

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 15th, 2018
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen Chairman, called the August 15th, 2018, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:31 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck (via phone); David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Jesse Kadrmas, NDDOT-Local District; Richard Audette, Airport Authority; Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; and Dale Bergman, Area Cities Transit.

Absent were: Darren Laesch, Dustin Lang, Stephanie Halford, Ryan Brooks, Steve Emery, Lane Magnuson, Paul Konickson, Ali Rood, Ryan Riesinger, Stacey Hanson, Nick West, Mike Yavarow, Lars Christianson, and Rich Sanders.

Guest(s) present were: Brandon Bourdon, Kimley-Horn and Scott Mereck, WSB.

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 JULY 11TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Kuharenko pointed out that the Downtown Plan Consultant is shown in the minutes as RBG Consulting but should be RDG Consulting.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 15th, 2018**

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE THE JULY 11TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, SUBJECT TO THE DOWNTOWN ACTION PLAN CONSULTANT BEING CORRECTLY IDENTIFIED AS RDG INSTEAD OF RBG.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF 2019-2022 FINAL DRAFT T.I.P.

Public Hearing

Haugen reported that included in the packet was a draft document and a public notice identifying that today would be the day for the public to appear in person to give public input as well as for anyone wishing to submit written comments to do so by 11:00 a.m. today. He stated that seeing that there is no one present for such input, he would like to open and close the public hearing. He added that there were no written comments received by 11:00 a.m. today either.

Committee Discussion

Haugen commented that there have been some changes made between the release of the document that is currently being reviewed and commented on by the public versus the one that we are asking for action on today. He added that those changes were not significant enough to cause us to have to re-advertise and delay action.

Haugen referred to the document included in the packet and went over the changes.

Haugen said that the first change is on the North Dakota Project List, Project #1 City Bus Operations. He pointed out that there has been a slight revision in the cost of what the federal share originally was anticipated to be, a drop of about \$50 thousand dollars, as well as a reduction in the State contribution and the Local Share contribution as well. He stated that the new total Operations is \$2.9 million dollars, and he believes that the one in the document was \$3 something million dollars; so there was a decrease in the total cost of the project, and based on this number, which incorporates the new system service that started operating this July, so 2019 will be the first full year of that operation; added service routes, added service hours, added service days; so this dollar amount affected the second, third and fourth year of this project listing in those subsequent years and the were revised similarly to how this one was revised.

Haugen stated that the second change deals with the Highway Safety Improvement Program. He said that in the draft packet there was a HSIP project, Project #10, that's for backplates and traffic signal pedestrian timing, that we have carried for two years as a separate project in our T.I.P.; when the Draft S.T.I.P. came out there was some differences in project description and funding so what occurred was that the City of Grand Forks and the group in Bismarck reached an agreement to consolidate all of these projects into one project listing. He added that because of some of them being on the State system versus some on the Local system the funding splits changed but the S.T.I.P. listing is based off of the summation of all of those individual projects

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 15th, 2018**

for a cost of \$399,000. He pointed out that they eliminated one project and incorporated into one project that is for the red light confirmation lights on Gateway Drive which has been in the T.I.P. as a separate project for a couple of years, so now you see a bigger project description and a dollar value of \$399,000 with a funding split of 90% Federal and the Local is around 9% or 11%, but in any event it isn't 90/10/10 as there is more local dollars funding it.

Haugen said that for the project listings those are the changes. He added that because of the changes in the Grand Forks City Area Transit funding, in Table 3 and Table 4 there were also some slight changes. He pointed out that it used to say \$78 million dollars total, but it is now showing \$75 million dollars on the North Dakota side. He commented that each individual year slightly decreased primarily because of transit operations.

Haugen reported that the last change occurs in our Annual Listing of Obligations and Project Status. He said that the draft document that was out for public review did not have any transit dollars identified in it and we have since gotten that information.

Haugen summarized that those changes are the ones that have been brought to staff's attention. He asked if anyone had any other changes or comments on the draft document. There were none. Haugen said that since there were no other comments or changes staff is recommending approval.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE 2019-2022 FINAL DRAFT T.I.P. SUBJECT TO THE CHANGES AS NOTED.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Bail, Gengler, Audette, Ellis, Johnson, Kuharenko, and Bergman.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: Williams.

Absent: Lang, Emery, Halford, Brooks, Riesinger, Laesch, Konickson, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, West, Magnuson, Sanders, Christianson.

MATTER OF PROJECT SOLICITATION FOR THE 2019-2020 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM

Haugen reported that we are coming to the end of our last two-year work program and are beginning to work on the next two-year work program. He pointed out that the staff report identified that we expect to have roughly \$300,000 available in 2019 and 2020, above and beyond our normal activities that we have to do.

Haugen stated that for the 2019 funding, half of that has already been obligated for some things that we are carrying forward from the start of 2018. He added that the one thing that we haven't started yet, but is already plugged into 2019 is updating our ITS Plan and Regional Architecture.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 15th, 2018**

Haugen said that we are now soliciting our member agencies for work activity suggestions for both 2019 and 2020, and we ask that you go through your governing bodies for their consensus for your activities. He added that at the end of 2019 we will revisit what we identify in 2020 to make sure the projects are still desired and/or warranted or that there aren't any new projects you would rather see programmed.

Haugen stated that this is the formal start for project solicitation and we would like to have your suggestions by the end of September. He added that as you are working on ideas, try to make sure the projects are eligible before we get too far down the road with them; and keep in mind that North Dakota Federal Highway has done a reversal of their policy on not allowing MPOs to do pavement management, so again just double check with MPO staff to make sure that things are eligible, and if there is a question about eligibility we can run it through the process in a timely fashion before we are under our deadline.

Information only.

MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE

Universe Of Projects

Brandon Bourdon, Kimley-Horn, was present for a presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request).

Presentation ensued.

Bourdon went over where we are at in the study process, pointing out that a public meeting has been tentatively scheduled for September 12th, but they are still working on that and don't have all the details ironed out, such as location, etc..

Bourdon commented that as a part of that meeting they are really trying to finalize things that they can in terms of the project list and ratings/rankings, which was distributed for various agency input and also just trying to do the forecasts so they can go to the public, and this is their last major public meeting, with information to share regarding thoughts on projects being selected based on the funding and having an idea of where we are sitting from a fiscally constrained standpoint, and that is pretty pivotal in terms of the overall schedule to be able to get a draft done here in September so that we can get all the approvals that are necessary for us to complete the final product.

Bourdon gave a brief overview of the goals, objectives, performance measures and targets update process; stating that he would try not to focus on those things that we have talked about multiple times.

Bourdon commented that we certainly had discussion in late 2017 regarding a variety of targets and goal areas, and in February of 2018 we finalized the goals and objectives and strategy

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 15th, 2018**

statements. He said that we also reviewed safety targets and the policy board adopted them at their February meeting.

Bourdon stated that in July we talked about draft pavement and bridge related targets and now we are going to talk more about travel time and reliability targets.

Bourdon commented that mobility measures are really the foundation of PM3, and there are three of them; interstate truck travel time reliability which focuses on an index, interstate travel reliability which looks at the percent of person miles traveled on the interstate that are reliable, and non-interstate travel reliability which focuses on non-interstate NHS and their reliability.

Haugen referred to the presentation and explained that, again, as with all targets we have options to adopt but in the case of PM3 that would mean that we would have a maximum of six targets, and even though we don't have interstate on the Minnesota side when we adopt the state targets we are adopting in Minnesota are all of the targets, or we can go with just targets for the MPO, or a combination of MPO and State targets.

Haugen referred to a Mobility Measures and Targets slide and explained that where North Dakota and Minnesota are with their targets, sort of leading into a recommendation from the staff, is that we would adopt state targets specific to the North Dakota side and not adopt state targets that Minnesota doesn't have in our MPO area, so that is why we have for Minnesota a couple cells that identify that they aren't applicable, and although Minnesota obviously does have targets they just aren't applicable.

Haugen went over the table information briefly, pointing out that the information at the far right is what the values are out of the MAP-21 tool, and what they are showing for us. He stated that, as you will recall, we had discussions about a data change from 2017 to 2018, so we are showing you the values from both those years and obviously 2018 is to-date, not the full calendar year. He pointed out that the MPO value is different than what the North Dakota and Minnesota values are. He said that the data comes from the tool and was reported in two ways; the first is just a global graphic showing that if we asked the data to show us a 90% achievement how many months does the tool report that we achieved 90% reliability on our non-interstate NHS system. He pointed out that you can see that at 90% in 2017 there was only one month that it was met but overall there is an 89.2% reliability; and the 2018 data, which most would say is better data, shows us at an 85.5% to-date, and again none of the current months were at the 90% level.

Haugen stated that the next slide is a map. He explained that the first one is just aggregate numbers, the second one shows it by segments and you can see they used colors to explain, and as with most maps green is better and red is worse. He commented that if you really zoomed in at some of our intersections you would see where we start getting into the oranges and reds, but for the most part we are at yellow, which are right around a 1.5ish area of reliability.

Haugen referred to the map and pointed out that he did highlight the worst segment that they had identified so far in 2018; North Columbia Road, and they do have it split by direction, so the southbound from Gateway Drive is at 1.9. Williams asked how they got the counts for that.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 15th, 2018**

Haugen responded that it is all from the National Highway Performance Data Input that each State DOT is required to do on an annual basis, so the ADTs come from that data source, and then the actual travel reliability is Probe Vehicle Data, which is a national contractor that has parameters in which they have to drive these corridors on a certain basis. He stated that the Interstate is done at a higher frequency than say North Columbia Road would be done. He summarized that it is done using annual reporting from each State into a data base and then a contractor with their Probe Vehicles driving the networks. Williams said that she finds that very unusual because there is no stop sign or anything there that would impede any of the travel, so she is wondering if the count was right. She added that she did find some problems with some of the counts in places, but that just seems awfully odd. Haugen commented that he doesn't know if there is any work being done there that may have been the impediment that caused these counts because work zones will show up in this data. Williams said that that was here next question, which is why their 2018 data looks like its low but she can't think of any roads that haven't been detoured practically this year. She added that she does have a very recent count from 10th and Columbia that was done by SRF, if that would be any help. Haugen responded that she can provide it to them as he doesn't think they have it unless they have it as part of the study that was done for the campus. Williams said that it may have been in that study, or it may not, but it does warrant a traffic signal.

Haugen said that for the Interstate truck travel time; just to refresh, the non-freight movements are expressed like a percentage of time, 90% of the time, 85% of the time is reliable. He added that the truck travel of freight is a different type of indices. He said that during your worst peak period how much more unreliability are you allowing the system to be, so the mid-point or average of 1.5 means that during a peak period of time 1 would mean travel is very reliable, and at 1.5 you are accepting that at certain times travel will be 50% worse.

Haugen commented that in our case, we are closer to not having a real difference in our peak travel reliabilities, or just the freight movement on the interstate system; and again this is just for truck travel reliability on I-29. He referred to a table and went over the information briefly.

Haugen stated that when we talk about PM2 and PM3, what we are asking you to consider, not necessarily for action today, but to start digesting that in both cases we have facilities that aren't included in the Minnesota infrastructure, so they are suggesting that the approach the MPO perhaps takes is in some cases adopt the States such as bridges, but when there is interstate pavement we can't adopt the State number because if we adopt the States we are saying that we are adopting both States then, so we will adopt a number that is equivalent to North Dakota's number. He added that the same would go for good condition, poor condition; non-interstate it would be the States. He said that for the PM3, again we don't have interstate on the Minnesota side, so we need to have a discussion that if our data shows that we have a very reliable system do we want to set a target that allows for the system to have less reliability than it currently has, and that is what adopting the State targets would imply for our MPO area.

Haugen commented that for the non-interstate system we are fairly close in the 2018 data with what North Dakota has for a target, slightly better, though we also have a very high construction year in 2018, so the data might actually be better than the 85.5 it is showing.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 15th, 2018**

Haugen stated that the truck travel, North Dakota adopted a rather ultra-conservative in this number 3; and the State of Minnesota is at 1.5, hard data is showing right around 1.2. He added that the States around us, beside North Dakota and Minnesota, Kimley-Horn did some research, and they are all down below 1.5 for their truck travel. He asked Mr. Johnson if he had gotten any more information for us on why North Dakota went with 3. Johnson responded that he hadn't gotten any directly, and he needs to visit with them a little bit more but he did talk to them a couple times about it, and posed the questions you have, and the only response he has gotten he already shared with you and that was that they believe that the number that they are sitting at works for them and moving forward they are in a comfortable position.

Haugen reported that what the 3 really is representing is that we will allow our reliability for freight moving down the interstate to be 3 times worse than what it typically is; and whether that is a target that the MPO wants to identify as what we want our interstate system through the MPO area to have is what we have to determine.

Kuharenko commented that in looking at this, and for the percent of reliable person miles, you have 85% there, but previous slides were you going with 90% reliability. Haugen responded that the 90% is just the default of the reporting system; he took the easy route because he knew we haven't officially set a target yet, and 90% is the default of the system and he just wanted to get these tables out; but 85% is the real number we are using right now.

Haugen stated that on the PM3 there is no direct penalty clause as there are for safety and pavements and bridges.

Williams asked if this was a situation that once we adopt these that is it, there is no going back and forth between which State we are using or is it reviewed with every Long Range Transportation Plan Update. Haugen responded that each target, each PM has a different timeline, unfortunately; so safety is annual, pavement and bridge there is an opportunity after two years to make adjustments, but every four years regardless, and PM3 is also four year targets, but again there is an opportunity for adjustment after two years.

Bergman asked what is the reliability factor, what are they actually measuring when they say reliability. Haugen responded that a classic example is Gateway Drive; 90% of the time we can travel it without getting stopped by the mill railroad crossing, or the Glasston railroad crossing, but every once in a while you get stopped and your travel time and reliability is out the window because you've got a unit train that keeps you stopped for twenty minutes, so your travel time and reliability goes down considerably, so that is what reliability is trying to capture.

Bergman asked if signals cause unreliability? Haugen responded that we have signal coordination so a lot of times it isn't too much of a traffic signal issue, it can be but it isn't always. Bergman asked if traffic signals aren't put in for safety purposes. Haugen responded that that is one reason. Bergman stated that that is what he is trying to get at; we are coming up with these ridiculous targets over something that, we haven't even worried more about what our roads look like instead of other measures like we have been. He said that to him that would be more of a liability. Haugen commented that certainly road condition makes a road unreliable, so

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 15th, 2018**

that is factored in the reliability, but one of the public comments we get all the time is how can I be sure that I can leave five minutes before work and still be to work on time. Bergman said that he just doesn't get why they put in some ridiculous targets, it just doesn't make sense to him. Haugen commented that you also have to remember these are from a national perspective, so what might by 100% reliability on the interstate doesn't seem to mean a lot here in Grand Forks, but if you were in Chicago and you could say you had 100% reliability on the interstate system that would mean a lot more than it does here; so one size fits all is kind of what's being captured here. Bourdon added that he thinks that something else it is trying to do is to avoid maybe what is happening in other places or at least being conscious of it. He said that when he drives up here, coming from Minneapolis, it is pretty nice, and he thinks things are really reliable, but when you visit us you probably go a little crazy during the peak time because their reliability is really bad, so it is being conscious of how that reliability changed when we weren't necessarily aware of it 20 years ago and it keeps ticking away and then you have a mess and you're not going to fix it. He added that it is having some things and metrics at least monitor things and be conscious of what is happening, so some of this is macro and some of it is competing interests, for sure; you do one thing and add signal safety but it is also trying to get people out through an intersection and it can only process so many people that come to the intersection, it is a capacity issue.

Haugen commented that he thinks that we are to the point that next month we will be asking you to take action on PM2 and PM3, make a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board.

Financial Forecast

Mereck reported that he won't delve too deep into this as you have seen it several times. He stated that in the Spring they worked with all of the agencies in developing functions through interviews for the various funding sources; and in May and June they developed some draft revenue forecasts and are positioning for the public meeting in September to kind of roll out the final forecasts they will use for the plan.

Mereck stated that, putting this into context, if recall we have this big universe of all the different projects types; state of good repair, safety, multimodal, capacity expansion; so all of those different project types need to be assigned a funding source so these are basically funding silos; HSIP and Safety, Interstate, Urban and Regional and Urban and Local, Mainstreet is your multimodal streetscape and then you've got your local funding sources; County, DOT matches, so they came up with forecasts that they work with you on, and assumptions tied to each of these forecasts over the 20 year planning horizon, broken down by timeframe; short, mid, and long term.

Mereck commented that one thing he will point out with the interstate, they have had some dialogue with NDDOT recently, and through the uncertainty and discomfort with where they are currently at with the interstate forecast, they need to have further dialogue to kind of zone in on what that number should actually be, but he thinks that all the other numbers on the North Dakota side have been tentatively approved. Haugen added, if you recall our discussion is that the universe of projects has interstate projects that are considerably more than the \$10 million

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 15th, 2018**

that we have totally forecasted; and they were talking with the NDDOT on some guidance, and they are suggesting that the \$10 million is probably too small, and whatever that number was, say \$100 million, was too large, so there is a number in-between but they aren't sure what it is, so whatever you put in this document is how you will get to it.

Mereck stated that one thing to keep in mind with all of this, the big picture, is that we have in round numbers about \$900 million dollars of documented projects for all the different project types, and if you gather up all the different funding sources on both the Minnesota and North Dakota side we are roughly at \$415 million, so we have roughly about half of the funding identified for all the projects identified, and within that we still need to program within each of the funding pots so there will be just a fraction of the overall projects identified in the universe of lists that will ultimately make it into the constrained plan, and that is kind of the key thing that he knows Mr. Haugen is working with everyone on, to really rolling up your sleeves and helping them decide our priorities for all of those different project types and what is important to all the agencies and communities and what you would ultimately like to see in that constrained plan that will fit within these different funding silos.

Mereck commented that, just a mere shot again on the Minnesota side, there aren't quite as many funding pots, but the same concept of allocating projects to these different funding types; and he believes these numbers have been pretty much solidified.

Mereck stated that they also have operations and maintenance costs. He explained that these are numbers that he believes are not required in the plan, but we are ultimately gravitating towards at some point having these numbers also solidified in the plan, along with the capital costs.

Mereck said that they do have some data on the operations side for North Dakota, although there are some holes in the data that they are trying to fill; and similarly on the Minnesota side as well. Bourdon added that they took what the existing operations revenue was, and adjusted it to get into the federal aid system, so they weighted that up to come up with totals.

Haugen commented that the earlier slide says that this information is coming from the T.I.P. document, and some of you might recall that many years ago Federal Highway put their foot down on our T.I.P. document saying that we had to show our operations and maintenance costs, besides the projects that were listed in the T.I.P., so we worked with the Technical Advisory Committee and agencies and came up with this way of showing the ratio of the total miles that are actually federal aid, they aren't showing all of the maintenance and operation dollars spent by all agencies, just a ratio of what we are informed is the total miles are times the ratio of total federal aid miles compared to the total miles available each year

Mereck stated that the total capital revenues are roughly \$443 million through 2045, so that is the constraint we will have on the \$900 million that is in the master of universe of projects list.

Mereck commented that you have seen this information several times, so this is just an update. He added that they are just zeroing in on the interstate forecast on the North Dakota ??, it is kind of the last piece of the puzzle and we hope to get that ironed out in the next month or so.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 15th, 2018**

Haugen stated that Mr. Kadrmas has some work to do on the District list of projects. He added that at the last special meeting there was some possibility that Grand Forks might revisit some of its project scopes as well; 48th Street came up as one possibility; is that still the case. Kuharenko responded that they are looking at some of their projects to see if they might be able to get a better definition, possibly get some things, but right now he thinks they ended up identify that there is a need for pretty much a lot of it and he thinks there was a discussion of putting it in the short-term, some of the streets they are looking at are 48th Street, possibly Cherry Street, possibly some work on 47th and getting those into a mid-range time-band. Haugen said that the sooner they get this information the sooner they can get that matched to revenue for fiscal constraint and really start identifying the projects that are within fiscal constraint, so they would ask that that list be submitted as soon as possible. Bourdon asked if it would be possible to get something yet this month because if they are going to go out and present something to the public it will be pretty tough for them to turn something around if they aren't getting it to the public and maintain the project schedule otherwise we will start running into issues in terms of overall scheduling and how they present information.

Bridge Analysis

Bourdon reported that we will get a lot more into some of the cost estimates, calculations of what the benefits the crossing will provide, and also look at what some of the B/C ratios are, so some of that will be new information.

Bourdon commented that based on direction they are looking at additional information that wasn't reviewed back in February regarding Elks Drive, and the 47th Avenue crossing.

Bourdon stated that it is the five river crossings; looking at what happens and the impacts and kind of compare them side-by-side since the review was to kind of revisit what had been done in the past, and the past had been focusing on 32nd Avenue South and Merrifield Road.

Bourdon reported that all crossings were assumed to be two-lane bridges, all connections on each side are two lane roads so it they are all consistent with a two lane facility, and they aren't adding additional through lane capacity and there was no new connections with I-29 or U.S. #2.

Bourdon said that they basically looked at some daily volumes and level of service from a link perspective, and they got some level of service from a Synchro analysis.. He stated that they have alignments that they reviewed, which really haven't changed. He added that they did meet back in June on the 47th Avenue connection on the Minnesota side so they did some revisions to that.

Bourdon commented that what is included in the report for the river crossings is a look at what is the level of service today, what is the level of service under no build conditions, and obviously out in the future to 2040 things get worse; it isn't really unique that we see where there is more traffic and the community is growing, that is what happens throughout changes in the roadway network.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 15th, 2018**

Bourdon referred to slides showing link level of service for each of the proposed crossings and explained that they then, for each of the analyses, generated some information regarding some of the key corridors, so the existing three river crossings were basically impacted some of the link level of services; in terms of B/C ratio and that is presented on the left of each slide and then the volumes are presented for each of the crossings as well so you have your existing, your no build and understanding what it would be like without a connection on the link and then what the anticipated river crossing would do.

Bourdon went over each of the crossings briefly and explained what some of the improvements could be:

1. Point Bridge operates better under 17th Avenue South, Elks Drive and 32nd Avenue Crossing scenarios.
2. Gateway Drive operates better under all crossing scenarios except Merrifield Road.
3. Washington Street operates better under 17th Avenue and Elks Drive crossing scenarios although all scenarios have segments with undesirable operations.
4. Belmont Board operates better under all crossing scenarios based on link LOS but Belmont Road/4th Avenue intersection LOS shows mitigation is required under Merrifield Crossing scenario.

Bourdon stated that just in terms of where things are from a volume perspective, when we look at what the anticipated volumes are they found that:

1. 17th Avenue is a two-lane facility and there is roughly 3,000 to 10,000 vehicles forecast under the 17th Avenue Crossing scenario, depending on where you are at with most of the volume being more to the west of Washington Street.
2. 24th Avenue is a two-lane today and the volumes are shown under the Elks Crossing scenario and range between 4,000 and 7,500 just west of Belmont and east of Washington Street respectively, so again the volumes are higher closer to Washington.
3. 32nd Avenue is mostly a two-lane facility between Belmont and Washington and the volumes are higher, ranging from 10,500 to 13,000.
5. 47th Avenue is in the 8,000 to 9,000 range under the 47th Avenue Crossing scenario.

Bourdon referred to a slide showing roadway planning capacities information and stated that if they look at rough capacities at a planning level they found:

1. The two-lane urban roadway can typically handle between 8,000 and 10,000 so, this is planning level stuff, if they go in and look at individual intersections it is kind of a different world but we are doing a long range transportation plan and so 17th Avenue is at the higher end of that threshold on the west end without a conversion to a three-lane the east end tends to be fine, and when we say three-lane that generally would involve adding some two-way left turn lanes.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 15th, 2018**

2. On the three-lane urban roadway capacity ranges from roughly 14,000 to 17,000 vehicles per day and 32nd Avenue would require a three-lane section; with segments between Cherry and Washington that would need some restriping; and between Cherry and Belmont there would be some minor widening required although it appears that 3 11-foot lanes would fit in most cases. He added that 47th Avenue would require a three-lane section so no changes would be needed between Washington and Belmont, but east of Belmont a three-lane section could be added with restriping only.

Williams asked if these are all assumed not to allow trucks correct, all the scenarios. Bourdon responded that that is correct.

Bourdon referred to a slides showing River Crossing Intersection LOS for each crossing and went over the information briefly. He then referred to slides showing the alignments for each of the crossings and went over them briefly as well.

Bourdon reported that in terms of the 47th Avenue Crossing there were some changes based on the June meeting with the various Minnesota Agencies. He said that some of the punch lines in terms of what they walked out with after discussing with the various agencies were:

1. Rhinehart Drive south of the dike could be converted to County Road or County State Aid Highway.
2. Rhinehart Drive between 13th Street S.E. and the dike could be converted to a City Street and likely would be reconstructed as an urban section.
3. 200th Street would be converted to a County Road or County State Aid Highway between the Red River and County State Aid Highway 58.
4. Improvements could be phased (i.e. Rhinehart Drive and 200th Street would not all have to be completed at once).

Bourdon commented that one thing that is a little bit different, and this is new information; they did get into probable cost. He explained that this had been done back in 2002, with more detail related to the Merrifield crossing done in 2004.

Bourdon referred to a slide that shows their opinion of probable costs and went over it briefly, pointing out that they used the 17th Avenue Low Bridge as an example; and came up with an estimated cost of \$38,448,133.00. He added that they did add some engineering and construction costs and for every one of the crossings they did this same thing, where they had impacts to the dike structure they included the cost of that, so there will be details in the report that will cover all of those crossings, but there will be differences in what is included for each crossing.

Bourdon stated that bridge costs have gone up, there has been a lot of time that has passed and that goes into the impacts of time and dollars, so the cost summary on the top they tried to grab relatively similar crossings so 47th, for an example is an exception because it wasn't looked at in the past so there is no number on the top to compare the costs to, but the costs on the top range

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 15th, 2018**

from roughly a half to even a third in some cases to the costs on the bottom. He went over the costs differences for each bridge crossing.

Bourdon commented that there was an exercise to go through and A.T.A.C. worked through it and gave us some changes in vehicle miles traveled, vehicle hours traveled; and WSB went through some calculations to give us some benefits in terms of what the benefited travel time was for each of the river crossings; the benefitted operations, crashes and air quality; and the benefits, as you look are in the neighborhood of ranging from \$15,000,000 to roughly \$25,000,000 with the highest benefits being at 32nd Avenue South and Merrifield Road with both being above \$20,000,000; where the lowest was 47th Avenue South at a little under \$3,000,000.

Williams asked if Merrifield Road included trucks. Haugen responded that it did not include a separate truck travel; and again they are trying to compare these all the same and the focus was supposed to be sort of like the Point Bridge. Williams said, though, that in reality we the Merrifield Bridge would be built so truck traffic could use it, and 47th Avenue South is the only one, in her judgement, that could be used for truck traffic because the rest all go through neighborhoods. She asked how difficult it would be to add a truck component into those to get a realistic look at it. Haugen responded that it wouldn't be too difficult, but the question would be is the benefit worth the calculation. Williams said that she thinks it might give a little more realistic look at it from the standpoint that; she knows that you are looking at probably no truck traffic, but in reality there would be truck traffic, so if you are going to look at just non-truck traffic that is okay, but the other way to look at it is, in reality you can look at it from another standpoint. Mareck stated that he will have to double check with their analyst, but he is pretty sure that they just made a generic assumption about percentage of truck traffic because any major roadway, any river crossing will all have a certain percentage of trucks whether you intend for them to be there or not, so, again he will have to check with their analyst but he believes they assumed 15% trucks for Merrifield and 5% for the other crossings, just as a generic default. Williams stated that she is still tying this exercise into the downtown area, where if we have a bridge that we can't get the trucks to use, they can't use it then we are still impacting the downtown with all the trucks running through the downtown all the time and she knows that that is one of the things that everyone is concerned about, downtown traffic and congestion and trying to get people to their destinations and a way to remove a certain percentage of trucks from that whole mix, so that is why she asked how difficult it would be to take a look at it.

Bourdon reported that the next slides are identical matrices that were presented back as part of the 2002 update; so probably these are the metrics that ended up going into the cost/benefit ratio. He pointed out that the construction costs they took from the slides before so there is an estimate of construction costs in 2018 dollars. He added that they have traffic flow and congestion, so that's vehicle hours traveled from the travel demand models so you have a value for that; and they have vehicle miles travel statistics and based on that they ended up with a benefit/cost ratio for each of them. He went over each of them briefly.

Bourdon commented that that is the benefit cost summary and comparison between the two. He stated that that is really kind of where they are at the end of doing the analysis. He added that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 15th, 2018**

they will be making some final tweaks to get the modification put into a power point into the report and that will get wrapped up in the next few days.

Haugen stated that the report itself will be distributed when we get a draft and then you will be able to see all the details that are in the report. He added that this power point is on the web-site so you have access and information that they are sharing already.

Haugen said that, back to the Universe of Projects; they need to have those projects signed off on, and they also need to converse with NDDOT a little more about exactly the interstate revenue.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2018 Annual Work Program Project Update

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

b. MN 220 North Corridor Study Update – Oral Update

Haugen reported that when he put this on the agenda early last week he was under the false assumption that the MN 220 North was due this week, it is not due for another couple of weeks so there isn't any thing more to report on this item at this time.

c. Grand Forks Downtown Transportation Plan Update – Oral Update

Haugen reported that the RFP for the Grand Forks Downtown Transportation Plan Update was due yesterday at noon. He said that we did not get our minimum of three proposals so if Mr. Johnson is still on the phone can you authorize us to proceed; he did send a request to be able to proceed as well. Johnson gave authorization to proceed.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY BAIL, TO ADJOURN THE AUGUST 15TH, 2018,
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:46 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager