

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2018
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen Chairman, called the April 11th, 2018, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:32 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Ryan Brooks, Grand Forks Planning; Jesse Kadrmas, NDDOT-Local District; Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Nels Christianson, BNSF; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; and Ryan Riesinger, Grand Forks Airport Authority.

Absent were: Dustin Lang, Brad Gengler, Stephanie Halford, Darren Laesch, Steve Emery, Lane Magnuson, Richard Audette, Paul Konickson, Ali Rood, Stacey Hanson, Nick West, Jane Williams, Mike Yavarow, 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.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF MINNESOTA SIDE DRAFT FY2019-2022 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that included in the packets were the tables and project listings from FY2019 out to FY2022. He stated that there were no real changes on the street side from what is in the current T.I.P., but there were some changes on the transit side.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2018**

Haugen referred to the information in the packets and went over it briefly. He pointed out that there were more hours of service and more miles being run so the cost increased, and is being reflected here. He stated that initially MnDOT was funding the first two years of that, now the T.I.P. is reflecting that MnDOT will continue funding that service additional years as well.

Haugen commented that there are also some capitol purchases shown that MnDOT will be assisting with the purchase of some items that benefit the system widely, but physically will be located on the North Dakota side.

Haugen reported that we did advertise for a public hearing that will occur at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting next Wednesday.

Haugen stated that the District and himself did reconcile their A.T.I.P. and this T.I.P. to ensure they match.

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY BAIL, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE DRAFT MINNESOTA SIDE FY2019-2022 T.I.P., AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Ellis, Bail, Brooks, Johnson, Kuharenko, Reisinger, Kadrmas, Bergman, and Christianson.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Emery, Hanson, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, Lang, Halford, Laesch, Williams, Yavarow, West, and Sanders.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF SELECTION OF CONSULTANT FOR CITY OF EAST GRAND FORKS' ADA RIGHT-OF-WAY TRANSITION PLAN

Kouba reported that back in January the MPO received a request from the City of East Grand Forks to assist them with their ADA Transition Plan. She stated that we amended the project into our Work Program, and then released an RFQ.

Kouba commented that we received two proposals and the Selection Committee met, interviewed, and chose SRF Consulting Group. She added that they did come in under budget and agreed to all the tasks we requested be done, so staff is requesting the Technical Advisory Committee approve forwarding a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board that they approve the execution of a contract with SRF Consulting Group to assist with the City of East Grand Forks' ADA Right-Of-Way Transition Plan.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE CHAIRMAN AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH SRF CONSULTING GROUP TO ASSIST WITH THE CITY OF EAST GRAND FORKS' ADA RIGHT-OF-WAY TRANSITION PLAN.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2018

Voting Aye: *Ellis, Bail, Brooks, Johnson, Kuharenko, Reisinger, Kadrmas, Bergman, and Christianson.*

Voting Nay: *None.*

Abstain: *None.*

Absent: *Emery, Hanson, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, Lang, Halford, Laesch, Williams, Yavarow, West, and Sanders.*

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF NORTH DAKOTA SIDE FTA 5339 AND 5310 CANDIDATE PROJECTS

Kouba reported that back in February the NDDOT, along with the MPO, released solicitation for projects for the FTA 5339 and 5310 Programs.

Kouba stated that Cities Area Transit is the transit provider for the area, and if anyone has any projects they would like considered for either program they have to go through them, they can't submit their own requests.

Kouba commented that for the 5339 program there were five projects submitted: 1) Medium Duty Bus (35-foot); 2) Digital Signs for Transit Center; 3) Destination Signs for inside the buses; 4) Manlift; and 5) Bus Stop Way Signage (this is a last minute inclusion and will go before the City Council for approval on April 16th).

Kouba stated that for the 5310 program there were two projects submitted: 1) Mobility Manager and 2) Replacement Mini Van.

Kouba said that these all fall within the realm of our Transit Development Plan, and staff is requesting the Technical Advisory Committee approve forwarding a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board that they approve all of the projects as being consistent with the Transit Development Plan.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE NORTH DAKOTA SIDE FTA 5339 AND 5310 CANDIDATE PROJECTS, AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN, AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: *Ellis, Bail, Brooks, Johnson, Kuharenko, Reisinger, Kadrmas, Bergman, and Christianson.*

Voting Nay: *None.*

Abstain: *None.*

Absent: *Emery, Hanson, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, Lang, Halford, Laesch, Williams, Yavarow, West, and Sanders.*

Haugen reported that one other thing, when we talk about 5339 grants, and the projects, he would ask Mr. Bergman to share some exciting news he received.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2018**

Bergman stated that on April 2nd we were notified that the City was receiving 5339 funding for a bus and the bus facilities in the amount of \$3.6 million. He said that in figuring out the dollar amount we got now, along with previous funds that we were going to add on to fix the buildings, we should have a total of \$4.88 million dollars. He commented that they originally requested \$8.6 million, but this still turned out very well for us.

Haugen added that along with that award we are going to have to make some amendments to our Transit Development Plan and also to our T.I.P.; and he hopes that Mr. Bergman and Ms. Kouba have been talking about that. Bergman responded that they have had one discussion, but he has been working on the RFQ for architects to do the work on the bus facilities. He explained that the original contract for work on the bus facilities, which was approved eight years ago, expired three years ago, and he didn't think we were going to be getting any funding so he placed it on the back burner in October, and then all of this occurred, so he has been working on a new one.

Haugen asked if they weren't also hoping to start construction this season. Bergman responded they were. Haugen said, then, that there is typically a sixty-day process for the MPO to amend adding that, so keep that in mind. Bergman said that they will start the process next week.

Haugen commented that as we discussed last month, and we will have more discussion on the fact that there are different timelines that kick in, or requirements that we have to meet; and obviously we talked about the Safety Performance Measures, but there are some Transit Performance Measures that kick in this fall, so we need to be aware of what is required when, and we may have discussions next month where we trying to address everything at once, but we do know we have to make amendments to our current plan and our current T.I.P. to accommodate your award.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT UPWP AMENDMENT FOR CITY OF GRAND FORKS' DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

Haugen reported that last month we discussed that we would be amending our work program to get things lined up to do some transportation planning for Downtown Grand Forks, and to a lesser extent East Grand Forks. He stated that the first thing the staff report irons out is our actual funding that we have available for the FY2018 calendar year.

Brooks commented that the City of Grand Forks is going to ask that this item be tabled. He explained that staff met and it is his understanding that they aren't quite ready to have this go forward yet as they are still in the process of hiring the consultant, so in talking with Mr. Grasser and Ms. Richards it was decided that they may end up doing the project all in-house with the current selection, potentially, so, if for some reason that doesn't work out they will probably come back next month with this, but for now they would like to have this item be tabled.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE TABLING THIS ITEM FOR ONE MONTH.

Haugen asked, for discussion purposes, if they could separate out some of it because it includes the cleaning up of our actual funding amounts, and also something about getting things lined up

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2018**

for amending our Street and Highway contract for additional bridge work. Brooks responded that he was just talking about tabling the Grand Forks Downtown Transportation Planning project.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE PULLING THEIR ORIGINAL MOTION.

Haugen reported that the first item; and we'll separate this into three things; so the first one deals with cleaning up our revenue, the second one deals with the potential downtown transportation project, and the third one deals with setting aside funds for a possible amendment to our Street and Highway contract.

Haugen commented that first, we originally were identifying \$610,000 being available out of the FY2018 Consolidated Planning Grant, but in working with Mr. Johnson and Minnesota we have now identified that the true estimate should be \$514,000. He explained that the previous year's, because we were allowed to use FY2014 dollars, it delayed the use of FY2017 dollars, and that total is actually, after audits and end of the year, \$329,000; so the first thing we would be asking is to amend our revenue to make it reflect these new funding sources and their dollar values. He said that the end result, as you can see, is about a \$20,000 decrease from what we had previously thought out work program could contain this year.

Haugen stated that the third one is, as we discussed with the last agenda item, involves the possibility that we might be tasked to do an additional scope-of-work; and since we were potentially doing a work program amendment we wanted to address all of the things in the work program at the same time; so we were originally setting aside so much dollars for the downtown planning, and the remaining dollars, which is around \$66,000 was going to be put into a line item for the Amendment #2 – Street and Highway Plan to develop with those bridge issues, and you see it reflected in the table at the end, \$60,000.

Haugen said that we don't have a precise scope of work yet for that Amendment #2 to the Street and Highway Plan, but it is going to be focusing on going to the next step with the bridge analyses; so far we have only done a traffic impact analysis. He stated that the next step, depending on which locations we are including, would be the touch down points, updating the cost estimates, and those items we spelled out in the scope of work amendment that we would be processed through the Technical Advisory Committee and the Executive Policy Board, hopefully next month, but this gets this out of the way and in our work program and the budget that is all identified as to what we need to do to place our dollars at for 2018.

Haugen commented that the last thing is not something that is part of a motion, but just to highlight and bring to your attention that a couple of months ago we did amend the work program for the Washington Underpass Study, and he just received word earlier this week from the NDDOT that they continue to want us to hold on that study, so we aren't doing any activities to further that project along.

Haugen said that, based on conversation a motion to approve the recommended Amendment #4 subject to striking out the Grand Forks Downtown Planning activity. Kuharenko asked if it

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2018**

would also include not striking out the U.S. #2/U.S. #81 scope of work. Haugen responded it would.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE RECOMMENDED AMENDMENT #4 SUBJECT TO EXCLUSION OF THE GRAND FORKS DOWNTOWN PLANNING ACTIVITY.

Voting Aye: Ellis, Bail, Brooks, Johnson, Kuharenko, Reisinger, Kadrmias, Bergman, and Christianson.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Emery, Hanson, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, Lang, Halford, Laesch, Williams, Yavarow, West, and Sanders.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF MINNESOTA MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING ON PROCESS FOR PERFORMANCE BASED PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING, AS SUBMITTED

Haugen reported that the FAST-ACT requires that the MPO, the State DOT and the Transit Operator reach an agreement on how the performance-based planning measures will be processed through all three entities. He said that this agreement is a separate agreement from another agreement that most of you, who are long time Technical Advisory Committee members are familiar with that lays out transportation planning, general for responsibilities by party, T.I.P. responsibilities, work program responsibilities, special study responsibilities, that is a separate document and that has to be updated as well, but FAST requires a May 27th deadline for this particular agreement to be in place.

Haugen explained that Minnesota has been working with its MPOs and transit operators drafting up the MOU. He stated that it is a two-part document; the MOU itself is a one-page document with signatures, and it is an MOU so it isn't very enforceable through court or anything of that fashion, but it does require the signature of the transit operator, which on the Minnesota side is the City of East Grand Forks, the MPO and the MnDOT.

Haugen commented that a follow-up document is meant to be the one document that pertains to procedures. It is separate from the MOU that has to go around for signatures, but it is referenced, and as you can see the original draft was in August, and an update done in November, and a further update in March. He said that it tries to identify all of the performance measures, etc. that are required, and also tries to identify which agency has what responsibilities in connection with data requirements.

Haugen stated that from a pure technical point of view, because PM1 or Safety, is the one that is already in place this MOU could only address PM1, but there is no real unknowns with PM2 and PM3, as to the process, so they are included in here as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2018**

Haugen reported that he knows that the City of East Grand Forks is vetting it through their process concurrently with the MPO, and actually discussed it last night at their meeting. Ellis commented that it will go for consent next Tuesday.

Haugen commented that MnDOT is asking us to get this done sooner than later, so with that it is a template that all the other MPOs and transit operators across Minnesota are signing off on. He added that we have worked through and identified any concerns we had and they have been addressed so staff is recommending approval of this MOU, and would ask that the Technical Advisory Committee forward a similar recommendation.

Kuharenko asked if this is something that the City of Grand Forks will be looking at from the NDDOT as well. Johnson responded that they are working on it. He said that he was trying really hard to get it ready for today's meeting, but you will have to consider it at our May meeting instead.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE MINNESOTA MOU ON PROCESS FOR PERFORMANCE BASED PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING, AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Ellis, Bail, Brooks, Johnson, Kuharenko, Reisinger, Kadrmas, Kuharenko, and Christianson.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Emery, Hanson, Rood, Gengler, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, Lang, Halford, Laesch, Williams, Yavarow, West, and Sanders.

MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE

a. Universe of Projects

Haugen reported that they have been shopping their spreadsheet around, adding that it is a rather opposing spreadsheet, but they have been able to get some responses back and have done some cleaning up and consolidation of projects.

Haugen stated that they categorized the projects into subcategories; we obviously have projects already programmed in our T.I.P., those are right around \$70 million dollars, because we identified existing plus committed street network, or as housing and employment needs to be located in greenfields, they need to have streets to them to model, so we are identify another \$65 million dollars worth of projects that are needed between now and 2045 to support that growth.

Haugen said that they went through the Safety planning documents and identified all the projects that are being recommended in those documents on both sides of the river; and there are \$20 million dollars there. He added that some of this, almost half, is already programmed.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2018**

He said that they also have some questions on the Minnesota side as to what exactly some of the projects are identifying, and they know that they are trying to identify them for us.

Haugen referred to the Multi-modal Streetscape and Studies should actually should have a higher value, but it is reflecting the two Urban Grants candidate projects, it is kind of where the new North Dakota Urban Grant, or Mainstreet Program, is being placed in, and so far we have only identified the two requests that were submitted, and then we also have the one request for the 47th Avenue Capacity Issue NEPA document, so this value should be closer to \$4.5 million dollars.

Haugen commented that the State of Good Repair is basically all the projects that were identified in the 2040 plan that aren't already programmed or completed, so as a baseline we are carrying forward those projects we prioritized in the current MTP, in this category of State of Good Repair.

Haugen said that the biggest chunk are what we are terming discretionary or illustrative projects, projects that have been identified in the past, projects that were identified from specific corridor studies or other studies that have been done; and you can see that almost half a billion dollars is shown for this category, for a total of three quarter of a billion dollars in projects.

Haugen referred to the tables in the packet and went the information briefly. He asked that everyone please give this information another look as we don't want to miss any projects.

Kuharenko commented that, in discussing the State of Good Repair projects, he knows that one of the things he sent an e-mail on last week or the week before was regarding the available federal funding, and that they thought that a lot of that should be focused on the NHS system; especially because of the performance measures that we've got they can come up with a list for those projects based on the NHS system, and he can get that out to everyone; but in regard to the rest being federally eligible, that would be a much larger task and it is something that where, even this past year Cherry Street pretty much fell apart on us, so that is a lot more difficult to do and he would think that they can get something more focused on the NHS system, so that is probably where we should end up focusing a lot of our federal dollars on, is on that system. Haugen responded that there are two problems with that; the first one is the North Dakota funding doesn't fund the NHS versus the Non-NHS, it funds regional versus urban, and there are a lot fewer miles on the Urban system that is part of the NHS, that the revenue that is being offered by North Dakota is too much to maintain the Non-State owned NHS. He stated that the second issue is that we do have to show the feds that their federal aid system is being maintained and operated in a state of good repair, so functionally classified collectors and above should have some work done that gives the State and the Feds ease of mind that their prior investments are being maintained.

Kuharenko said that he would counter on that a little bit on the use of federal funds by saying that he agrees with you that the urban road section of the NHS is small in comparison to the regional, however in looking at the projects that they requested in this last go around, to reconstruct Columbia, the overpass and University, the current condition of the northern part of Columbia, and then getting into a more robust maintenance cycle on Columba and Washington,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2018**

south of 32nd, as well as following up with their traffic signals and that sort of thing, that a lot of the federal funding is focused more on the NHS system than on the rest of the classified system; and from the performance measures that we have currently, as far as he is aware, that is more geared towards the NHS and the Interstate System bridges, than necessarily the rest of the classified road network, and even though it is federally eligible, the available federal funds would tend to have it more focused on the NHS system than the rest of the remaining classified road network.

Haugen stated, then, that we will have to come up with a balance. He added that we can't neglect the rest of the federal aid system without some way of assuring that it is being maintained, and that five years from now, or ten years from now we aren't going to be saying "boy, we missed the boat and now these other federal aid systems are bad"

Johnson commented that Mr. Haugen is correct. He added that the other risk you run is that federal funding might move in the future to only fund NHS, right now you've got money available to fund all of those federally classified roadways, so you don't want to completely walk away from them.

Haugen said that we found in our current 2040 plan that our State Highways are in horrible shape and need a lot of funding. He stated that there is a balance that we have to come up with, we can't totally not address the Non-NHS Federal Aid Roadways, and we are required to focus on the NHS system, but we can't focus on it by ignoring the rest of the federal aid system. He added that we also have some State Highways that aren't even on an NHS system that we have to deal with as well; and we do know that some of your recently raised sales tax are currently addressing some of the federal aid roadways that were previously identified in the state of good repair list from the 2040 plan, so we aren't saying that their being neglected, we just have to show our State and Federal partners that they are being maintained.

Kuharenko commented that that is one situation where it can end up varying quite a lot from year to year, that's why they want to focus on classified road system versus the local roadways. He said that he knows this year they are hitting a number of local roadways that they had petitions on with that sales tax money, and they are also hitting some classified roadway systems as well, but that can vary from year to year and so that point in time we start getting into how much is actually being spent on the classified roadway system versus the local, so that is another balance they have to play as well.

Haugen said, then, that we can assume here that there we are going into program periods; short, medium and long, so we can assume that we have an annual base of "x" dollars being available, but also know that our revenue likely won't grow at the same rate as the expenditures grow, so, last time what we did was to put all of year of expenditures at the mid-point of the short, medium and long; and our revenue was placed not at the mid-year, but as an annual growth, and within those periods that was the total that was available.

Kuharenko asked if we ever got a determination as to what we are using for revenue inflation. Johnson responded we haven't yet. Haugen added that we did on the Minnesota side. He said that right now every fourth year is capped at \$860,000, without assuming any increase. He

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2018**

added that on the trunk highway side in Minnesota, they have identified a third project, but they only go out ten years with their identification of projects, and previously we had two projects identified and the third they have identified is in 2021 we are doing the west bound lane of U.S. #2 and U.S. #220, and in 2028 they are doing the east bound lane of U.S. #2; other than that the Minnesota funds can't reasonably forecast any additional element to the MPO study area. He said that we can identify a lot of competitive opportunities to federal or state fund on the Minnesota side, but we can't assume an allotment of those to come in as new projects.

Haugen said that, where he was going with his previous point is that with the ebbs and flows that you talk about, sometimes the classified system sometimes just local systems, but we should be able to assume a reasonable amount would be going towards the classified system, and address it that way instead of, again, trying to plug everything into a specific year with a specific cost, we are trying to YOY at the mid of a time period cost to acknowledge that it is an estimate and there is a lot of range that is going on to that estimate. Kuharenko commented that he was looking more for if we had a percentage of inflation that we are using for revenue, and what percentage of inflation are you using for construction costs.

Haugen stated that what we are trying to do on the Main Street Program is, there is some unlikelihood we will get a grant every year, but it is likely that as this continues out several years, we should get some success and get grants, whether it is one every three years or every four years; then every five years we would agree to a reasonable forecast assumption and go with that for the next five years, or if we find out it is grossly in error we can make the changes mid-stream, so it is important that we identify all of the federal aid roadways in our study area.

Haugen said that they are talking with the counties. He added that, historically, both counties have not enjoyed, have not utilized a lot of federal aid on their system within the MPO area, but that is now changing so we also need to bring them into the mix; and we have had recent discussions with them to get that done. He said that, again, he is asking everyone to review the lists and help us identify what those projects might be and the timeline of when they should occur.

Riesinger commented that he noticed that the airport intersection is listed in there in the 2030-2045 Safety Operations table with a current cost of \$1,722,000 for an intersection reconfiguration/ITS improvements; do you know more specifically what that all is referencing. Haugen responded that what they did with that specific listing is the actual local roads safety improvement program identifies an R-Cut at a cost of \$1,000,000, but our U.S. #2 Study recommendation is that Staggered-T at the \$1,722,000 cost so he believes the description is still generic, but the dollar value show is the highest of the two; so it is identified with the higher dollar value and as an intersection reconfiguration, not specifically identifying either an R-Cut or a Staggered-T, but the value is the higher value. He added that he believes that North Dakota is about to do the cabinet work there, and he thinks part of their decision is to put in speed minder signs ahead of time, and then do some modifications to the locations of the flashing lights, so some of the ITS that is referenced there is being done probably sooner than one thinks.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2018**

b. PM3

Haugen reported that they are skipping PM2 as they are still waiting for information. He said that the PM3 is reliability; PM3 is the, and he thinks the Mr. Viafara went through that with you last month, the calculations, the details of how it is calculated and he believes you also made reference that there is now a tool that is available that does all that work for everyone so you just need to go in and download that information, and that is what these maps are showing, but the one thing that the tool is trying to clean up still is this issue of using the pre-FAST NHS system, and we are trying to do a PM3 using the current NHS system, and so for the States, in their first effort in identifying targets they are going to struggle with that issue because not all NHS routes are being loaded up in the tool, and there are some Non-NHS that are being ported out of the tool; however because the MPO has 180 days that issue will be resolved by mid-summer and we should be able then to rely on the tool having a correct NTS Route System in place.

Haugen commented that another thing it allows is the 2017 year that these follow up pages are recording out of was a transition year from a contractor that was collecting the data one way to a new contractor that is collecting data, so we will have more consistent data when we go through the effort of identify what our targets may be.

Haugen referred to slides of three maps and went over them briefly.

Kuharenko said that he has a question on the Non-Interstate reliability portion; does that take, if we end up having a year-long project, is that taken into account into these calculations or is that going to possibly ding us somewhere down the road. Haugen responded that when we set the targets we need to account for that and set our targets knowing that it will ding for that year if we have a lot of construction, our travel will be reduced. He added that it is a two or four-year target, so one year is softened out over a long period of time.

Haugen stated that on the PM3 it is being reported out as all the MPO area, it isn't being reported out on the Minnesota side only, so when you look at the State of Minnesota data where we talk about interstate they also report I-29 for Grand Forks/East Grand Forks and I-29/I-94 for the North Dakota side for Fargo/Moorhead; and so whereas in the safety we are between two states PM3, utilizing this tool we are in the same boat.

Haugen commented that this tool is also collecting data for the Non-NHS Routes, the State of Minnesota is purchasing the ability to utilize and access that data, and it will be giving all MPOS access to that data as well. He added that it will be similar to how North Dakota purchases the travel demand model network, and allows us to have access to it, so what is free and available on the website right now is this NHS system, what MnDOT is purchasing will be available to us at some point in the near future and will be the non-NHS routes.

Johnson stated that one thing he would add is, and most of you already know this, but there is a common misconception that they have heard when dealing with this reliability, that it not the same as congestion; you can have reliable congestion, so it is how reliable is that facility working on a day to day basis, if it is bumper to bumper every day, that is reliable.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2018**

Haugen commented that there is no built-in penalty if you don't meet the target. He added that the State PM3 does need a decision by May 20th, and that starts our clock for the 180-day period we are allotted. He asked if everyone recalls with the safety performance target, he forgets which, but one State reported theirs a couple of days earlier than the other State, and therefore we had to make a decision on one side of the river on one date, and on another date on the other side of the river, so they have since clarified that our 180 days start on the day the last State makes its decision. Johnson asked who provided that direction. Haugen responded that it is in the Federal Highway Headquarter Q&A.

Information only.

c. Future Bridges

Haugen reported that we went through the task of trying to identify how four locations benefited the local traffic impact and presented it at a meeting of the MPO Board, to which the Technical Advisory Committee, the City Councils from both cities, and others were invited, and the Board made a recommendation that staff go to each individual agency for their recommendations. He said that East Grand Forks is recommending focusing on just 24th and 32nd Avenues and Grand Forks has formally asked us to keep all four options on the table, and also consider adding 17th Avenue as well. He added that he is meeting with Polk County next Tuesday and Grand Forks County hasn't yet scheduled the agenda item yet, although it has been requested several times.

Haugen commented that just to give a recap on where we are with 24th, 32nd, 47th, and Merrifield, when we were at the Grand Forks City Council meeting they really wanted to know what impacts an interchange on 47th Avenue would have, so we said we would run that model. He explained that the reason they didn't run it in the past was, by definition an Interchange on Interstate is to serve regional movement not local movement, but we did it anyway. He said that when they ran it they found that the interchange operates just as the other interchanges do, there isn't a strong correlation between interstate traffic and new southern bridge locations, however Merrifield is the one exception to that general rule.

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

Presentation continued.

Haugen stated that our next steps, if we are truly going tackle these, and keep all four crossings and maybe add another crossing, would be to resurrect all of our previous work we did after the flood, and update it so it reflects today's costs; revisit how the bridge profiles were done, do the actual benefit/cost calculations, etc.

Haugen said that we have already recommended an amendment to the Work Program, so we aren't being delayed by a need to do it later. He added that he already identified to Kimley-Horn the possibility of the scope of work and he provided them with the information we generated from the 2030 plan, but we do have to remember that the have a draft by early

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 11th, 2018**

October is still a deadline for us, and we need to have the 2045 plan adopted by the MPO Board by the end of December of 2018.

Information only.

d. Open House April 18th

Haugen reported that we will be holding an Open House on April 18th at Choice Health and Fitness Center starting at 5:30 p.m., with a presentation at 6:00 p.m.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2018 Annual Work Program Project Update

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

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO ADJOURN THE APRIL 11TH, 2018,
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:40 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager