

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen Chairman, called the May 9th, 2018, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:30 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Bobbi Retzlaff, MnDOT (Proxy for Darren Laesch); Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck (via conference call); David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning; Jesse Kadrmaz, NDDOT-Local District; Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; and Ryan Riesinger, Grand Forks Airport Authority.

Absent were: Dustin Lang, Brad Gengler, Ryan Brooks, Darren Laesch, Steve Emery, Lane Magnuson, Richard Audette, Paul Konickson, Ali Rood, Stacey Hanson, Nick West, Mike Yavarow, and Rich Sanders.

Guest(s) present were: Mary Karlsson, Kimley-Horn; Brandon Bourdon, Kimley-Horn; Scott Mareck, WSB & Associates; and Al Grasser, Grand Forks Engineering.

Staff present: Jairo Viafara, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen asked that, for the benefit of those in the audience today, could everyone please state their name and the organization they represent.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 11TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Kuharenko reported that his name was misspelled in the voting sections of the minutes.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE THE APRIL 11TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, SUBJECT TO CORRECTION OF MR. KUHARENKO'S NAME, AS REQUESTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

SUSPEND AGENDA

Haugen commented that we do have a request to suspend the agenda to hear discussion on Agenda Item 9: Matter Of 2045 Street/Highway Element Update. Consensus was to suspend the agenda to hear discussion on Agenda Item 9.

MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE

Haugen distributed copies of the updated power point presentation and stated that our consultants from Kimley-Horn and WSB are here today to give a presentation.

Presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) ensued.

Revenue Forecasts

Karlsson reminded the committee of the Special Technical Advisory Committee meeting on February 20th, where they walked through the initial revenue forecasts, really focusing on identifying the programs, and then began to get their hands around the general dollar amounts in those programs.

Karlsson stated that in March and April they worked to refine the assumptions. She thanked everyone that met and/or talked with her to get this accomplished.

Karlsson commented that today we will be reviewing the Draft Revenue Forecasts, and then they will give everyone some time to digest the forecasts and then in June we can finalize them.

Karlsson referred to the revenue sources and pointed out that this is very similar to what you saw in February; breaking it out into different programs. She stated that this time she is going to structure it so that we first go through the federal funds that are distributed by the State DOTs; then through the state funds that are distributed by the State DOT's, and then we will go through the funds that are distributed by the local entities. She said that it seems to flow a little better that way, if we can give up who the distributing agency is instead of purely the source of the funding, whether it is Federal, State, or Local.

Karlsson referred to the list of federal resources that are distributed by the State DOTs and commented that you can see that the programs are a little bit different in North Dakota compared to Minnesota; but the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) is a unified program.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

Karlsson referred to a slide listing the key changes that we are seeing from what was discussed in February and went over it briefly. She pointed out that the first one is the potential that Fargo will become a Transportation Management Area (TMA) in 2022. She explained that what this means is that it could have an impact on the funding that is available throughout the State of North Dakota because North Dakota has to take a certain amount of funding and put it toward a CMAQ program.

Karlsson stated that the second change, a positive change, is the Main Street Initiative. She said that they worked with the NDDOT to develop a potential revenue projection; again this isn't a source that existed in the past, so they developed a methodology to come up with a number that should be federal aid acceptable because it is and identified funding source that will be allocated, but there is no guarantee that Grand Forks will receive funding, but in working with the NDDOT they decided to base it on population as an assumption, so you will see they came up with an amount of \$600,000.

Karlsson commented that the last change is the HSIP funding, which is a significant addition from the current plan.

Karlsson reported that, while a possible 30% reduction in Urban Regional funding looks like it is a big number, it works out to about \$1 million dollars, so it isn't a huge reduction, but it is somewhat of a reduction, but then these other two sources will end up evening it out so there will actually be zero change in the amount of funding.

Karlsson pointed out that they added the North Dakota Interstate Program, so this is one area that they still need to work on with the NDDOT to coordinate with them to see if there will still be funding that Grand Forks can participate in for the Interstate. She stated that they also added in the Mainstreet, and are saying that is about \$600,000 a year. She said that one of the things they will need to discuss on that is if it should be an annual function, so every year the region would be receiving \$600,000; or should we be assuming that that would be every two years, every two years we would get \$1.2 million or every three years \$1.8 million.

Grasser asked if, on this slide, this is how it is going to be distributed and broken down to Grand Forks. Karlsson responded that it is just for the Grand Forks area within North Dakota, and the other column is Minnesota. Grasser commented that it might be beneficial to adjust the title in there to make sure we understand, you are kind of bopping back and forth between wholistic North Dakota and then back to Grand Forks, just so it is clear which number you are talking about. Karlsson stated that, again, this would not just go to Grand Forks, it would also go to the counties, which you will see in the next slide, so if you want it can say this is Grand Forks and Grand Forks County.

Haugen commented that part of what he thinks Mr. Johnson is asking the Technical Advisory Committee to weigh in on is, among other things, the Main Street Initiative. He said that the reason why it is kind of important that we agree on a forecast whether annually or every other year or third year is how you frame the project that you will be applying for or want considered, so obviously every year you could consider something in the realm of \$600,000 or every other

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

year you could be looking at a project that is \$1.2 million and so the question comes back to what kind of projects are we envisioning we will be applying for, what scale of project, because not every year does it have to be a \$1.2 million or \$600,000, but it shouldn't be \$5 million dollar projects every year.

Kuharenko commented that, as a point of reference, he knows that the last Urban Grant Program application they applied for, 2019 and 2020, they ended up targeting about a million dollars in federal funds for each of those applications; and they were trying to figure out what would be a reasonable project size at that point in time, so that was their best guess; whether or not they would keep moving forward with that size of project, or reduce the size of project.

Karlsson said that she is hearing, if she had to translate that she would say maybe once every two years at \$1.2 million; that, maybe is how you want to characterize the funding. Grasser responded that he doesn't know enough about the program; you're asking for an answer to something that he probably has more questions on, because the Urban Program we may target a certain project, it might be \$1.2 million, and ask for it this year and if it gets turned down reapply versus if you assume you are going to every other year, every other year suggests to him that you've got an allocation, and you can count on giving up one year to get the next; but with this being a competitive program he is going to submit every single year, and while we may not get it every year, but he would hate to forgo a year and then not get it and essentially lose out on funding, so he would be very leery about characterizing this. He added that he thinks \$600,000 a year in general; you're asking how we are going to strategize the implementation, we are at the planning stage here, so he would be uncomfortable saying we would do this or that, in any event today. He said, again, on the Urban they don't always get their request every single year, but you throw it in and see what happens, it is a competitive process, and this would be a competitive process. He stated that from their standpoint, they would also consider how small of a project should it be before it is worthwhile doing all the federal paperwork. He commented that, maybe it is just because it was their idea, but he thinks that that million dollarish type timeframe is not a bad one, but he wouldn't necessarily say they would give up every other year to do that. H

Haugen stated that all of this is good input; adding that they aren't expecting direct answers today but would ask that you think about it and we will bring it back next month so we can come to an agreement on what our financial forecasts will be from that point forward.

Bergman asked what the Main Street Initiative monies can be used for. Haugen responded that it can be used for all of the Title 23 activities, and Title 49. He explained that Title 23 allows their dollars to be crossed over to Title 49 so transit operations, transit capital, anything that is allowed under Title 23 so it is very open.

Grasser commented that he thinks that some of this they will have to see how the downtown master planning thing comes through because that will also suggest maybe priorities and scope and those types of things, we just don't have those answers today.

Haugen asked Mr. Johnson to walk us through the 30% potential cut issue, there might be some interest in having a little more knowledge on what is going on with that.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

Johnson gave a brief overview on the possible 30% reduction in Urban Regional funding. He explained that they ran through, internally in their department, scenarios using assumptions, and went over them briefly.

Johnson summarized that with all of this information they came up with a potential Urban Regional Program of about \$17.5 million and an Urban Roads Program of about \$17.5 million as well. He said, though, that one thing to note here is that the makeup of the Urban Grant Program could possibly take a million dollars off the top of each one of those programs and that has been accounted for. He explained that when they looked at the TMA option, the difference is when the STPBG funding is allocated to the State, the urban pot of money is split, so the TMA gets their chunk, the urban areas get a chunk, and the rural counties get a chunk. He added that the county number doesn't change all that much in the scenario that they brought; so then when they divided that out and tried to look at it, now when they makeup the Urban Program that number that was about \$35 million, but with a TMA is now just under \$25 million for the TMA; so half of that would make up Regional, which is \$12 million, the other half is Urban Road with \$12 million, and then the TMA population actually also equals out to right about \$12.4 million, so they are all right in line with each other and end up being fairly equal.

Johnson commented that there are a couple of things to note here; as Ms. Karlsson alluded to, the \$3.5 and the \$4.4 is about a 30% reduction on the Urban Regional side; on the Urban Road side it actually works out, surprisingly well, or status quo, because eventually Fargo and West Fargo would no longer be in the Urban Roads Program, even though there is an equivalent 30% reduction available to the Urban Roads, the amount of money that Fargo and West Fargo is currently getting in the Urban Roads Program is almost identically about that 30%, so removing them from the program, Watford City, and using that new number of \$12.4 Urban Roads and running it through the formula, everyone's yearly amount available from the Urban Roads Program is almost status quo; for example, the Grand Forks number shows a slight increase of about \$34,000, all the other areas also show slight increases, and that is even showing a new allocation of about \$420,000 for Watford City, so on the Urban Roads side there won't be much of an impact with the new revision of the TMA, and adding Watford City assuming all the other formulas and stuff stay in place. He explained that the regional is about \$4.4, but it is a more competitive type number.

Grasser asked, procedurally, this \$2.458M starting in 2018, that is the theoretical amount we would receive under a fully funded transportation bill, he is assuming, is that a correct assumption. Haugen responded that it is. Grasser commented that this has always been a difficult issue; what's it been, ten year ago or so we kind of had that great financial reset to correct the funding balances between a bill theoretically provides and what is actually appropriated, is that somehow addressed in the Long Range Plan, or are we going to assume that Washington is magically going to just change their process and just come up with all the money they are supposed to.

Haugen responded that he thinks the basic question here is, the rescission that is looming out there under the current FAST ACT, congress is supposed to have a set rescission, but he doesn't remember the dollar amount or how it impacts all the programs across the board so he would

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

defer to Mr. Johnson to answer this if he can. Johnson responded that he isn't positive what the impact is, but the way the law was originally written is that there was a rescission apportionment; so any appropriation that the State is sitting on, those would be pulled back, but he doesn't remember the actual numbers, but he believes we have the opportunity to use some apportionment moving around if we don't want maybe a program that has a little bit of a higher apportionment number to it right now, we can move it and have it programmed for those certain things to help us down those funds needs and move forward. He added, though, that Fiscal Year 2018, the fiscal year we are in right now was the last funded year of the FAST ACT, Fiscal Years 2019 and 2020 are not funded, so there are a lot of functions going into all of what they are doing, not only what he just explained, but also the plan that Mr. Haugen is trying to lay out that Ms. Karlsson is representing with this table of figures, they are assumptions, and they are all something that we can all agree to today and sponsor now but can be completely different.

Grasser commented that he appreciates those complications, and he is really a simple guy when it gets down to it, and why is his simplistic thought process then behind these numbers, these are high end numbers likely to go to down to some amount in the future, these are high end optimistic is kind of how he characterizes it in his head.

Haugen stated that he would provide that, the way the current formula and accounting that the State does is, every year you are not going to have a \$2.5 million dollar project, but they account and balance, and in fact he thinks you are borrowing from another urban city in the current T.I.P. so if the rescission does come, you might be on the positive side of the rescission because your balance was a negative, and if you deduct a negative from a negative it is a negative, you don't lose anything. He said, though, that then they go right back to this formula and these numbers would be the numbers that would build up again, so you are losing paper money at a bank that may never have been real money anyway, so the short answer is that we know it is out there, but if our assumption is that it isn't going to have a major impact moving forward, if the decision comes in 2020 or 2019 or 2021 that causes us to say that it is a huge change in our fiscal picture, we will be required to revisit our financial planning.

Grasser commented that the hard part is, how does this go over the next twenty five to thirty years; these things have a tendency to kind of recur.

Karlsson stated that the federal guidance is that you have to have a reasonably defensible assumption; so what they are showing here is, according to federal law right now, is reasonably defensible. She added, though that you are right, you don't want to go take a loan out on this, but it is following the federal guidance and it is following the best information we have available, and you are right, from a strict financial planning perspective, you may have to do some over assuming things. Grasser said that that is what he said, again recognizing these are probably high end numbers on the planning level.

Haugen said that it is kind of a similar discussion on the 30% decrease, and the MPO Directors met last week and he raised this concern to the DOT that if we decide that we are going with a 30% decrease on the regional side and craft our plan around that, when we come to solicit programs for the T.I.P. we will be expecting, then, that the regional program should reflect that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

30% decrease, and it is just a matter of how long might the State wait before they say that it is our State Highways that are taking the 30% hit here, should we revisit the formula and try to make it equal again; and so he is just trying to, push might the word, the NDDOT to have some confidence level, or discussion at least, that if we move forward with the 30% decrease that four months from now it isn't going to get flipped on us and we are in the midst of adopting a plan with that 30% decrease and now we are hearing different information, so that is a push on the 30% decrease that he is being the squeaky wheel about. Johnson commented that they have an internal meeting on Friday to work on a response to that question, so they are moving on it, although he doesn't know if he will have an answer for you by Friday, but they will put some thought into it and try to come up with a solution.

Johnson state that two other things he just wants to make sure he highlighted are; number one, and this has been historical for quite some time with the current make-up of the Urban Program and where the funding comes from; within each act there is a base formula for allocation to urban areas that they, as a State, must provide and they have historically been higher than that number, quite a bit higher than that number and then even with these reduction and these changes he is noting, because of the grant program reduction and the funding formula, they are still providing quite a bit more to the urban areas than they are required to, so that is something to consider to as part of the assumption that they are assuming that things are going to stay the same with how things are funded.

Johnson said that the other thing to highlight is that there is a lot of talk, and a lot of concern about federal funding and the possibility that it may reverse its current split from 80% federal/20% local to 20% federal/80% local, which would have an enormous impact on everything we do across North Dakota if that were to occur.

Haugen commented that he thinks the last point to make is that Mr. Johnson is trying to get guidance to all three MPOs that is the same, and that might be a first for us. Johnson responded that that is correct. Haugen said that we just happen to be the first MPO with a deadline of the end of this year for new MTP; so you are on our schedule to some extent.

Karlsson referred to a slide listing the funding programs, and the amount of funding they provide and reported that she did add that the Grand Forks County has been receiving roughly, or has been allocating roughly \$400,000 per year within the MPO area, so that is a change that is not in the current plan. Grasser asked if they are expected to keep that money in the MPO area. Haugen responded that they aren't.

Karlsson stated that on the Minnesota side there is \$25,000 a year in HSIP, that has not changed from February. She pointed out that they did add in the Statewide Performance Program and the District Risk Management Program, each providing \$1 to \$2 million a year in funding; and the City Sub-Target Program that provides \$860,000 every fourth year.

Williams asked if it would be fair to say that the supply is going to be reduced by 30%, but then the demand is also going to be reduced by nearly 30%, is that correct. Karlsson asked which program she is talking about. Williams responded that it is the Urban Regional funding, where it

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

says that the Urban Regional funding may be reduced by 30%, but there isn't a line in there that says that demand is also going to be reduced, so that is kind of mis-leading. Haugen responded that the Fargo/Moorhead area would be removed from competing for those funds. Williams agreed, adding, though that that is about 30%. Karlsson pointed out where it states that the NDDOT is anticipating a 30% cut that would not be replaced, then under Urban Regional, as Mr. Johnson explained, there is a 30% cut here, but because Fargo/Moorhead comes out there isn't a change, so these numbers are showing no net change.

Haugen commented that from a statewide perspective the elimination of Fargo/West Fargo, the 30% cut is absorbed statewide, so for the GF/EGF MPO that 30% cut is real. Johnson responded that it is technically for the NDDOT because there is a 30% reduction in available funding of Urban Regional dollars, however that leaves, if not more, maybe 30% less from the Fargo/West Fargo area that is no longer eligible for a part of that, so it is a true statement, however because that is a competitive number, today Grand Forks theoretically has access to apply for \$17 million dollars, but now they have the theoretical ability to apply for \$12.5 million dollars so the reduction is a little more real than just removing of the roadway Fargo/West Fargo, so the way Ms. Williams is saying it is correct.

Karlsson stated that she will continue to work with Mr. Johnson to make sure that they are communicating this correctly.

Williams commented that her concern is that it states that it is going to reduce the funding, there is no follow up statement explaining the offset, and she just doesn't want anyone to get alarmed.

Karlsson referred to a slide discussing State funding, distributed by the State DOTs, and reported that there aren't a lot of changes, but they did add a couple of things. She commented that at the February meeting we talked about the one-time legislative funding that occurred in the past, and she wants to acknowledge that that did happen in the past, and that we are following the guidance, but also wanted to point out that there isn't an amount shown, just an acknowledgement, and then also acknowledging that the North Dakota Bank loan program is an action in North Dakota for State funding. She commented that under Minnesota there aren't any changes.

Karlsson referred to the next slide and pointed out that it lists the State and Local funding that is distributed by the local governments. She explained that the sources are for both Counties and Cities. She stated that for the County, in North Dakota we have the gas tax and County property taxes; and in Minnesota we have County State Aid, County Property taxes and County sales taxes. She added that on the City side, in Grand Forks there is the existing sales tax, the new sales tax, gas tax allocation, city property taxes, and special assessments; and on the East Grand Forks side there is the Municipal State Aid and special assessments. Haugen stated that when we talk about gas tax allocation in North Dakota we are really talking about the Highway User Distribution Fund, which is actually more than just a gas tax.

Karlsson stated that the key changes to this category is obviously the new sales tax for Grand Forks. She said that this is a significant amount of money, remembering that the new sales tax

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

sunsets in 2037, it is a twenty-year program, and brings in \$65 million dollars end of year expenditure between 2018 and 2037.

Karlsson said that starting with local, how the numbers shake out; for the Grand Forks County there is about \$100,000 a year from their various sources; and then on the Minnesota side they are still doing some work to marry up with how the State Aid works with the property and sales taxes. She added that you can see that based on the T.I.P., that there is about \$750,000 being spent in the MPO area, however when we talked to the Finance Director and County Engineer they were both very clear that that is not something that happens regularly so they are still having a conversation as to what that amount will be.

Karlsson stated that we just talked about the new sales tax in Grand Forks, which is about \$3 million dollars a year and sunsets in 2037; and the existing sales tax is about \$3 million now, but, again, in talking with the Finance Director they feel that they should probably reduce that a little bit given the current trending of sales tax revenues in the City, which she thinks is a very good decision, so they are lowering it to about \$2.9 million. She added that, based on some information that Mr. Haugen provided, through the City's budget book, there is about \$2.9 million dollars the Intergovernmental Users fund.

Karlsson stated that in East Grand Forks we are looking at about just under \$600,000 per year, that is all usable Municipal State Aid plus the match. She added that it already has the loan payback reduced.

Grasser asked if Minnesota can get special bonding as well. Karlsson responded that they can. She explained that two slides previously she has this identified as "potential" funding. She stated that at the State level there is State Trunk Highway Bonding that they can do, and at the local level there is the Local Bridge Bonding as well, but it isn't something that we can assume.

Grasser commented that we are talking the income side, and they seem reasonably accurate, but are we going to translate these dollars into projects, because some of these dollars goes toward operating the highway department and other operating systems besides projects, so he doesn't know if you have taken a look into that, so this won't be all project driven. Karlsson responded that those are great point. She added that that is what Mr. Mareck is going to talk about next, how we go about the process of identifying projects, and identifying operating costs is one of the key things that they did; they made sure they had a line item in there that said that all of this isn't available for capital, that a lot has to go for operating, and they make sure that they communicate that very clearly, that all of this funding is not available for capital.

Universe Of Projects

Mareck reported that we touched on this at the last meeting, so just a quick update on the Universe of Projects list; which are any and all projects regardless of size, there is no financial constraint, no consideration of whether it is politically palatable or not palatable or environmental; it is just kind of an open-ended brain storming of any and all projects, whether

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

City, County or State, that have been identified in various plans and programs that we want to consider, ultimately for the regional MPO Transportation Plan.

Mareck stated that they feel they are getting pretty close to a final product, and he knows that Mr. Haugen has been coordinating with a lot of folks on getting data, so they appreciate everyone's cooperation and help with this.

Mareck commented that, he has just a couple of points to share; MnDOT provided them with some maintenance information that they were assuming for the Kennedy and Sorlie Bridges, and he believes that that was inclusive for the entire bridge in both cases they will need to work out what the DOT shared for those projects. He said that there is also our question about whether we want to show any maintenance tasks for the Point Bridge. He added that they are also looking for some additional data on the state of good repair projects for the City of Grand Forks and Polk County and Grand Forks County.

Haugen reported that when MnDOT sent us their list they identified the work on the Kennedy and the Sorlie and included the total dollar amount; and we didn't show that at all on the North Dakota District list, any work on the bridges, so the first question is does North Dakota agree with that work in that timeframe, and if so then we automatically have to show that there is a cost on the North Dakota side for your half. He added that of the three existing bridges, two are having some work scheduled in the future, while the third, the Point Bridge, had work done on it ten years ago so will it need work done again sometime before 2045, so we should factor that in as well. Karlsson commented that this is definitely where we want to add that operating cost as well. She added that, although it isn't a project, per say, you'd want to have that in as a line item to say that it is something that required some of the funding.

Mareck referred to a slide and explained that this, then, is where we are at so far with the entire list, and this is kind of a geographic representation of the various projects, where they are located, and what category they are in. Haugen asked if this needs to be updated with the data from MnDOT and East Grand Forks. Bourdon responded that it was updated yesterday so it should be complete. Haugen said that, just to point out, of the \$4.54 million; all future river crossings are lumped into that, and we most likely won't be doing all of them so this number is if we did all of them.

Mareck stated that the next steps will be to put this all together. He commented that Ms. Karlsson was talking about the financial plan, that is the constraint of what you can actually build over the next twenty years; we also have performance measures from both DOTs that are being pulled together into an MPO set of performance measures that incorporate local values and priorities, so the performance measures and the priorities and goals that come out of that, combined with the financial forecast of what will be available, will be combined with this huge Universe of Projects list that is almost a three quarters of a billion dollars and consider all of those things together will give us the alternatives analysis, which will be the next step in the process; considering all of those things and coming up with a financially constrained project list that is supported by the Cities and the Counties and the DOTs and the MPO, that you will ultimately adopt with your transportation plan.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

Mareck referred to a slide listing the timeline for the Universe of Alternatives and went over it briefly. He stated that back in February we had an initial draft of the Universe of Projects that has been refined over the early spring months and they are now hoping to finalize the Universe of Projects by the May 23rd board meeting if possible; and then in June and July they will actually work through the alternatives process where they will look at the financials, the performance measures, and this Universe of Projects list altogether and ultimately come up with your financially constrained plan that we can then present at the July public meeting.

Future Bridge Update

Bourdon referred to a slide and explained that it is a slide that has been shown before, when we were talking more about four river crossings, and based on input they were asked to revise the scope of work to update the analysis that was done before and add some additional analysis, so instead of four they are now looking at 5th and 17th Avenue South as well. He explained that their last analysis had some things in it, in terms of some of the travel demand output, and what would happen on a link-based analysis as well as intersection analysis, so they want to update the data to include these additional analyses. He commented that there are also some changes they want to revisit near 24th Avenue, with the Elks Drive alignment, based on some input they received.

Bourdon stated that in the past, and they will go through some slides that have been worked on in the past, one thing that made some sense just because it was transportation planning focused before, would be to update some of the cost estimates that were done in years past to kind of bring them up to today's values. He said that, for instance, the 47th Avenue South crossing didn't have a crossing estimate, so we need to do a high-level analysis to provide some more metrics that can be focused on cost estimating and some of the other performance measures.

Bourdon pointed out that the next slide shows the next steps. He explained that he already talked about adding a 17th Avenue South crossings and adjustment to Elks Drive; but one thing that they think makes sense is to look at some of the operations that will be anticipated near each of the crossings; so additional intersections at a Synchro level or intersection capacity analysis that have been added to make sure we kind of understand what happens near the touchdown points on both the west and east sides. He said that they will then update the prior memo and incorporate some of this additional analysis related to Synchro and the revised cost estimates, and a new cost estimate for 47th Avenue South, and then we will come back and present the results.

Bourdon reported that the next few slides shows information/data for each of the five locations being studied. He went over the information briefly.

Haugen commented that the current Draft Scope-of-Work for Amendment #2 was included in the packet. He asked that everyone please review it and submit comments as soon as possible as we are in kind of a time crunch given that we have to have the update completed by the end of 2018.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

Haugen stated that the two things that Mr. Bourdon and himself are trying to discuss, and you don't seem then quite yet reflected in the Scope-of-Work are:

- 1) They took a shot at trying to identify the local versus regional, they thought they had a fairly clear request to focus on local traffic; so many of you saw what information they provided to try to give a sense of local versus regional, they aren't sure what additional information they can be trying to provide to answer that question, so they are trying to seek your insight on this issue.

Bourdon commented that there are some different ways, using that information, that would be helpful to present information that would maybe help with some decision making or things that maybe aren't obvious to them that would help in terms of explaining the impact of a particular crossing for local traffic versus regional traffic.

- 2) For all of the crossings, except for 47th Avenue South, they have an expectation of who is going to be the lead agency on those crossing, anything north of 32nd Avenue South; 32nd, Elks, 17th, both cities are expected to be the leads on those; Merrifield Road, in the past both Counties have said that they are anxious to do a bridge at this location, so again the assumption is they both confirmed that they are interested in being sponsors for this. He said that the one they don't have a clear answer on, on the Minnesota side is 47th Avenue South; it isn't close to a County State Aid system, it is a mile away from the flood protection system, and it is more than a mile from their current city limits, so one of the things they are trying to work a scope on is to sort of flesh out the challenge that the Minnesota Side lead agency may pose for this site.

Kuharenko referred to Amendment #3 and asked if it is what we discussed for the work program last month or is this going to be in addition to that. Haugen responded that it is what we discussed last month.

Haugen commented that, again, they would like to get any comments or insight from this body sooner than later. He explained that they are going to try to have the MPO Board consider approving Amendment #2 next Wednesday. He stated that, again, the timing isn't what we would like to present but it is the timing that we have to present.

Grasser asked if we are going to somehow think about or acknowledge off the bridge itself improvements. He said that we talked about it on the Minnesota side because the road is physically missing, but even on the North Dakota side, lets say 32nd Avenue South, or almost any of those roads, they are all old they are all in poor shape, so if we have traffic to them are we going to accelerate improvements, will there be financial recognition, or should we build-in or reconstruct part of the road to at least get it to Washington or something like that; and then how do we deal with a really wild card issue such as a pedestrian underpass. He stated that he doesn't know how to deal with those things, but there might be permutations to this beyond the bridge itself.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

Haugen responded that part of the answer is just the normal preservation or the state of good repair of these corridors; when are you scheduled to do something and what type of work would that entail if a bridge was placed at that corridor, how drastically would that change the scope, so there is the difference in up-scope that we would try to address, but there is going to have to be some basic work done on all those corridors by 2025.

Williams asked, so if we already have a mill and overlay scheduled, and it would require a complete reconstruction, you would just take the difference between those two. Haugen responded that that is correct. He added that this is where you guys would all do your magic if we were to add 4000 more vehicles above and beyond what would be there in 2045, that would mean we would have to do “X” instead of what we were doing before.

Grasser said that that is kind of the question, like on Belmont Road, if we add that traffic do we now go from our small two-lane section that we currently have or do we need to add turn lanes, it isn't just a matter of state of good repair, it might be a capacity extension too. Haugen commented that they are looking at all of the intersections along Belmont at all of the proposed bridge locations.

Bourdon stated that the intersection analysis would point out if an additional turn lane is needed, or some other change to an intersection, and that could all be factored in; and then he thinks there has to be some dialogue about what the difference is, in terms of where we are versus what you were already planning. He cited 24th, and explained that they looked at what the existing condition is based on what they have in the existing condition report, and it isn't great, so there is likely something that needs to be done, so we will have to have some dialogue in terms of what that is, but an enabling project or a project that goes all the way to west we will have to have some dialogue to make sure it is reasonable and will somehow tie into the bridge. He added keep in mind that this is going to be the planning level study so we want to keep it at a higher level, with higher level estimates, and we aren't going to necessarily be getting into every bit of minutiae in the planning step. He said that estimates at a higher level should have some contingents in there to make some planning level decisions. Grasser stated that another thing that should maybe be included is some sort of look at pedestrian facilities, because there are some corridors that either have sidewalks on one side that isn't a bike path, and none on the other side; so if we are going to trigger those issues that could get pretty pricey as well.

Mareck commented that another thing he would note is that we have been focusing a lot on the river crossings, and that is good, but you have your entire network that they analyzed and did a level of service analysis, which was a regional model put together, so you have your DeMers, your Washington, you major arterial corridors and other parts of the system, above and beyond the river crossing analysis where they did show various levels of congestion in the forecast in the 2040 forecast, so none of those congestion points have really been contemplated, as far as being added to the Universe Of Projects list, so as we wrap up the Universe of Projects he would encourage everyone to think of what you desire to include capacity improvements in some of those corridors; if there are any of those major arterials where you have a desire to show capacity expansion of some sort it would be important to make sure that those are shown in the Universe of Projects list.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

Grasser stated that that is a good question, but he has no idea where to start on it. Mareck said that they have mapping that will show you level of service A through F for your major arterial corridors, and how your different arterials grade out on a congestion basis. Haugen pointed out that most of them are in the discretionary list. Grasser commented that the catch-22 on this is that from a federal level we don't talk about doing any kind of capacity as up to a level of service D is acceptable, and state of good repair we don't do capacity improvements at all; but he could see on a local level, once we start getting into that level of service D, there will be an uprising and they aren't going to care about federal standards, they are going to want to see something done.

Kuharenko commented that if we start doing intersection improvements and we need to start acquiring property as well, we are going to need to try to balance that with congestion issues as well.

Williams added that it would help us greatly, when we are looking at a list, and you are showing the cost of a project, if we know whether or not it includes buyout acquisition, utility relocation, design, or is it just going out and assuming that all of that has been done and all we are doing is building the road, so if we know what we are talking about that would be extremely helpful. Mareck responded that all of the project costs you see in the Universe of Projects list are going to be planning level unit costs, "X" amount per mile, it isn't going to be to a final design level. Williams said, then, that it doesn't include right-of-way or utility relocation. Mareck responded that there is a generalized assumption that is made, but it is not property specific, so basically your full Universe of Projects list is an educated guess based on some unit costs that are done at a planning level to give you a placeholder to consider that project in your programming, and then once you develop a project and get it into the program, then you will need to review all of those costs and come up with better estimates. Karlsson added that any of the projects that have had a cost estimate done, that are in the plan, they take those costs and inflate them based on what was in there, so you would know better than they do what costs exactly are in there.

Mareck stated that many of those costs are already defined based on studies, and they are adjusting them based on the year of expenditure and then they will look at them as cost based on the year anticipated for implementation, so under the short-term, mid-term, and long-term plans you will take your revenue forecasts and you have a model based on what the revenue will be over time, then you have inflation for a particular time frame to try to true it up as close as possible.

Grasser said that they have made this comment before so it is important to put some of those notations, not just in the report, but almost on the table where you are doing the estimates because, again as you are pulling them out of other studies, not all studies have been consistent in the manner that they handle those; so again, from the construction side of the world, and the notation side of the world they need to have a sense of if there is just a generic allowance of 2% for right-of-way, that is fine but when they start looking at a project we need to know if that is going to be way higher or way lower so they can start factoring that in, but if they don't have that sense they can't really get into it to get a sense of how accurate that number might be.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

Karlsson reported that the other piece of comfort that it would give, is that you remember that this plan is updated every five years; so as you mentioned about the level of service D, her previous boss always used to tease her about, well Mary, autonomous vehicles aren't going to show up tomorrow, we are going to be updating the plan soon enough that we are going to be able to address what is going to come, and she takes comfort in knowing that we will be living with this plan for three or four years and then this conversation will start again and we'll update it, but she knows that isn't a great answer. Grasser responded that it is actually a good answer, and it is important to keep that in context when we are trying to predict paving for the next 25-years; he agrees with you that five years is probably, at best, a fairly reasonable estimate to try to identify some projects, so he agrees with that statement.

Bourdon referred to the next slide and explained that they held the third public meeting on April 18 at Choice Health and Fitness, and had fourteen attendees sign in. He added that most of the interest was more related to river crossing dialogue than anything else. He said that it was a good meeting, but there weren't a ton of comments, but they did have some dialogue during the meeting and they stayed later for any questions anyone had.

Bourdon reported that the next public meeting is anticipated in July, and we will see where we are in terms of presenting stuff, ideally they will be presenting a lot more about where the plan is going in terms of some of the finalized financial information and projects list and more implementation information on what is planned, so they are hoping it will be in July but it could slide a little later.

Information only.

RESUME AGENDA

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF PERFORMANCE BASED MEASURES
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING/AGREEMENT**

Haugen reported that last month we were considering the Minnesota side Memorandum for Performance Based Planning processes, and the Technical Advisory Committee recommended approval but the MPO Executive Policy Board wanted to wait to see what the North Dakota document looked like, so included in the packet are both the Minnesota Side and the North Dakota Side documents. He added that we are fortunate enough today to have the authors of both documents participating, Mr. Johnson on the phone, and Ms. Retzlaff in the audience.

Haugen stated that there is an obvious difference between the two documents, the number of pages. He explained that the purpose of North Dakota's being shorter is because they aren't as advanced with the performance measures as MnDOT; MnDOT has a ten-plus year history of working performance measures, North Dakota is still ramping up for that.

Haugen commented that some subtle differences; the first is the title of the documents is different in that Minnesota calls theirs an MOU and North Dakota calls their and MOA, but he thinks there is an understanding that they are synonymous terms, but other than that he thinks

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

both authors would say that they are both basically taking things out of the Federal Register and inserting it into the documents, and not creating new sentences or paragraphs.

Haugen stated that the action you can take is to reconsider the Minnesota document if you wish, otherwise your action from the prior meeting stands; and then there is the option of considering the North Dakota document. He added that staff continues to recommend approval to authorizing signature and entering into these agreements of both States.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE AUTHORIZING SIGNATURES FOR THE DRAFT MINNESOTA SIDE MOU AND THE DRAFT NORTH DAKOTA SIDE MOA ON THE PROCESS FOR PERFORMANCE BASED PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Ellis, Bail, Halford, Riesinger, Retzlaff, Johnson, Kuharenko, and Bergman.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

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

MATTER OF STATE PM2 AND PM3 TARGETS

Haugen reported that each State has to finalize their PM2, Pavement/Bridge; and their PM3, Travel Reliability performance targets by May 20th.

Haugen commented that included in the packet was a draft that was available as of Friday, distributed in front of you is an updated document.

Haugen referred to the updated presentation and explained that the targets are just for the NHS facilities, but there are a couple of things to understand; for PM2 and some of the PM3 targets there four-year targets, and then after two years you have the ability to revisit your target to see if adjustments need to be made. He said that there is some argument within the planning world that is that really a two-year target and a four-year target or a four year target with a two year adjustment; but you are seeing them labeled as two year targets and four year targets, so just know that after two years you have to visit your target and there will also be determination by Federal Highway after two years as to whether you are progressing.

Haugen stated that the travel reliability still has no penalty clause, and North Dakota targets are still not ones that have been formally adopted by the director. He asked if Mr. Johnson had a date as to when the director might be taking action. Johnson responded that he does not have that information at this time. Haugen commented that, again, MPOs have 180 days after the May 20th deadline.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

Haugen referred to a table listing both States' targets and went over them briefly, pointing out the differences between the two States.

Kuharenko asked if we know where Minnesota and North Dakota are at today for each of these targets, as a baseline. Haugen responded that we know that based on the data that they have an analyzed performance forecast, like on the pavement there is new requirements of some measures that you have to collect, and some of those haven't been collected yet so they are utilizing the data that was available to them. He added that they are also using some of their existing predictability models, particularly on the pavement. He commented that both sides, he knows for sure on the Minnesota side they are, and he believes that they are on the North Dakota side, because of the penalty clause that is a part of this they have put themselves in kind of a protective position, they are very close to what the actual percents are now, and they don't foresee the rapid decline in any of these, so the penalties is really at the poor condition being above a threshold of four. He added that they are comfortable with where they are on the poor conditions.

Ellis commented that, in a sense, the only what that this affects is, because the States spend money on their interstate system, so the only way it would affect us is if they're not meeting their performance measures; they may pull some of their federal dollars aside or put more into their projects which would leave us less money, is that correct; do we really have a say in what they are setting as their performance measures for their interstate. Haugen responded that we do, adding that it is a cooperative process, and because, obviously on the Minnesota side we have less say because we don't have an interstate in the MPO area, but on the North Dakota side the interstate is in our MPO area and it is still a cooperative process. Ellis stated that that would be the only reason why she would want to know what you are looking at right now as far as percentages because if they are so far off then we aren't going to notice a decline in funding, but if North Dakota feels that they are going to be able to comfortably meet those then she wouldn't have any concerns with it. Kuharenko agreed.

Haugen stated that on the PM3 side they are very similar on reliability on the interstate system, again they discussed this, even though there isn't an interstate on the Minnesota side, the way that the PM3 information is released is that it is for the MPO area as a whole, and not divided by each State, so the number on the Minnesota side obviously includes the rest of the State across Minnesota.

Ellis commented that, just as a side note, do you think that some of them trying to meet their PMs might have something to do with why their corridors of commerce all ended up being in the twin cities. Haugen responded he doesn't know the answer to that. Ellis said it is just a guess on her part.

Haugen stated that the only real significant difference in the PM3 is the truck travel time reliability. He explained that the metrix here is on a scale of 0 to 3, and the mid-point is 1.5, so it is a percent of how many of your segments are above the 1.5, so Minnesota is using the 1.5 as their mid-point but North Dakota is using 3, which is at the extreme end of the spectrum.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

Ellis asked if the feds approve the State's PM measures. Haugen responded that they don't approve them, they report on them and then they have to show progress. He added that some of them have penalties, but travel did not. Ellis stated that that was her only concern, is if the feds looked at the PMs and said, no, they want to set them higher; because for our interstate program that would obviously shift funds too, but there isn't anything to say that they could adjust or not adjust them at this point. Haugen responded that there is nothing that says that they will be adjusting them two years from now that we report on these measure. He added that the feds will make a determination if we are making progress or not, and they can adjust. Retzlaff reported that on the Minnesota Side their federal partners were involved when they were setting these targets and if they would have had any concerns they would have mentioned at that point.

Information only.

MATTER OF STATE PM1 (SAFETY) TARGETS

Haugen reported that the annual cycle is back up. He said that, if you recall, a couple of these are also connected to the National Safety Administration, fatalities and serious crashes, so each State has to report those targets by the end of June, and so both States are reporting all of their safety targets in all five of these categories at the same time. He explained that, officially the due date is for all five targets is the end of August, and then we will have the same 180 days, so what is showing right now are the 2018 targets that were established last year and in red are the 19 proposed targets, and, again, listed by each State. He went over the targets briefly.

Kuharenko said, then, that every year we are going to have to come back through and revisit, reconfirm, and reagree with the States on these targets. Haugen responded that that is correct, every year by February is the current schedule. He added that the only thing that has changed is, if you recall, we had one State reported theirs a couple of days earlier than the other State so we had two different due dates, and now the feds have now clarified that it is 180 days after the last State has set their targets, so only one date.

Kuharenko asked if there was a general feel; he knows that we a set decrease on a number of these items, is the general feeling that it is going to keep with that maybe, or is it going to be reevaluated, will each individual State be reevaluating where they are at and refiguring what their targets are. Haugen responded that each year they have to go through the calculations. He stated that each State has a little difference in how they use calculations, and Minnesota is factoring in some growth; North Dakota didn't consider that when they calculated theirs, so, again there is the penalty clause that attaches to these safety targets, and both States are aware that and are looking ahead. He added that if they continue this trend what will it mean for our next year, what will be our target, so we have some sense of what they need to do to achieve that. He stated that we probably won't revisit this until sometime late this fall or early next spring.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

MATTER OF PROPOSED NEW CITIES AREA TRANSIT ROUTES

Haugen reported that Ms. Kouba is out sick today so he would ask that Mr. Bergman please give us an update on the proposed new bus routes.

Bergman stated that they held several public meetings for the proposed new bus routes; the last one was held at the Grand Cities Mall last night, with only two people attending. He said that they did have a good turn-out at the one held at the Senior Center and at the University of North Dakota.

Bergman commented that they are still compiling all of the information together. He pointed out that one mistake they found, that they didn't realize until maps were printed for the proposed changes, was on the night bus area as they totally forgot to show the northend of Grand Forks, so they are addressing that now.

Ellis said that an adjustment needs to be made to the East Grand Forks tripper route within the City because the morning pick up is a little on the short side, so they are going to add another hour or hour and a half to that route as well.

Bergman reported that a couple of things that were brought up was about having volunteer riders the first week that we would start these if it gets approved by the City Council to use girl and boy scouts to do this. He commented that hopefully in the next couple of weeks we will have this all finalized. He added that he recently received a call requesting a meeting with Development Homes and their staff on Friday morning.

Ellis stated that with every comment they received they went through the routes just to make verify what their comment or concern is; what they feel may or may not work, so they are going through every question individually and looking at every route and responding, in essence, to every person that submits a comment so that they make sure they are clear on what out routes are or aren't doing, so she thought this was a good process. Bergman agreed, adding that he thinks they had more turnout on this than they have ever had for any process they've ever had in the past.

Bergman reported that one thing they did find out last night was that Hope Church, who owns the Grand Cities Mall area, their number one key is that they want transit, and they want it there, and they will work with us to get a transfer center there, which would be plus for us.

Ellis said that they also have night service in East Grand Forks, which they have not had before.

Haugen stated that comments can still be submitted through May 16th. He added that this information is on both Cities' websites and the MPOs website as well.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 9th, 2018**

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.

b. Near Southside Draft

Kuharenko commented that he saw that we had a draft on the Near Southside project came up this morning. Haugen stated that it is out for staff comment and then it will go out to the neighborhood.

c. Bike/Ped Plan Update

Kuharenko asked for an update on the Bike/Ped Plan, as to when we will be seeing the latest rendition of that. Viafara responded that they putting together the agenda and you will receive it by the end of the week.

d. Legislature Update

Haugen stated that he saw that the Legislature is wrapping up and they might ask for a vote by the public for dedicating sales tax on automobile parts and services. He said that it was transferred over and it is looking like it is iffy that it might get put on the ballot. He added that there is also an implementation schedule proposed on it that the 100% won't be until 2024, it will be phased in because the taxes are being taken from other general funds services and dedicating them to transportation, but it could raise \$250,000,000 a year.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO ADJOURN THE MAY 9TH, 2018,
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 3:10 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager