

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen Chairman, called the June 13th, 2018, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:33 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Darren Laesch, MnDOT; Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Ryan Brooks, Grand Forks Planning; Jesse Kadrmas, NDDOT-Local District; Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Ali Rood, Cities Area Transit; and Ryan Riesinger, Grand Forks Airport Authority.

Absent were: Dustin Lang, Brad Gengler, Stephanie Halford, Brad Bail, Lane Magnuson, Richard Audette, Paul Konickson, Dale Bergman, Stacey Hanson, Nick West, Mike Yavarow, Lars Christianson, and Rich Sanders.

Guest(s) present were: Scott Mareck, WSB & Associates; Bobbi Retzlaff, MnDOT; Mike Bittner, KLJ; Meredith Richards, Grand Forks Community Development; and Al Grasser, Grand Forks Engineering.

Staff present: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; 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.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MAY 9TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL
ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE THE MAY 9TH,
2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPWP AMENDMENT #5

Haugen reported that we are trying to accomplish two principle things with this agenda item:

- 1) The first one is, at one time during our discussions on the Washington Street Underpass project, we decided to set aside funds to assist in the project development for the project, but a couple of weeks ago the NDDOT requested we not pursue that study which freed up those funds we had identified for that project. He stated that MnDOT identified a request to do an update on a 2007 Study that was done on Minnesota 220 North, so we would like to amend the work program to move the funds for the Washington Street Underpass Study to the Minnesota 220 North Study Update. He added that MnDOT has also indicated that they would provide the 20% match for that project.
- 2) The second one revisits the Downtown Grand Forks Planning Transportation effort. He said that there has been some communication of the MPO, now that the City has hired a consulting firm, RDG, undertaking some of the work for this project. He explained that as part of that communication they are trying to get the MPO to include it in the work program, and they have resurrected the old amendment that was tabled back in April.

Haugen commented that, if you will recall, in April we had an intersection study at Gateway Drive and Washington Street that we added more funding to the budget, but in the end we did not swap out the actual work, and you will see this later in the proposed scope of work. He added that since the packet was sent out there has been some addition communication with the City of Grand Forks on not really wanting to swap out and so the intersection study, so the proposal hasn't been changed in the packet, so he would ask that someone from the City of Grand Forks please give us a little more information on what their desires are on this.

Brooks responded that he will talk about the Downtown Planning Study. He explained that they were down to a kind of parking study that they feel they need to have done, but the Skewed Intersection Study he thinks is still desired by their Engineering Department. He stated that, timing wise and budgetarily, he doesn't know if there is enough money to do both, but if there is enough to do the downtown planning they could certainly fit it in, but he is thinking that he probably won't have much time to work on it very much or have the scope of work done so he was thinking that it maybe could slide to 2019. He said, though, that if there is funding available, and you want to put it in late in 2018, they could certainly do it but he does know that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018**

the Engineering Department do want to keep the skewed intersection study in as well as it is a priority for them right now.

Haugen commented that the communication that was taking place last week was about a \$120,000 worth of transportation planning goes to Downtown Grand Forks, being identified as something that the MPO might want to undertake. He added that the request was to not swap out the Skewed Intersection study, so he offered that they could start both projects because we aren't going to finish either one this year, but we would then finish them next year, and next year we would program them, so he doesn't know how that fits. He said that the skewed intersection study, again, as he mentioned was at a different dollar amount, but right now he thinks the consultant cost on that is \$110,000 to \$120,000 so we could split that money up and free up the funds as the whole study wasn't going to be \$110,000 for the intersection study so we could certainly start both, and what they are doing on the work program is not the detailed study of what we are actually going out for with that scope and cost and selection, it's setting the stage, the foundation so that we can go to the next step and have our State and Federal partners agree that that is appropriate to do that type of work with planning dollars. He referred to a table of projects and stated that he doesn't know where we are at, possibly eliminate the strikeouts and, referring to a table of projects, determine how to split the funding.

Kuharenko said that last month we ended up, he believes, pushing forward Amendment #4, correct; and that increased our revenue. Haugen responded that we did that in April. Kuharenko apologized for the error, and said, then, that in April we ended up moving that forward, and he thinks it was like \$126,000 in available revenue, and something like half of that was going to be going towards the Long Range Transportation Plan consultant for a bridge study, and the other half was probably going to be going to the Downtown Study, so right now, as it stands, we should have about \$60,000 available, is that right. Haugen responded that the funds are sitting in the highlighted line item on the table. He explained that it was put into that line item and didn't change the scope of work but did change the funding. He said that they took the \$60,000 and added it to what was already there. Kuharenko said that he thought that back in April we didn't make that change because it would have removed the skewed intersection. Haugen responded that, again, they didn't change the intersection study language they adjusted its budget.

Brooks said, then, that the skewed study is still in the work program under 300.20 as well. Haugen responded that it is. He commented that right now the official work program has the skewed intersection study in it. He added that the proposed amendment was just swapping out the text and not changing the budget amount, and then what is being offered is to not strike out the text but just split our budget for the 2018 dollars and then in 2019 finish off both studies. He said that he is still unclear of what the City of Grand Forks' downtown planning request is, parking will certainly be a part of it, but what additional work will be desired. He stated that the list that he was asked to look at was around \$120,000 of work, and that was sort of what he was led to believe was the scope that was of interest for the MPO to undertake; if we just split this in half we can finish up the rest, if we do this, we can finish up the rest when we work on the 2019-2020 Work Program as to what the final allocation toward each individual project will be, but what this does it to get us to the next step, and that step would be for the Intersection Study doing the RFP, the detailed scope of work, going through the qualification based selection process and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018**

for the Downtown Plan it gets it in the budget so the next step would be the same thing depending on what the scope of work is. This step is already taken care of and we can progress to the next one in a more timely fashion.

Haugen stated that the initial thing that is going on is to swap out the underpass study, which the State says they don't want us to do, so that frees up that budget amount and that line item; MnDOT and East Grand Forks says their Central Avenue/220 North Corridor Study should be updated and we have the ability to do that with this; and so what we do with the Washington/Gateway Intersection and the Downtown Transportation Plan is; initially the thought was that we would swap one out for the other, but now the proposal is to split the monies and start both and then finish them both next year.

Haugen referred to a project table and went over the changes being proposed. He then gave a brief history on the Skewed Intersection project as well.

Grasser asked, for someone that doesn't know all these numbers and things intimately, he finds the discussion and the tracking history a little bit hard to follow, so he was wondering if on the staff reports it would be possible to give a small summary of what Amendment 1 accomplished and/or changed, what Amendment 2 accomplished and/or changed, etc., so that we have a historical record that we can look at to track what has occurred.

Brooks commented that as long as Engineering is okay with moving the Skewed Intersection Study to 2018 and finish it in 2019; the MnDOT stuff seems good to him. He added that we would then come back with a scope of work once they nail it down, and that still has to come through for approval. Haugen responded that the RFP and all that stuff would have to be approved, and then it will come back through once we have the consultant selected and the negotiated scope of work, so you can still say no at that point.

Laesch reported present.

Williams asked if what Mr. Brooks is saying is that we would put the downtown study on hold and leave it as a placeholder, then. Brooks responded that what he is suggesting is that we would just leave the skewed intersection study in as being done in 2018 and 2019, and the downtown study, as he understands, would be done in 2018 and 2019 as well. Haugen stated that that is correct. He explained that the writing wouldn't change for either, the strikeout would change and a couple of other minor changes would occur, but the main change would be that we would split the funding into two with the downtown plan taking half and the skewed intersection study would take the other half and then when we do the 2020/2021 budget we would figure out the finishing touches on both. He added that the 220 North study would have a completion date of the end of June, and the transportation stuff we could go as late as December if necessary; we couldn't with the Central plan, but you said you might want it done sooner than that. Laesch responded that he thinks that they are going to talk about the scope a little bit this next month and figure out what they want done and then set the timeline, but he would think that having a completion date in 12-months would be sufficient.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018**

Grasser stated that he thinks that for the skewed intersection on their side there isn't anything terribly urgent on there; he wants to be sure that we don't try to push projects and interject projects such that it has an impact on the ability to deliver the Long Range Transportation Plan. He said that we have a lot of stuff going on here and the completion date for the Long Range Transportation Plan is coming up so he thinks that we need to make sure that they aren't asking the MPO to deliver stuff that is going to impact that schedule.

Haugen commented that most of the work for these two projects would be to get the RFP out, waiting for the response, and making the consultant selections. He said that by that time the transportation plan is hopefully in the approval stages and we are cleaning up loose ends and not creating new studies or requiring amendments, so from a staff perspective with all this timing releasing pressure and focus on this one. He added that we are showing that we are spending all of our funds that are given to us, which he knows is a keen interest for both North Dakota and Minnesota, but particularly Federal Highway.

Kuharenko asked what the skewed intersection study was originally programmed for. Haugen responded that the consultant costs were somewhere around \$55,000 to \$60,000.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE AMENDMENT 5 TO THE 2018 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM SUBJECT TO REMOVAL OF THE WASHINGTON STREET UNDERPASS STUDY; PROGRAMMING THE MNDOT 220 NORTH STUDY; SPLITTING THE FUNDING FOR THE SKEWED INTERSECTION STUDY AND THE DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION IN HALF; PROGRAMMING THE WORK FOR THE SKEWED INTERSECTION STUDY AND THE DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION STUDY TO BE DONE IN 2018 AND 2019; AND TO DETERMINE THE DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION PLAN STUDY SCOPE OF WORK AND COORDINATING IT WITH CITY STAFF.

Laesch asked for clarification as to whether the dollar amount that they talked about for the MnDOT 220 North Study remain the same. Haugen responded that it did; \$70,000 for a consultant.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Ellis, Brooks, Riesinger, Johnson, Kuharenko, Laesch, Emery, and Rood.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Bail, Hanson, Gengler, Halford, Bergman, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, Lang, Yavarow, West, Sanders and Christianson.

MATTER OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO FY2018 ANNUAL ELEMENT OF THE 2018-2021 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that this used to be very simple T.I.P. amendments, but now with the new performance measures and different timelines, etc., it has gotten a bit more complicated. He

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018**

explained that the reason it is late getting on the agenda is because we just received further guidance from Federal Highway, and in fact even today we were getting clarifications of what is going on.

Haugen stated that in the past, if you recall, on the Minnesota side it was clear that if you did a T.I.P. amendment it didn't trigger a plan amendment; on the North Dakota side we had some differing guidance, and this was a North Dakota T.I.P. thing so we had to shake out what, beside a T.I.P. amendment, what other things did it entail with all the timelines being triggered, etc. He said that the guidance we received is that since it is FTA it doesn't trigger the prior interpretation of a plan amendment; so now we know we have to do a T.I.P. amendment, and in the past these T.I.P. amendments were just like you see in the packet, going to the project listing, make the minor changes, and process that; still as of today we aren't sure if our text in our T.I.P. needs to be amended to include a write-up on safety performance. He added that, clearly, if this were federal highway it would require that, but FTA is still trying to get clarification from their headquarters on whether or not it triggers anything on their end. He said that in the meantime all you are seeing is the old T.I.P. amendment type of process.

Haugen commented that this all came about because of an old grant for the Veterans, a statewide grant that Grand Forks was leading, and at the end of the grant process there were still some dollars remaining. He stated that the equipment that Grand Forks has for vehicle location notification, etc. is no longer adequate, and this money is available and needs to be spent or turned back, so the scope or work was really just changing the word "rural" to "urban", but that simple amendment has triggered a lot of this other discussion, but the actual change to the T.I.P., as far as funding is that the total cost is \$140,000 with \$99,400 in federal funding.

Haugen stated that we are still unsure as to what the language of a safety performance measure will entail if we have to do it. He added that his understanding is that this T.I.P. amendment needs to be processed in June, and between now and the MPO Board meeting it might come through as this or it might come through with that additional safety measure writeup, and you all have that from past TAC meetings as to what the guidance is.

Haugen said that, as you will notice, the public notice is identifying that the actual opportunity for the public to make formal comment is at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting next Wednesday, with written comments being taken prior to that, so whatever action we take today will be subject to public input received, but staff is recommending approval.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FY2018 NORTH DAKOTA SIDE T.I.P. AMENDMENT, SUBJECT TO PUBLIC INPUT.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Ellis, Brooks, Riesinger, Johnson, Kuharenko, Laesch, Emery, and Rood.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018**

Absent: Bail, Hanson, Gengler, Halford, Bergman, Audette, Konickson, Magnuson, Lang, Yavarow, West, Sanders and Christianson.

Haugen commented that, just as a follow-up to this starting perhaps as early as next month, and certainly in August we will be doing a plan amendment to the transit projects. He said that the biggest one, of course is their huge 5339 bus barn renovation grant, that needs to be amended into the plan and also the T.I.P. so at that time we certainly will be amending our plan to address the safety performance write-up for that so that when we do the T.I.P. amendment we will also have the safety performance writeup with that T.I.P. amendment.

He stated that perhaps the lesson now is from this point forward we will be having all T.I.P. amendments and plan amendments now having to address, for now temporary safety performance, and by the end of this fall all the other performance measures.

MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE

Haugen reported that we wanted to devote most of our time today going through particularly the Universe List of Projects and Revenue. He said that Scott Mareck is here to walk us through this update.

Mareck referred to a power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and commented that this plan has been under development since last May so they are a little over twelve months into it and they have another six or so months to go before final approval, but today he wants to give an update on the process and timeline; the Universe of Projects, which is kind of the full gamut of any and all projects that could potentially make it into the plan; the Financial Forecast, which they are pretty close to having a final draft; a supplementary Red River Crossing Analysis they are working on; and then the next steps and timeline. He reiterated that this is the overall schedule, getting back to late spring early summer of 2017 through now, and gave a brief overview of the timeline and what they have accomplished to date.

Presentation continued.

Grasser stated that when the presentation was made at the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting the word “discretionary” seemed to cause some confusion for the commissioners. He said that they view the use of that word as being money that we can allocate anywhere we want, so he doesn’t know if the word “discretionary” is the right one to use in there to portray that it is, and he thinks it is essentially a project need that we can’t find funding for; and he isn’t sure what the right description is but if it caused confusion at Planning and Zoning, it might not be the right word to use. Mareck responded that one way that people describe that is illustrative. Grasser said that that might be better as “discretionary” caused confusion. Mareck stated that he doesn’t think that they are necessarily “married” to using that term, so if there is a better term that works for everyone they are open to changing it. Haugen commented that the challenge is that we view illustrative as a budgeted category of things and that isn’t what this is doing, this is just saying that the projects are categorized in this fashion with no budget assigned to them just cost

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018**

estimates assigned to them, so the word “illustrative” also then implies there has been a budgeting decision that they are beyond fiscal constraint, so “illustrative” is not probably the appropriate term either. Grasser suggested that maybe just putting an asterisk or something by them.

Laesch asked for an example of a discretionary project. Mareck responded that one of the big ones we have been talking about is the South End River Crossing; we have three or four different alternatives that we are evaluating that are in the \$25 to \$50 million dollar range, depending upon what comes out of those phases. Haugen cited other examples as well, adding that it isn't just all tied up in interchanges and underpasses and river crossings, there are some existing roadways that are identified as candidates for reconstruction if financing were to become available. Grasser asked if we should be carrying the North End Bypass project. Haugen responded that the MPO Executive Policy Board keeps wanting to continue including it as something, not so much that we are actually pursuing funding, locating, or costing out, but as a reminder that it is maybe a long range wish.

Mareck reported that these projects are broken down into the various funding categories including the T.I.P., which is an existing program; existing and committed network, which is basically a local program funded with local funds; Safety program, which are a lot of your intersection improvements or safety type improvements and operational type activities. Williams asked to go back to the T.I.P. slide and asked what dates are being shown, is it 2015 to something. Haugen responded that it is certainly 2018 to 2022, but it might include some 2017 projects as well. Kuharenko commented that he thinks one correction might be on 32nd Avenue, as that project incorporates the intersections for the interchange ramps and he believes that also goes out to South 20th Street as he doesn't believe they are doing any work at 17th or at Washington. Haugen stated that the project termini is Washington to I-29.

Mareck continued going over the funding categories to include State of Good Repair, which is your pavement rehab projects like mill and overlays, full reconstruction, and bridge preservation rehab projects. Haugen pointed out that this map doesn't reflect the latest Grand Forks list. Kuharenko asked if it was based off of the old 2040 Plan. Haugen responded it was. Mareck added, though, that they do have the Grand Forks projects in their Excel table, they just weren't reflected on this map.

Mareck stated that the last category is discretionary or illustrative or whatever you want to call it which includes all the other projects that have been identified but not included in any of the other categories.

Mareck commented that the next step after we finalize this kind of mega project list is to do what is called an alternatives analysis. He explained that what that does is it takes the financial forecasts, basically your checkbook with how much money you have to spend, and breaks it up into a number of sub-pots; so you have six to eight different programming categories that will each have a dollar amount assigned to them, and so they will take that big project list and assign each of those projects to one of those funding categories that have a finite amount of funds in them, then they will assume a local match, and once they go through that exercise and allocate

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018**

all the funds then that will ultimately be your financially constrained plan. He added that the philosophical guidance that will help you, along with your own input to decide where to invest those project dollars is based upon your performance measures, so again that is looking at pavement, safety, capacity, multi-modal, looking at all your different transportation investment areas, there is a performance metrics that they've developed, however they aren't going to get into that today, but there are performance metrics that have been developed and there is guidance from the DOTs and FHWA along with some local input on that as well, but those performance measures will help you identify where to invest those project dollars.

Mareck stated that after they come up with an overall subset of the Universe of Projects that you want them to consider as the financially constrained formal MPO plan, they will work with ATAC and have them run the travel demand model so we can have sort of a network performance output on how that subset of projects will result in improved congestion on your overall system.

Williams asked if Mr. Haugen could refresh her memory on the 17th Avenue South overpass; they went back and forth saying there will never be one, but it is in the 2040 plan right now correct. Haugen responded that it is not in the 2040 plan. Williams said, then, that this would be an addition. Haugen commented that it is, again, one of those things that is an identified project that has not ever been absolute in a recent plan. He added that an interchange at 17th was in a plan several iterations ago, but the current plan does not show it or recommend it. Johnson stated that he thinks the I-29 Study said that it wouldn't provide any benefit to any of the other cross-roads, therefore that should not drive it need but there may be potential other needs for linkage in the future.

Laesch commented that in regard to splitting out the projects in the investment categories; a lot of their projects are going address your state of good repair, safety, and multi-modal all in one project; are you making some assumptions as far as splitting out each project or does the whole project go into one of those categories. Haugen responded that there are going to be some projects that address multiple things, but there are also some funding categories that can only address that specific funding category and safety might be one of the prime examples of where those projects are really going to stand alone as addressing only a safety need. He pointed out that as you will see we have different funding amounts on each side of the river; and one side there may not be very many projects and in the budget they are small scale, but on the other side there might be more opportunity because we have \$7 million plus on one corridor on the North Dakota side addressing just safety issues. Mareck agreed, adding that some funding programs are flexible, where you can use the program to address a variety of different needs where others; like the HSIP, which is exclusively for safety operations; your main street program will be more for your downtown, multi-modal transit, street scape types of improvements; so everything kind of depends upon the program you are talking about how the funds can be used, but as they understand there is a requirement to do a financial constraint based upon the program, so each of those programs has a different color of money, it is not all green, its purple, yellow, etc. so it does create a little bit of inflexibility, but we can work through that.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018**

Mareck stated that today we are going to go over what they think is a finalized draft of the overall revenue forecast. He referred to a slide listing those revenue sources distributed by both State DOTs and went over them briefly.

Mareck commented that the main issue they just learned about in the last week was that NDDOT has decided to not assume that Fargo will become a TMA, at least for this existing planning horizon, however that could change during this horizon, but for now we are going to assume that there will not be a 30% reduction in federal funds for the GF/EGF MPO Plan.

Presentation continued.

Mareck reported that kind of a new wrinkle that they are being asked to add into the financial plans is operational revenue. He explained that this has not been required, they understand, in previous plans so it is something that is kind of a work in progress. He stated that they will fill in the information as it becomes available and they know it may be a little challenging to come up with some of these numbers, but as they understand it there will be some flexibility in what they are able to show, but the hope is that over time we will be able to fully populate the operation side as well as the capital side to show what those future revenues will be.

Mareck referred to slides listing the North Dakota and Minnesota totals in forecasted revenues and stated that this is where the rubber hits the road. He reiterated that we were talking earlier about all the different silos and different colors of money and pointed that that these next two slides list those funding sources for both States.

Grasser asked, in regard to how you are categorizing dollars, if we have, let's say a federal project of \$1 million dollars what are you programming in that as the expected City match, City project cost. Haugen responded that we are using an assumed 80% if it is fundable with federal aid dollars and 20% would be the match amount. Grasser commented that, internally, when they look at a federal project, when they are figuring out the total cost and matches, they are usually more at a 70/30 or 60/40 split by the time they get through all of the project development phases and all those different things, so they will account for the expenditure somewhere in the line of, we look like we have more dollars for match than they really do. Haugen responded that as we get into the allocation of this project and this time band we will be working with not just the federal aid projects, but now with the sales tax you will be doing some project on the federal aid network without federal aid involved, so at that point we can start identifying how much we think will be covered by this revenue source versus how much will be covered by that revenue source, so we are starting out with the generic 80/20 split, but we can get project specific on some of the key projects, but he doesn't know that we have to through every project, especially the outer years.

Mareck added that the plan is really kind of meant to be a 30,000 elevation snapshot of just a best guess at this time; we don't know how all these numbers are going to shake out; but Mr. Grasser is right that there are circumstances where you will end up providing more local funds than we are showing in the plan; but if you know if there are certain projects that you know for sure it will be more than the 20% you can let us know and we can show that, but we are just

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018**

trying to use the minimum amount required by federal law, which is 20%, and use that as a guide. Grasser commented that in those concepts though, if we are spending to a 30,000 level; which he agrees we should have, we might use a 70/30 maybe. He said that they know every single project that they have, that probably isn't on a state highway, is going to cost them more than 80/20; it is only a question of whether it is 70/30 or 65/35, but he thinks by default on that you assume something greater than the 20% local share; and he agrees he would rather not do it on a project by project basis, but to use that argument he would say 20% is probably not an accurate analysis either. Haugen responded that they will canvas each individual jurisdiction to see how they want to approach this; Grand Forks might want to use the 70/30 split, and that is fine so they will start, from there you will get an e-mail soon; and that might be comfortable when 80/20 is assumed in North Dakota, so they will try to get a sense, but they will certainly going to spend more effort on the short-term and maybe half of the mid-term projects than the long-term projects.

Mareck continued, summarizing that they have identified roughly about \$900 million in need in the Universe of Project list in current dollars; so keep in mind that if there is a significant change in any of our revenue assumptions during the life of the plan it is required that the MPO then revisit this assumption, so, for instance NDDOT tells us that we do not have to assume that FM/COG is a TMA, and that we will have to cut back our federal funds by 30%, that would be considered a significant change in our assumption so we would have to go back and ratchet down that financially constrained plan to illustrate that change. He added that if there would also happen to be a change in congress with the allocation of federal funds that come into the States of Minnesota and North Dakota, that would obviously have a trickle-down effect to local jurisdictions and the MPOs. He cited things like the FAST-ACT expiring in a couple of years, which is during the time-frame of this plan; and right now the Federal Highway Trust Fund doesn't have enough funding coming in to keep up with the revenue going out so unless they come up with a way to fix that discrepancy, there could potentially be a reduction in federal funds coming from Congress to the States; so these would be examples of a need to go back to revisit the plan and make some adjustments.

Grasser commented that at the national level there has been some discussion about changing the federal formula from 80/20 to 20/80, is that something that could actually happen. Mareck responded that that would certainly turn everything upside down if that were to happen; it would be a brand new world so hopefully that doesn't happen, but they would have to deal with it if it did.

Mareck stated that it is assumed that it is reasonable to use the current established rule as we know it today, and lets assume that that is reasonable, so no one is going to question us for using the current legislative landscapes at the State or Federal level, and that is basically what we have to go by right now so that is what they are using at this point in time.

Haugen commented that the flip to 20/80 has been discussed, particularly at the Executive Branch level. He added that even the BUILD program that is out on the street right now, there is still 100% funding for rural properties, so the 20/80 is still far from law, but for now since we

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018**

have to do this by the end of the year, it is reasonable to forecast that it isn't going to arrive in January, but if it radically change we are mandated to radically revisit our plan.

Grasser stated that he isn't sure this is right place to ask this question, but on the Universe of Projects; and he knows that Mr. Haugen submitted the Universe of Projects on the Urban Grant, and one of the things that has been desired by our local politicians was that we had to bury some of the underground utilities in the alleys, and things like that, is kind of portrayed in some of the mutual concepts of that program, and now we are getting direction that those aren't qualified federal, and he gets it that we would kind of determine qualified federal but is there the potential that we would be interjecting some other non-Federal sources in there that would make those he is trying to figure out if it is right to excluded from the Universe of Projects, but he isn't sure that they can include it either, so he is trying to figure out where to go with that Universe of Projects thing. Johnson responded that in terms of just burying the utilities for essentially an aesthetic reason that wouldn't be a federal expense from the current funding that we have available. He added that we can put federal aid on utilities if we are in fact mitigating, in-kind, so if we were doing a project say downtown and we impacted an above ground utility we can pay for it and put it back above ground, but if the utility company wants to bury it they pay the additional cost to bury it, so you're right, that would not be something that they would be able to fund as of right now. He said that the NDDOT is, to his knowledge, still the only agency that has an active program for funding for the Main Street Initiative right now; there are other departments that are working on things that maybe could potentially bring some additional funding to the table for those elements, or there maybe is the opportunity this next legislative session for some sort of State revenue to provide the ability to do those types of things, but right now they don't have a funding mechanism in place. Grasser said that he is wonder if they remove them from one set of books but then keep them in mind for another set of books. Johnson responded that he thinks that would probably be a good idea, to keep them out there as another element and concept the City wants to pursue as part of the overall Main Street Initiative that may be currently unfunded.

Haugen said that in the spreadsheet available they have identified, perhaps, some projects that you've already identified as being replacements for those ten utility relocates; adding that they haven't changed the dollar value; and it seemed to be a one-for-one change, there aren't as many projects but the dollar values are fairly close.

Mereck stated that the last thing he wants to touch on briefly is the addendum that is being worked on for the Long Range Plan to do an update of a previous river crossing study.

Mereck reported that ATAC has rerun the Elks Drive location, explaining that it is a very minor variation of the 24th Avenue modeling; and added that they also did 17th Avenue as well.

Mereck reiterated that he is with WSB, and they are working with Kimley-Horn, who is actually the prime on this overall plan; and they were not able to be here today so he is filling in for some of the commentary that they would be doing.

Mereck reported that the travel demand modeling has been completed and they are doing some micro-simulation models of intersections and the Kimley-Horn team is working with the Army

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018**

Corps and coordinating with them on some slip-plain locations that have been identified and are doing a very high level preliminary engineering review of the river crossings and Lidar files have been obtained and in the end they will have a high level travel demand modeling and traffic analysis of the immediate intersections east and west of the river crossings. He added that they will also be looking at a very high level of pavements for each of these corridors and also providing a planning level cost estimate updated to current dollars for each of those river crossings.

Haugen commented that the next thing on the schedule will be this last bullet where we will be trying to assemble a group of elected officials and others just to walk through what the 47th Avenue Road Authority on the Minnesota side processing, adding that if the Township can do it that would be awesome, but they are struggling to figure out how they can, so we need to find a surrogate, and that is what the June meeting will be trying to do, just to help identify what all that entails. He added that in July we will get the full analyses for all five crossings.

Mareck went over the timeline for the plan and stated that they will be seeking approval of the final plan in December.

Mareck referred to the project list and asked if anyone wanted to go through it in detail. Haugen stated that we can do that now if anyone wishes. He added that it is critical that we have we have this list kind of buttoned up so we aren't lingering next month and still questioning why projects aren't the list or why projects are on the list.

Williams asked where the written list for the Universe of Projects is located. Mareck responded that Mr. Haugen has it on the computer and can pull it up if desired. Haugen added that the list is available on the MPO website for review as well.

Haugen referred to slides illustrating the list of projects and pointed out that there are project categories; there is the T.I.P. list of projects, the existing plus committee list of projects, the safety plan identified list of projects, the Urban Grant or Mainstreet list of projects. He said that on the Minnesota side it would be the Main Street Urban Grant. He pointed out that the ones in yellow are highlighting that they are projects that are not eligible for the Urban Grant Program, and says that there are some projects further down on the list that are identified as replacements or surrogates. He added that there is also a list of State of Good Repair projects, and the ones that have these are the ones that could be replacements for the Urban Grant project. He pointed out that the last part of the list are the discretionary projects.

Grasser said that when they gave staff their list there were actually two lists; one was the classified streets and he is wondering if we were to receive to federal funding for certain project they would be essentially reconstruction on most of them, but if they are going to end up doing them as local, how do you reconcile those two lists. Mareck responded that what they did, for now, and they are looking for input, is that if there two numbers; a larger number and a smaller number, for financial constraint reasons they assume the worst case scenario. He explained that they do this because if you show the lower cost and then come back and want to do the higher cost, you would have to do a plan amendment because it would be outside the financial

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018**

constraint, so if you are going to have the bigger cost in the plan, and end up doing something smaller for whatever reason you might still have to coordinate with the MPO and let them know, but you might be able to avoid a plan amendment because the smaller amount would be a subset of the bigger amount.

Haugen referred to the list and stated that they are identifying them as all reconstructions, and the dollar amount represents that higher value. Mareck said that if anyone knows for certain that a project will not be a reconstruction project, please let them know and they can change it; but if you want to have the option to do either he would recommend sticking with the higher cost number. Grasser responded that he thinks that the ones that maybe wouldn't be a reconstruction project would be ones like a street that they built in the last five years, that may need some maintenance activities by the time we get to 2045, so that is what he is referring to. He added, though, that almost all of the older streets would most likely be a reconstruction project.

Haugen commented that he would anticipate that, just as they had to do with the Grand Forks District's list last time, where they had some reconstruction projects identified, to get it fiscally constrained it pushed some beyond the life of the plan and a lot of these reconstruction projects will be pushed beyond the life of the plan as well; but still identified as perhaps the ultimate project you would like to see done, but we have the option if you, for whatever reason, would decide two years or a month from now that Cherry Street should no longer be reconstructed and should be a mill and overlay, and should be considered in a fiscally constrained plan; the only way we could do it is squeeze it in at the mill and overlay cost and that is still available as an option to us, but right now we just put in the most costly project when we had those two options. Grasser asked if that suggests that if they do a mill and overlay with local money that we have to go through amendments every time we do one of those projects. Haugen responded that we are trying to identify state of good repair on the Federal Aid system and so, yes, for the first five years that would be a way to show that they are being maintained otherwise they aren't being shown as having a project that is impacting the Federal Aid system, bringing them up to a state of good repair.

Haugen reported that the one list had the reconstruction extension of Columbia and South Washington, that was placed in discretionary because you had a state of good repair project identified, and you had it listed as illustrative, so that was the only project out of your list that they did place in the discretionary list otherwise all the rest are either in the Urban Grant or the State of Good Repair for now. Kuharenko asked if that was the reconstruction project for those two. Haugen responded it was.

Haugen stated that if they have not received any changes by Friday, they will consider this list good to go and will use it in the plan.

Kadrmass commented that he hasn't had a chance to talk to Mr. Noehre but he wanted to ask about the segment on Highway 2 from 55th to 69th. He said that you have discretionary, you have from 55th to 69th for the rural to urban section upgrade, and then on the MPO T.I.P. you have reconstruct from 69th to the Air Force Base, so what is happening between 55th and 69th in

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 13th, 2018**

the timeframe to the discretionary project. Haugen responded that there is nothing identified. Kadmas said that he just wants to make sure we don't forget about that one.

Haugen said that he was just going to talk briefly about the additional revenue that we are identifying now that we didn't in 2040, the main funding sources. He explained that they are, obviously the new sales tax in Grand Forks is one contribution; Minnesota DOT, in the old plan we didn't identify any work being done in our study area now there are a lot of identified projects with corresponding revenue programmed to it; and then to a much lesser level we are now including county revenues, so other than inflation and more revenue coming in, generally those would be the three things that really have shifted to a larger dollar amount.

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.

b. NDDOT Draft 2019-2023 S.T.I.P.

Haugen reported that the NDDOT released their Draft 2019-2023 S.T.I.P. He commented that the only program that hasn't announced an award are the FTA 5339 and 5310, otherwise all of the other programs have announced their awards. Johnson commented that one other one would be the Urban Grant Program.

Kuharenko commented that adding to that, they did receive notification from the NDDOT that they were awarded TA funding for 17th Avenue North. He said it wasn't the full amount but it was about \$205,000 or \$208,000. He said that this will be going to the City Council for their approval to accept the funding.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO ADJOURN THE JUNE 13TH, 2018,
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:59 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager