, or we don't have the same direction. Williams commented that we then impose on ourselves, and it is not a minimum that is required, we have added a level that we don't need to add, so we want to meet the minimum requirements but not overburden ourselves with things that are not required. Ellis said that totally agrees that you want a plan that you are following and assessing otherwise there is no reason to have the plan. She added that she gets that we need to continue to move forward on it, but we still want to make sure that it is something that we have all agreed to.

Grasser stated that he thinks that part of the issue there is, when you go back to the engineering comments; we made philosophical comments last December, and what they are looking for is, we need to do measurables, right, but can we do measurables of things that we are basically, as much as we can, already doing instead of coming up with different sets of measurables. He said that the comments that are actually in the report here from engineering are suggesting measurables that they think they can do in various categories, that are not going to take a lot of additional manpower and effort, and one of the things they asked for on these things, and he calls this a fiscal note, is how much manpower is it going to take to accomplish the different things because, again, if we can measure them fairly easily, then let's go after those; but we also need to know from an operational standpoint as we are putting together City budgets, if we now have a task that takes 2000 man-hours to do in a year, that translates into a new person, or something to that effect, and that goes back to the issue of are we approving these things in modules, okay, on the screen it talks about things that we are going to do on an annual basis every two years, every five years, and again it takes x-amount of manpower, so we are not going to approve a module and commit to ourselves to a module when we don't know what all those measurables and follow-ons are going to end up being, and that is what they are struggling with. He stated that he knows from a planning standpoint we like to approve one before we move to the next, but then they get caught with the "I know we approved all these goals and objectives previously, so now we can't go back and change them, and that is what they are reacting to, is the apparent inability to go back and reconsider once new information is available at the end", so that is what they are struggling with when we talk about are we approving a module, or have we had consensus to move ahead, that we reserve the right to comment further,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

because should we find, again, those things that look like they are going to be a really big issue in terms of manpower or dollars, we have to deal with it at a local level too, so that is kind of what the crux is of what we are all dealing with here, and we are making comments, and are trying to move productively forward, but he looks at the bullet points we have here, even in the staff report, and as Mr. Kuharenko said, we put these in in December, these don't appear to him to be large, onerous things that need an extensive amount of response, these are recommendations of things, and it's March 14th and we haven't gotten anything back, and quite frankly we feel like that burden of delay is being put on the Engineering Department, and that is the way they feel the comments are coming through and, quietly frankly, they are taking exception to that because they are one of the few, Engineering and Planning, one of the few that are spending the time to try to do through this and introduce comments, they are trying to move forward in a productive away, so that is where they are trying to go but those are their reservations when talking about a couple of these different items.

Viafara responded that Mr. Grasser's point is taken and will be heeded, so thank you for the insight, and you will see the responses to them.

Grasser asked if this is just information at this point, and will we talk about some of the philosophical aspects of it. Viafara responded that that is why he would rather suggest if you could please make sure that we get something for the report that we can insert for the Executive Policy Board, or submit another report, it is up to you but as it is this is what we thought would go to the Executive Policy Board, but your comments, now, need to be considered by basically making them available to others to appreciate your insight. Grasser asked if anything further was needed from the Technical Advisory Committee. Viafara responded that nothing more is required, but added safety clarification, in part also, the Engineering Department has been privy of all this back and forth, the needs for addressing some of those elements of consideration so then whatever results happen at the end they are aware of these things coming. Grasser commented that they have kind of, quite frankly, purposely not done a lot of comments because they are also concerned about the frustration and the manpower it takes every time we do so they have actually, since December, haven't provided much of anything, he doesn't believe, in terms of additional comments, and again they don't want to spend their time worrying about things that don't amount to amount to anything, and yet they don't want to approve something that later on does turn into something, so they want to see the whole package so that the comments can all be put into the proper context. Viafara responded that they will see that.

Information only.

MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE

a. Revenue Forecast

Kouba reported that we put forward, at the Special Technical Advisory Committee meeting in February, some of the areas we are looking at; and that we are still waiting to hear something back on. She commented that she knows that the NDDOT is drafting a document for all MPOs to follow on how to forecast revenue for their MTPs. She added that we are also trying to determine how we are going to handle the additional sales tax in Grand Forks as well. She said

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

that the group also agreed to a \$510,000 amount for HSIP funding for the North Dakota side per year as a base. Grasser commented that the report says \$510,000 just for HSIP, that is competitive through the whole State, right. Kuharenko responded that HSIP is competitive, but he believes there is about \$6 million available annually. Kouba added that that is just a base per year, but it doesn't necessarily mean we will get that amount ever year, it will depend on how it is distributed. Grasser said, then, that what we are saying is that, long-term average, Grand Forks might see \$500,000 a year. Kuharenko stated that, and Mr. Johnson might be able to chime in on this, but he believes we have about \$6 million dollars available annually, at the State level. Grasser said, then, that supposedly, over time, would be in the range of \$500,000.

Kouba stated that this is what we have come up with for right now, as the base per year, that way we can figure long-term; and we do understand the carry-over concept, but other than that we are still getting input for the revenue forecast process.

Information only.

b. Universe Of Projects

Kouba reported that we presented our current list of projects at the Special Technical Advisory Committee meeting for review and comments, and she knows that we have received some additional projects, but we want to make sure that there aren't any others that we need to be aware of for the next few years.

Kuharenko commented that he thinks that for them, one thing they are kind of waiting on is trying to find out what is the revenue model, what inflation rates should they be looking at for the federal funding coming in. He stated that they have been working on it, but they are waiting to see what kind of revenue forecast they should be looking at, what kind of inflation factors we should be using on construction project so that they can get a better feeling for what they should have in there.

Laesch asked how far out are we looking at for projects. Kouba responded we are looking out to 2045. Laesch commented that they can share a 10-year plan, but beyond that are we just looking at major projects beyond that. Kouba responded that that is probably be what they will have available for us, but if you know of any other projects that might be beyond ten years, please let us know.

Grasser said, then, on the next update; when we talk about the transportation system and the list of plans, you've got the Interstate, the State Highways, the NHS, major arterials, minor arterials, collector streets; are they trying to get a local, they clearly aren't going to allow us to get all those things, so when we talk about a universe of projects, it is easier for us to start identifying the big ones on like the NHS system, it is much harder when you start going down to the lower classified streets. He added that the a lot of the additional sales tax revenue for Grand Forks will be dedicated towards the local street network, so does that put it on book or off book from the MPO; and he will be honest that he doesn't think the MPO should be involved in some of those truly local street projects; so he thinks focusing on the NHS and some of those higher classified streets makes a lot of sense, but he struggles with creating a list. He

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

added that, as an example at the local budget level, he doesn't even get a list of street projects for the next year, because with a spring like this, we are rearranging priorities right now as we speak, reacting to Mother Nature and deterioration, so producing a list can give a false sense of knowing what the crystal ball will show.

Kouba commented that we are kind of the defining mark. She stated that, you do understand that there are some classified roads that are considered more local than anything else, but there is the possibility that federal funds might be applied to them; there are some collector streets as well, so we don't want to get caught flat-footed and not have it included on the list in the event that would occur.

Grasser reported that, just some information, what they do on the local side, when we do these outside projections, is we put them in categories, and the MPO has done some of that too with short-range, mid-range, and long-range projects; and sometimes they will just say, like with a traffic signal, to be determined because we don't know if it is going to be at this intersection or that intersection, when its six or ten years down the line, but they have the sense based on past history that we will need something someplace, so, again, without defining it as a specific spot, we can still define it as a fiscal likely need.

Kouba commented that in the Universe of Projects list that was handed out, there's lots of those kind of various locations city-wide. Grasser stated that he likes that, and he encourages, where we can define them lets define them, but, especially when we get out in those out years it is really hard to know what is going to be happening.

Kuharenko said that he is also thinking that with those performance measures that we are going to have coming up, particularly on, we got on the Interstate System, we got on the NHS System, and he would think that a lot of the federal fund will be focused on the NHS System, so he thinks that is probably where they are going to be focusing a lot of the attention.

Kouba stated that, again, this is Universe of Projects, and we obviously know that not all are going to get funded now, or even in the near ten years or so, but it makes sense to have a placeholder in place for them just in case funding becomes available.

Information only.

c. Future Bridge Study Status

Kouba reported that the MPO held a Special Joint Future Bridge Location meeting in February, and unfortunately not very many City Council members from either side attended. She stated that the purpose of the meeting was to try to determine whether or not we should continue studying all four locations, or cut any of them out. She said that the decision was to keep all four locations and to take the issue to the respective City Councils for their input.

Kouba commented that this will be submitted to the East Grand Forks City Council on Monday. Ellis reported that they are going to recommend to continue moving forward with the report with 24th and 32nd as the local options, as 47th Avenue and Merrifield don't meet the local traffic

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

needs. Kouba stated that they will probably keep Merrifield just because it would be a regional location.

Kouba said that Mr. Haugen is also working on setting up a similar meeting with the Grand Forks City Council to submit this to them for their input as well.

Information only.

d. PM2 And PM3 Information

Viafara reported that there is further information on this item on the website at:
www.theforksmmpo.com.

Viafara referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and went over it briefly.

Viafara commented that PM2 is the measures of performance for pavement and bridges on the NHS System. He explained that pavement includes anything on the Interstate and Non-Interstate Roadways; and bridges are only those on the classified roadways.

Presentation ensued.

BRIDGES:

Grasser said that he isn't familiar with this, but they get a bridge inspection report, and he thinks the last time they talked about doing those inspections on a four year cycle, which is a different issue, but is the NBI rating, do you get to that through the inspections that you are currently doing, or is this a different thing. Bail responded that the NBI ratings are stated when you do your bridge inspections, it is part of the National Bridge Inventory. Grasser said, then, that you will get that when you are done with the bridge inspection. Bail responded that that is correct, and added that they have to be included with any bridge inspection that is done anywhere. Grasser said that he is just trying to figure out if that is something that they are already getting or if it is something new.

Viafara commented that we have a number of those bridges for North Dakota and a number of those bridges for a portion Minnesota; with the numbers and the ratings that we have received so they are available in case you want them. He went over the calculation formula briefly.

Grasser asked if, on the Minnesota side, they are correlating their bridge expectation with the level of funding that you are giving to them. Laesch responded that they are estimating whether their bridge performances are going to lead us on the funding. Grasser said, then, that you are trying to make those two match anyway. Laesch responded that they had, prior to their recommendations coming out, they had to set up some goals, prior to that, so he thinks their goals are more ridged than what the feds came out with so he isn't sure if they will be adjusting theirs to hit that minimum instead, or what their philosophy will be from this point on.
Presentation continued.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

PAVEMENT:

Grasser referred to a slide illustrating pavement calculation data, and stated that Grand Forks has a number of NHS Systems that are posted AT 40 mph, and not more; even Washington has some that are posted 35 mph and some 40 mph, so are you going to use different criteria on the same roadway, or can it be less than or equal to 40 mph; you may want to think about that.

TRAVEL TIME RELIABILITY:

Viafara explained that this applies mainly to freight systems. He added that we don't have a greenhouse situation here because this is attainable, so we don't do an air analysis condition.

Presentation continued.

Williams asked if, when going through all these calculations, is there any type of thing as far as miles per hour or anything like that is easy to relate to. She said that most of this stuff is all, it would actually be ridiculous to do some of these calculations in our area when she can drive, during the peak hour, from one side of town to the other in less than fifteen minutes, so is there a simple way of going through this and saying that if the average speed is so much, or if you can get from here to here in a certain length of time that it is acceptable. Viafara responded that he would defer to Mr. Johnson to provide some insights.

Johnson asked for clarification on Ms. Williams' question. Williams clarified, stating that, on the freight reliability calculations; she can see going through all these calculations, but is there a certain mile per hour in the peak time that is acceptable, or a time/distance measure that you can get from here to here in this amount of time it is acceptable, because that is a lot of calculation in a small area when the whole city is less than four miles wide. Johnson responded that he doesn't know if he will be able to provide exactly the answer you want to hear. He said what he knows about the reliability stuff is that it is mainly about distances; that it isn't so much about the details from one roadway to the next, but more about the level of reliability and measures today and that if it continues at the same level of reliability, then it is reliable; but if it is congested, at long as it is reliably congested, it is considered reliable.

Williams asked if they were going to set a level of service to strive for or something like that; like as long as it is functioning at B or better during the peak it is okay. Johnson responded that in terms of travel or reliability they wouldn't.

Grasser asked Mr. Johnson if he knew when they might be having any of these targets coming out on the North Dakota side. Johnson responded that on the pavement, bridge, and reliability; he believes the timeline for the State needing to notify the Feds of their targets is May 27th, but they actually don't officially have to report them to the Feds until October; so they shared some of this information with the MPOs, in terms of the reliability and the pavement, but the bridge issue is something they are still working on getting out to the MPOs.

Kouba commented that, with this information, she believes that once the State has set their targets, then we have another 180 days to review and determine whether or not we will be

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

setting specific targets and measures for our MPO area, or if we will support the State's targets and measures. She added that right now the States are the ones that will end up with any kind of penalties; but if we, as an MPO area decide to have targets and measures we will not face any kind of penalties for not measuring them, it is just in relation to what the State does; so, once again, you have put out there in the past what kind of financial backing will we get if we are just backing the State, or if we have our own targets. She stated that we will have more discussion on this issue next month.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. Minnesota FHWA T.I.P. Guidance On Incorporating Performance Measures

Kouba reported that because of the incorporation of the performance measures, Minnesota FHWA has given us T.I.P. guidance on incorporating those performance measures and; while they aren't saying we have to do it, they are strongly encouraging us to make those changes within the written body of our T.I.P.s beforehand. She added that, once again, we do have our deadline to do this, at the end of May, but could have to do it sooner if we need to do any amendments to our T.I.P. prior to that.

Williams commented that she thinks there was a motion on this at the last Technical Advisory Committee to not do anything with this until we are absolutely required to do so. Kouba stated that that is correct.

Information only.

b. NDDOT Advised To Hold On Underpass Study

Kouba reported that at the last Technical Advisory Committee meeting we forwarded a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board to amend the MPO Work Program to include a Washington Street Underpass Study; however since then the NDDOT has requested that we hold off on that as they are still working out some issues with it.

Williams asked why they are asking us to hold off on this study. Kouba responded that there is an issue of whether or not the MPO can actually do the study, or if the State will have to do it, so they asked that we hold off amending our Work Program until that is clarified.

Information only.

c. Add Downtown Transportation Planning To FY2018 UPWP

Kouba reported that this item, too, is on hold as to whether or not the MPO is going to participate in it or not. She said that they are working with Meredith Richards and Keith Lund on this item, and will update the Technical Advisory Committee once it has all been ironed out.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 14th, 2018**

d. 2018 Annual Work Program Project Update

Kouba reported that the monthly work program update is included in the packet for your review.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BAIL, SECONDED BY LAESCH, TO ADJOURN THE MARCH 14TH, 2018,
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 3:00 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager