

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

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen Chairman, called the July 11th, 2018, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:40 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Darren Laesch, MnDOT; Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck (via phone); David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Jesse Kadrmas, NDDOT-Local District; Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; and Dale Bergman, Area Cities Transit.

Absent were: Dustin Lang, Brad Gengler, Ryan Brooks, Brad Bail, Lane Magnuson, Richard Audette, Paul Konickson, Ali Rood, Nancy Ellis, Ryan Riesinger, Stacey Hanson, Nick West, Mike Yavarow, Lars Christianson, and Rich Sanders.

Guest(s) present were: Troy Schroeder, NWRDC; 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 everyone please state their name and the organization they represent.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 13TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE THE JUNE 13TH,
2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

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

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

Minnesota Side

Haugen reported that this amendment will be the first amendment that we are addressing that will also address the performance measures that we are now required to include. He added that it is in regard to safety.

Haugen stated that the amendment itself is due to the possibility that several projects that East Grand Forks is scheduled to do this summer may be funded by a different funding source than the City's Subtarget that the City gets through the ATP every four years.

Haugen commented that he isn't sure if this is something that is just Minnesota opportunity for SAFETEA-LU monies left over from the Safe Routes To School Program, or if it is a national call and this is just the Minnesota portion of it. Laesch responded that he believes it is a national call for funding, but they reached out to Minnesota early in the process. Haugen said, then, that across the State of Minnesota they are trying to identify projects that are really "shovel ready" to try to get access to these funds as they are set to expire, so the Minnesota District 2 Office was able to identify four projects, that are a part of a larger set of projects that East Grand Forks is doing with their City Subtarget funds.

Haugen said that he doesn't know if they have received word as to whether or not if this will be funded out of this program, so, because there will be a very short timeframe between making a decision and accessing the funding so we are sort of taking tentative action so that when the MPO Executive Policy Board meets next week, if we don't have an answer by then, we will be asking the board to approve this contingent on the award being done at the Federal level, and the State level.

Haugen commented that the two things we don't know is if this will truly be funded out of these other pots of money, out of the program or not other programmed amounts, and the other thing that is hopefully going to happen is that more dollars from the Federal side will contribute to the total dollar amount. He explained that the way the State has been considering this is one of two ways; right now he thinks that if the total project is like \$1.2 million dollars, they have \$860,000.00 in City Subtarget so one way of doing this would be to just replace the difference between \$860,000.00; well let's backtrack; . he He explained that SAFETEA-LU Safe Routes to School funding allows for greater than 80% match, so there is a possibility that there could be a larger match than \$860,000.00, so the question is how much more federal funds beyond the \$860,000.00 will actually come from the Safe Routes to School program, we don't know that dollar value yet. He added that another thing that could happen is that the actual City Subtarget will be removed and all of the federal funds would be coming from the SAFETEA-LU Safe Routes to School program.

Haugen stated that what they are showing on the draft amendment is just the fact that the funding source is going to change, but we don't yet know how to change the dollar amounts so we aren't

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

proposing any change to them yet. He said that we hope to have an answer by Monday and the public hearing notice was published for Next Wednesday's MPO Executive Policy Board meeting.

Haugen commented that the first time he heard about this was a couple of weeks ago, and they were hoping to have an answer to all of this at the end of June, but now are hoping for an answer by next Monday so are moving this along, but, again, if they don't have an answer and the Board meets Wednesday and they want to approve this it would be contingent on award of the different funding source and approval at the local level.

Haugen reported that the public hearing notice was published for next Wednesday's Board meeting. He stated that it is his understanding that the City awarded the bids for this project last evening at City Council. asked if the project had been awarded already. Emery responded that they did award the bids last evening, it had. Laesch asked if there were any concerns, now that it has been awarded, that it won't be eligible for the SAFETY-LU funds. Emery responded that he talked to Lou and was told to go ahead and award it.

Haugen stated that the second part of the amendment is the write up for our T.I.P. based on the Minnesota Federal Highways' guidance that they provided to us back in April. He said that a copy of the draft write up was included in the packet, but since then Federal Highway Minnesota did ask for an additional piece be added to it.

Haugen referred to a slide showing the requested information and explained that what is essentially saying is how MPO Staff are learning about performance measures, and how they have engaged with our MOA's with both States and how we will be moving forward with them.

Haugen commented that, with this addition Federal Highways Minnesota is comfortable with the draft before us, so Staff is recommending approval contingent on both the public's participation and also the Federal Award outcome.

Halford referred to the public hearing notice and pointed out that it says North Dakota side instead of Minnesota and she was wondering if that would create a problem. Haugen responded that it would not.

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY LAESCH, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE ANNUAL ELEMENT OF THE FY2018-2021 T.I.P., SUBJECT TO PUBLIC INPUT, AND ON THE FEDERAL AWARD OUTCOME.

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

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

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Emery, Halford, Laesch, Johnson, Kuharenko, and Bergman.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: Williams.

Absent: Lang, Ellis, Bail, Gengler, Brooks, Riesinger/Audette, Konickson, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, West, Magnuson, Sanders, Christianson.

MATTER OF DRAFT RFP FOR MN#220 NORTH CORRIDOR STUDY

ViafaraHaugen reported that a copy of the Request for Proposals for Transportation Planning Services to undertake the Minnesota 220 North Corridor Study. He stated that the information that is needed by the prospective consultant, including the scope of services and products to be delivered by their services is included.

Viafara said that he would like to bring to your attention is that the purpose of this scope is to retain a consultant to conduct an analysis of the segment that is between Minnesota 220 North down to the intersection of DeMers/9th Street, and then one mile over to 23rd Street North.

Viafara commented that just for information what was included in today's packet has since been updated and a few changes were made in order to clean up the overall document. He referred to the RFP document and went over the changes made.

Laesch stated that MnDOT's focus is more on the intersection of U.S. #2 and 220; he said that he knows you have that one on the slide, but the one in the packet doesn't have it. Viafara responded that what is in the packet is the old version and wasn't updated. Laesch said that, again, their emphasis is that intersection as they have a lot of safety issues that they would like to address with an HSIP project, and they would like this study to further analyze that. He added that they are also looking at the intersection to the north to replace the signal, so they would like to update the whole corridor before they move ahead with any projects. He said that that his reason for rephrasing to ensure that the focus is more on the higher volume areas of the corridor.

Viafara continued going over the changes that were made since the packet went out.

Kuharenko referred to #6 Proposal Format and Content Section C and pointed out that it says US2 and US Bus 2 Study. Viafara responded that, again, the document in the packet has not been updated, but the incorrect studies have also been replaced so in the next version you will not see that. He added, though, that there are two areas that you will find U.S. #2, it is an intersection with 220.

Emery referred to the Staff report and pointed out that it gives a budget of \$70,000, but when you look at the Request For Proposals it shows a budget of \$60,000. Viafara said that he would make that change. Halford asked if it was \$60,000 or \$70,000. Emery responded that he thinks it is \$70,000.

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

MOVED BY LAESCH, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FOR THE MINNESOTA 220 NORTH CORRIDOR STUDY SUBJECT TO CHANGES, AS NOTED.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Emery, Halford, Laesch, Johnson, Kuharenko, and Bergman.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: Williams.

Absent: Lang, Ellis, Bail, Gengler, Brooks, Riesinger/Audette, Konickson, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, West, Magnuson, Sanders, Christianson.

**MATTER OF DRAFT RFP FOR THE GRAND FORKS DOWNTOWN
TRANSPORTATION PLAN STUDY**

Haugen reported that he has been working with Meredith Richards, Grand Forks Community Development, and she provided a scope of work of the most interest to coincide with the effort they are doing with their Downtown Action Plan.

Haugen referred to the scope of work, included in the packet, and pointed out that it entails a Parking Study Update; looking at the one-way pairing of 3rd and 4th Streets; looking at University Avenue Corridor and strengthening the connection between UND and the downtown; and doing Downtown Traffic Management by looking at what roads we can switch people to and determine what type of improved traffic coordination we get with the signals on the Minnesota side, trying to see if there is a defined bike network that we can identify, see if there is more transit opportunities including looking at autonomous transit.

Kuharenko asked how exactly does the Downtown Action Plan the City is currently working on, and this scope of work mesh together. Richards responded there is a little bit of background just ahead of this but they are in the process of doing their Downtown Action Plan and this paragraph kind of lays out what that will produce in the way of deliverables. She stated that the context kind of behind why they are doing this was the idea that over the next five to ten years Grand Forks is expecting on the order of \$100 million dollars in reinvestment in Downtown Grand Forks, so they want to make sure that for this intermediate term we are prepared with technical elements so that as these investments come in we are ready. She added that, obviously the streetscape is going to be first and foremost with the DeMers reconstruction, but longer term, private sector issues like updating our Design Guidelines, and having a redevelopment strategy that addresses some of the economics and financing is important.

Richards stated that, again, the context for their Downtown Action Plan is to get prepared for this infusion of reinvestment so that it is strategic and coordinated, and that we don't miss any opportunity; so then the transportation elements that flow into that; yes the parking study is, obviously the MPO printed that in 2011, so that clearly needs to be updated with 3rd and 4th Streets. She added that, as Mr. Haugen mentioned, a big part of our Downtown Action Planning process is looking at the redevelopment of the Water Treatment Plan, so we want to make sure that we know if there are unintended consequences with the idea that 3rd Street should be vacated

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

so that construction can really access the view that would be up and over the dike, as well as some of other things that are mentioned such as congestion with the bar closing time, and the long term issue of the one way pairs that would be eliminated. She stated that the University Avenue Corridor, again, this has been a long term discussion formed of how we can build bridges physically and perception wise between campus and downtown. She added that coincidentally the Downtown Action Plan consultant RDG is doing some of that work on campus right now so we can take advantage of that.

Richards reported that for the downtown traffic management, she is going to just throw up her hands and say that it is a little bit over her head in terms that she isn't quite sure what this means and so she kind of unsure of changing the words in line four.

Haugen commented that a lot of this is based on a proposal that the Selection Committee entertained with the selection of RDG; a follow-up proposal of work that they can do. Richards added that out of the interview process, the reason they selected RDG's design, was that there was kind of a dazzling presentation by Mike Bitner, and that kind of stimulated some thought about what else could we incorporate into downtown traffic planning.

Kuharenko said that he supposes that that number four, kind of how it ties into the DeMers Avenue reconstruction; he knows they are working on the design and getting it out the door as quickly as possible; and it looks like the final report for this is due at the end of June 2019, so about a year from now is when this is supposed to be done, so does that make sense for the DeMers Avenue Reconstruction; and he doesn't know when the Downtown Action Plan will be wrapped up. Richards responded that the timeline on this kind of surprised her because it is longer than she expected it to be; and the RDG plan will wrap up sometime in May or June 2019 so some of the earlier elements they really need to have prioritized to make sure that they get done and the information shared with RDG during the time that they are actively planning, so she isn't quite sure how to deal with that timeline issue, in terms of this RFP.

Haugen stated that Ms. Richards did share with him the surprise, and he replied back a couple of things; we are starting later than RDG is starting, but there is still a scope of work that has to have time to it. He said that for some of the data collection we need to wait for the Kennedy Bridge to open up to its typical four-lanes of traffic otherwise the closure of two lanes will certainly affect the data.

Haugen said that in terms of the relationship to the actual project on DeMers, he doesn't think anybody was intending to imply that whatever comes out of this study will change the design, it is just going to build off of what is being designed in place, and to see what else needs to be done to manage the traffic downtown, so other activities could be done in the future. Williams stated, then, we could take the downtown traffic management out of this study and move it to another study that we do for the 2050 update, so we would keep all of this but it wouldn't be a part of this study, correct. Haugen responded that it is supposed to be a part of this study; so as Ms. Richards works with the strategies of what redevelopment is going to be, where it is going to be, and what kind of traffic will be generate, and how we would manage that differently than it is currently managed.

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

Haugen commented that we will be looking at whether there is potential for changing mode share as this downtown builds vertically, are we going to be able to capture changing how people get; particularly getting people to the downtown as DeMers Avenue is the main corridor, but is there a way to capture motorists prior to getting to the heart of DeMers Avenue downtown. He stated that for many years that was a reroute concept for the Downtown; from the west side.

Haugen stated that in terms of signal coordination, this is geared more towards adaptive signal timing. He said that MnDOT is looking at upgrading their signals in East Grand Forks by 2023. He explained that we currently have ATAC under contract with the Counting Program to help inform MnDOT what equipment works best with the Counting.

Haugen commented that in the past we have always been hampered by two different signal systems that aren't great at communicating with each other for the DeMers Avenue traffic flow, this might be the opportunity to help identify to MnDOT how their investment would work, and show them, through simulation, how that might work to make traffic flow better in both downtowns.

Williams asked if it wouldn't work better if all the traffic counts and everything that is included in Number 4 were done after the DeMers construction because we don't know what the bump-outs are going to do; if it is going to divert traffic, but to go through this using existing traffic, it isn't going to be any good once DeMers is done because that will be a major change. Haugen responded that it can be updated, but from the information he is getting this is what is desired by the City to have us undertake. He added that with the dollar value that we've allowed for this to work, it fits within the dollar values, so again they have given a skeleton proposal to one consultant saying this is the work we want done, so work with it within the RFP, but this is what we would like you to help us do with our Downtown transportation.

Kuharenko referred to Number 4 in the Scope of Work and commented that he is still looking at this with the timelines we have coming up, with the differences with the traffic flows we are going to have between the Kennedy and reconstruction of DeMers Avenue he doesn't know how worthwhile it is going to be to have this particular segment at this point in time. He said that he would have a problem that this might be, just for the sake of the timeline, but also for the aspect of funding as well, maybe removing this portion and getting it put into either a study down the road after DeMers has been reconstructed, after North 5th has been given a mill and overlay, it might not be the right time for it. He added that he would probably be inclined to go as far as saying we should just remove this segment from the scope of work and focus on those items #1, #2, and #3. Haugen said, again that the communication he is getting from the City of Grand Forks, this is the proposed segment they want us to consider, so you are reconsidering all this, that is fine.

Discussion on whether or not #4 should remain in the scope of work ensued.

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

Richards stated that she is looking for information that will inform her consultants as they do the elements of their study which were those items she mentioned; redevelopment strategy of streetscape and design guidelines. She added that she is the first to admit that she hadn't thought about the issue of data collection and how it would change based on the Kennedy Bridge reconstruction, but all she knows is what she wants at the end, but she doesn't know how to get there, so that is why this Technical Advisory Group is here.

Bergman asked if MnDOT would be looking at signal priority too. Laesch asked what he meant by priority. Bergman responded that you have TSB that you use on emergency vehicles and buses. Laesch responded that he would think that would be considered. Williams added that in Grand Forks they currently have a system they are using, the GTT Opticom, where they have the preemption for emergency vehicles, but they also have a true transit priority so that it is set in there. Laesch said that he will have to talk to their traffic engineer about this, as it is certainly something that is desired.

Grasser said that it sounded like we are getting caught in a catch-twenty-two in here that circumstances have changed, probably, from discussions that we had, and those types of things; and he is concerned that we need certain things to move very quickly in the downtown, and if we can't deliver them, is there some way we can use existing counts and get something and more thoughts into the study as opposed to waiting because the waiting thing is going to potentially make much of the study irrelevant relative to being able to apply it to decisions that otherwise wouldn't be made, so he is wondering if there are some things we can do to cut down the dollar of the scope of work, as some of those items are not meant for item 4 seem to be a little bit more global in nature, and might be better off to defer to a; he is sure you can't do it in our current Long Range Transportation plan, but even another study or the next one down the line. He said that his understanding is that we are probably looking at a kind of corral the downtown the next five to ten year planning period so the best investment and so those things that may only have impacts down the line, the things suggested might be things that we back out in the interest of time; and again if you do traffic counts you are not trying to date back the counts and project them out through the years, you are only trying to project them five, and maybe there is enough info that today's data and past data that we can maybe use it to get us close enough for a shorter time frame.

Haugen commented, obviously for DeMers itself we could rely on the traffic data that was done; as far as traffic operation analysis it is those other streets off of DeMers that we really have limited counts for. He added that it is his understanding that for traffic management it isn't so much focusing on the management of DeMers, as we know it is going to be changed there next summer, it is with that reality, and we have more demand coming in, and what is being built there the traffic operation study asks if it is going handle all future traffic, so we need to try to start the path of converting people to other modes, with vertical density is going to allow better opportunity than is currently there.

Williams said that they have to know if 3rd and 4th are a one way pair to get to the second part, the second part is dependent on the first part and she thinks that the stumbling block, in that we have to first determine whether the 3rd and 4th one way pairs are going to be there or not, and

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

then if we figure out if they are or not then the next report can be the downtown, because she wouldn't want to try to guess what would happen if we make both of those streets two-ways, so your counts are going to be all different.

Haugen pointed out that the schedule shows that we aren't able to hire anybody until September 1st.

Kuharenko asked if there was any other way to get the timeline a little bit more compressed because that would then allow Ms. Richards to get the information over to her consultant. He said that he doesn't know if we end up making the draft report submittal due in April, in March, and then the final a month after that it would be a much tighter for the timeline. Halford asked what Ms. Richards' ideal to making timelines was. Richards responded that her consultant has kind of laid out a pretty solid scope of work to the end of this year, so she isn't real sure of at what point the products of these studies would be necessary for them to stay on schedule. Haugen stated that the parking is something that obviously doesn't have to have traffic counts, and waiting for the Kennedy Bridge, so that is on it's own schedule so it can be moved up and done faster than being part of the complete documentation things we have to do. Richards commented that the University Avenue Corridor does not seem to be too time sensitive.

Haugen commented that #2 has to be determined before #4 can be done, so we can identify different time frames for one and two within the RFP and allow longer ones for the other two.

Grasser asked if #3 depends on traffic counts. Williams responded that she doesn't think that the University Corridor is going to be affected as much as the downtown with the changes. She said there might be a little bit of change at 3rd and 4th, but she actually thinks you can go ahead with the University Corridor also. Haugen asked when the Kennedy Bridge would be fully functional, or as normal as possible. He stated that the big things are there are on and off ramps on the Minnesota side, when are they going to be fully functional. Emery responded that they will have to switch to the south half of the bridge probably in August or September, and then they will probably open the whole bridge probably in October or November.

Discussion on traffic count data needs ensued.

Kuharenko asked when the final report is due. Richards responded that their timeline has them completing their work in May. Kuharenko said that you are talking probably preliminary approval in April. Richards responded that the timeline is for preparation drafts in May. Williams commented that there are a couple of items in here that if there were any changes made you would need to go through the public comments and such, so in essence this report would need to be done at the end of January or early February.

Haugen asked, just to flip the question; can the Downtown Action Plan schedule slide a month or two. Richards responded that the focus right now is streetscape, streetscape, streetscape; and that has kind of altered the course that they would probably follow for a project like this, so in fact what they are calling their Kick-Off meeting won't occur until October. She added that obviously streetscape has to be done by the DOT timelines, once that is accomplished their

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

process is not willing to deliver a final booklet, so we'll get a streetscape element, and that will be done well before May, and then they will get a parks and open space opinion, and we aren't really worried about the timeline for that element.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY HALFORD, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT APPROVE THE RFP FOR THE DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION PLAN, SUBJECT TO CHANGES AS NOTED; SUBMITTAL OF DRAFT REPORT BY THE END OF FEBRUARY 2019; SUBMITTAL OF THE FINAL REPORT BY THE END OF MARCH 2019; REMOVAL OF ITEM #4 IN THE SCOPE OF WORK; AND FOR STAFF TO DETERMINE COST DIFFERENCE AND BRING REVISED COST ESTIMATE TO THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Emery, Halford, Laesch, Johnson, Kuharenko, and Bergman.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: Williams.

Absent: Lang, Ellis, Bail, Gengler, Brooks, Riesinger/Audette, Konickson, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, West, Magnuson, Sanders, Christianson.

MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE

Haugen reported that they are trying to get some revenue forecasts finalized, and will touch on Performance Measure 2, and give an update on where we are at on the River Crossing Analysis.

Universe Of Projects

Haugen commented that he believes that we are only waiting for it; there was a meeting with the Districts and other staff on the North Dakota District and Mr. Noehre was going to modify his spreadsheet to show the work of that effort, but it hasn't been delivered yet, but he is aware of the request for it.

Haugen stated that with the Universe of Projects they do still have to identify each individual potential river crossing projects.

Haugen said that on the Main Street Program they were informed that the utility relocations aren't eligible under the Urban Grant Program, so there is still a need to perhaps identify projects for that program in lieu of those that were an addition to those.

Haugen referred to a slide and explained that it is a reminder of the dollar values that are still in-flux, but there are still around \$900 million dollars.

Haugen commented that they are trying to get the Universe of Projects wrapped up, and sent information out. He stated that it looks like July 27th is the best date to go over the Universe List of Projects and start applying fiscal constraint to them, etc., so please schedule four hours of your time to do that.

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

Laesch asked how that affects the DOT side, as the projects he submitted he feels we can do fiscally, but is this kind of a give and take between all the different jurisdictions. Haugen responded that the fiscal constraint is still within the funding silos, so you really don't have any projects competing against the funding for the District Risk Management Funds, or the statewide program; some of those are still siloed so we aren't stealing from one to pay to the other. Laesch said, then, when you looked at what your total amount was are you basically taking what he submitted as those silos. Haugen responded that that is correct. He added that they are using a baseline and applying what MnDOT said was the rate of growth to use for financial forecasting.

Kuharenko asked, just for clarification are you saying July 27th, Friday morning, is that an 8:00 to noon meeting. Haugen responded it is.

Haugen commented that as soon as we start to narrow down projects, they will start to run some travel demand models to see how it helps or hurts our system with those projects.

Financial Plan Draft

Haugen stated that the big change from last month is that they were doubling up on some City of Grand Forks funding programs, so they revised what they were forecasting.

Haugen referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and commented that we previously had a number of \$200+ million dollars, but after reviewing everything, that number has been reduced to \$126 million dollars. He explained that last month they showed what the total was, and now they are showing what the funding programs are.

Haugen reported that on the Minnesota side we show a total of \$30 million in the Statewide Performance and \$30 million in the District Risk. He commented that the projects themselves, again these aren't showing what the project cost will necessarily be; how many projects will be done in those time bands. He added that they aren't going to do, say another Urban Regional, a \$37 million dollar project, and only do one project in a timeband. He said that this is identifying based on a baseline of a million dollars, how that grows, 2% in North Dakota, and how per year, then add up the years and come up with these timeband amounts by revenue sources.

Haugen pointed out that this number has been revised down as the total available, and again because of that doubling error on the Grand Forks local side, it was reduced considerably from what it was last month, but we are, again reporting this in the year of expenditure dollars so as soon as we look at our projects on Friday, July 27th, and start assigning the year expenditure those costs will inflate to the year of expenditure and will coincide with the dollars available.

Haugen stated that he wants to remind everyone that this is a five year plan, but because of a potential major change in financial we may have to revisit the plan earlier than the normal five years.

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

Grasser asked, on the finance end what are we doing in 2018 to 2023. Haugen responded that they are doing things differently; each program almost has a different answer because; HSIP, Interstate, Regional, Local, these top four, they are all pretty much programmed in our T.I.P. so 2023 would be the start year for them; the Urban or Main Street Grant is only awarded out to 2020, so we will start in 2021 for that program; so some of these programs have a little different timeline, but the general timeline is 2023 to 2045, but some individual programs will be a little different.

Discussion on projects and timebands ensued.

Performance Measures

Haugen stated that they are focusing on PM2, the pavement and bridge targets. He explained that, just as with Safety, we can adopt up to twelve targets, or we can adopt as little as six targets. He said that if we adopt the State targets we have to adopt both State targets, we can't adopt one State target and have a local target in that same measure.

Haugen commented that for Pavement we are looking at Interstate, Non-Interstate, NHS; both good and poor targets. He said that what we are finding out is that we are not able, in this Long Range Transportation Plan to make a uniform data collection to have one target set for the MPO, and that is for all of these targets, so with the event, unless some miracle happens, we are now recommending for these particular targets to adopt the State targets as we don't have the availability of uniform data, particularly on pavement, bridges it is a little more uniform.

Haugen stated that we officially have until the end of November to make a decision, and we also have scheduled to have a draft document done earlier than that, so maybe as early as next month we will be asking for a decision on bridges and pavement target setting.

Haugen commented that these are generally four year targets, but there is a provision in the law that requires after two years a review of how they are performing and allows for an adjustment to be made in that target, but each State considers that two year period a little differently; for example on bridges with poor condition Minnesota, even though the target value is the same, they made it a two year target rather than a four year target while North Dakota made it a four year target at 4%, but again most States have to review them after a two year period.

Grasser asked if this measures "the bridge" or percentage of the bridge that maybe in poor condition. Haugen responded that there are three components; three different parts of a bridge or culverts over a certain size.

Grasser said, though that we are only measuring Interstate and NHS, so in his mind, just going statistically, we are either going to have almost 100% or we are going to have 0%; but he agrees 4% makes sense, and he isn't saying we should change anything, but percentage wise we are either going to, because of the small number of structures we have, we are either going to totally great or totally fail. Haugen pointed out that the info still shows the Kennedy Bridge, for example, prior to the work that is being done on it in very poor shape. He explained that it

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

presented poorly largely because the Kennedy Bridge data that is prior to the work Grasser stated, again, as we are measuring it on that NHS system, we have so few bridges that are on that system.

River Crossing Analysis

Haugen reported that the consultants have done the mapping that shows; you will remember that we added 17th Avenue and shifted 24th Avenue to the more logical location of Elks Drive; so the data results were included in the packets. He commented that 17th performs a lot like Elks does, its not to much of a dramatic change. He added that one big thing is that at each of the intersections the touchdown points, they have also done the calculations of level of service, and that is in the packets.

Williams asked what the level of service based on, was it the existing traffic controls, or are they all signalized, or what. Haugen referred to a slide (a copy of which is included in the packets and available upon request) and pointed out that there is a column showing the existing traffic control and the 2045 level of service, and that crossing was added; and then the proposed traffic control improvement change, and what the level of service will be. He added that there is also some mitigation and strategy; and they are still working yet touchdown points the bridge traffic doesn't change much, there is an increase in traffic, but from a level of service point of view its not.

Williams referred to a page in the document and stated that it is based on existing traffic control devices. Haugen responded that that is correct.

Kuharenko referred to the Roadway Planning Capacities sheet and pointed out it states that 32nd Avenue, east of Belmont, widening is going to be required, but yet in the 32nd Avenue River Crossing you are only showing 8,000 ADT. He said that he is wondering why we would widen 32nd Avenue east of Belmont, when it would probably be suited by a two-lane roadway. Haugen commented that it is adding a left turn lane. He added that it is east of Belmont so it is the intersection geometry at Belmont and 32nd. Kuharenko said, then, that it would only be a left turn lane at that intersection. Haugen responded that that is correct. Kuharenko suggested it might be good to word that bullet more clearly.

Haugen referred to slides illustrating alignments, in a planning view level, and commented that you will notice a difference between these photos/maps and what we had in our last study, fifteen years ago; they are using a lot thicker lines of alignment, and aren't zooming in to a greater detail. He stated that these next slides show the five alignments.

Haugen commented that there was a meeting held at the end of June to talk about the uniqueness of 47th Avenue on the Minnesota side. He said that he believes the outcome from that meeting sort of identified that basically from the flood protection south is unlikely to be, as it was identified in the draft, a City issue, it would be a County issue. He added that the County staff and officials that were there identified the possibility of perhaps, the both do not have to be designated highways to be a part of the State Aid System, but they felt perhaps one should be

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

designated CSAH, and the other could just be a County road, the difference is the funding source, obviously. He said that CSAH has some State money being applied to it, while the county road is just local/county revenue sources.

Haugen stated that we are asking the County to essentially give us some sense of where they sit, as a Board, on changing their County network. He said that they have added miles, the CSAH system they had to take off miles somewhere, a new system of trade; they added just County roads that they can just add

Haugen reported that they are working on the final Universe List of Projects, and will be going over it on Friday, July 27th, from 8:00 am. To Noon. He stated that you should be getting some more information prior to that meeting.

Haugen stated that there will also be a package of information to help us work through fiscal constraint and other ways to try to narrow down the list of projects as well.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2018 Annual Work Program Project Update

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

Halford asked if there is a total of five sections to the Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan, or are there any more sections out there that they haven't gotten yet. Viafara responded that there is recommendation section and an Executive Summary. He stated that he mentioned to her that there were not recommendations standing alone by itself, there were some recommendations embedded in the overall text. Halford asked if that should be part of the Executive Summary. Viafara responded that is what they are preparing now.

Halford asked when that information would be shared. Viafara responded that he expects it will be available in about a month. Halford asked if that next plan is to take it through the approval process. Viafara responded that that is the plan. Halford asked if he wanted comments before the next Advisory Group meeting, or do you just want them to bring their comments to that meeting. Viafara responded that if they are available prior to the meeting that would be nicer because then he can prepare a response. Kuharenko said that as he was going through a couple of sections he noticed that there were a couple of pages that were intentionally left blank, so are there going to maps inserted there. Viafara responded that there will be two maps. He explained that the maps dealing with the carry-over projects from the previous plan; they will still become now, basically part of our new horizons and priorities, so they are moving them.

Halford asked if once the recommendations and the executive summary are completed, will you put all the sections together into one document so they know what it looks like as a whole. Viafara responded that he would.

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

- b. Reschedule August 8th Technical Advisory Committee Meeting To August 15th

Haugen reported that because we are holding a Special Technical Advisory Committee meeting on July 27th we would like to move the August 8th meeting to August 15th to give us a little time between it and the next meeting. He added that we also had a conflict with the MnDOT on August 8th a well, so staff is wondering if it is okay to make that change.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY HALFORD, TO ADJOURN THE JULY 11TH, 2018, TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 3:10 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager