

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE SPECIAL  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Friday, July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2018  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Earl Haugen, Executive Director called the July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2018, Special meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 8:10 a.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck (Via Conference Call); David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Jesse Kadrmaz, NDDOT-Local District; Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Richard Audette, Airport Authority; and Rich Sanders, Polk County Engineer (Via Conference Call);

Absent were: Nels Christianson, Dustin Lang, Darren Laesch, Dale Bergman, Brad Bail, Lane Magnuson, Ryan Riesinger, Stephanie Halford, Ryan Brooks, Paul Konickson, Ali Rood, Stacey Hanson, Mike Yavarow, and Nancy Ellis.

Staff present: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Jairo Viafara, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF Office Manager.

Guests present: Les Noehre, NDDOT-Local District; Al Grasser, Grand Forks Engineering; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Mary Karlsson, Kimley-Horn; Brandon Bourdon, Kimley-Horn; Scott Mareck, WSB; and James Kiedrowski, KLJ.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE**

Haugen reported that the agenda today is to give you an update where they are at with the Street and Highway Plan Elements. He said that they are trying to focus a lot of their time on the Universe of Projects; and they think they finally have a comprehensive list.

Haugen commented that, as you can tell, a few entities did give us updated lists within the last couple of weeks so we will spend a little time going over those. He added that now that we have, we think, a list; and we also have what we think are the financial revenue forecasts we can do our first attempt at fiscal constraint.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Friday, July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Haugen stated that many of the entities gave us an idea of what the project timeline would be so we have some update to the timeband.

Haugen said that the last item is introducing a tool that we are developing to help us somewhat prioritize the projects, and Kimley-Horn will go over that information. He added that it is a tool that they are building off of how we score T.I.P. projects.

Haugen stated that the first thing we will do is to update everyone on the Universe List of Projects. He added that you have three entities that gave us updated lists; the District, State of North Dakota, East Grand Forks and Grand Forks County. He asked if staff was going to lead on this. Bourdon responded that he thinks staff can discuss a little bit of what the changes were.

Mareck added that NDDOT sent them a new list a week or two ago so they removed all of the previously provided projects by NDDOT, and added in the updated projects, which he believes are all state of good repair projects. He said that, similarly for Grand Forks County there were state of good repair projects that were provided, and he doesn't believe you previously had a state of good repair for Grand Forks County so those were added; and for the City of East Grand Forks we also had a number of state of good repair projects that were provided that were added to the list. Haugen asked if he had the capability to show those updated totals. Mareck responded that for each of the tabs he could go over them. He added that he thought they were on the tool, but he will have to pull them up. Haugen said that we will need to have that spreadsheet distributed, but it could be in the toolbox that we are distributing after today's meeting, all those projects that were added. Bourdon stated that the projects are all incorporated into this sheet, Scott added them and they then incorporated the prioritization tool so they are all on the spreadsheet in as shown on the screen.

Mareck stated that he could go over the tools if you want. Haugen responded, yes, that he thinks we just need to know how it basically just changes the state of good repair and a bit of the discretionary.

Mareck referred to the spreadsheet and went over it briefly:

- 1) Safety is at \$18 million
- 2) Multimodal is at \$31 million
- 3) State of Good Repair is at \$356 million
- 4) Discretionary (a catch all for everything else) is at \$379 million

Haugen commented that he noticed on the spreadsheet when going over it last night that some of these additional projects might not have all the information on them. He said that he noticed that, for instance on the North Dakota list, MnDOT gave us projects on two bridges. Mareck responded that there is some data missing on a number of projects, so at some point we need to work through how to obtain that data. Haugen commented that he would guess for the two bridges we would take the MnDOT estimate and divide by two to plug into the North Dakota side.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Friday, July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Haugen stated that, just to have a little discussion, when we get to the fiscal constraint, you will see that, at least when he did it last night and it was the first time looking at this so he didn't have this information to share, but it seems like NDDOTs projects compare to 2040 seem to be similar project types but the costs are substantially less, have you had a chance or sense of comparing the project costs at all. Noehre responded that he sent the latest update of their project cost history, so that is what they are using. He said that five years ago was at the height of the oil boom, when everything was higher, but since then things have come down and you can compare them one to the other, but you have the tool that he used to cost estimate. Haugen responded that he did get that cost estimate, it is just surprising the change of the cost total.

Haugen said that the next step is to send out this tool, and in the tool are all the projects now, and to try to finalize the missing data cells, so one last review by everyone would be appreciated. He added that there aren't very many and you probably just solved two of the missing cells. Noehre stated that he didn't add in the bridge work dollars because you already have them.

Haugen stated that the next step would be to discuss the fiscal constraint analysis, is that right; or go over the tool? Karlsson responded that she thinks we, in terms of fiscal constraint this has not changed from your previous meeting where Mr. Haugen presented this, so the numbers in front of the slashes indicate dollars by timeband; so, for example, for HSIP in North Dakota there is \$3 million dollars available for 2023 through 2027, and then \$7 million dollars for 2028 through 2037, and \$7 million dollars for 2038 through 2045. She explained that this information, again, that previously, they have it broken out by program and by State, so what is on the screen right now is North Dakota, and then on the next slide is Minnesota.

Karlsson referred back to the slide showing North Dakota and said in comparing that to what is in the spreadsheet, they are looking at, for HSIP in North Dakota, a total of \$12 million dollars of projects identified for the full timeframe. She stated that if we do look at by timebands it far exceeds the \$3 million dollars that is available in the first five years. She commented if we do that same analysis for Minnesota, we have the same findings in that it exceeds the fiscal constraint for safety.

Karlsson stated that that is the kind of analysis that they will do for each program. She said that if we go to state of good repair we find a similar situation, but again acknowledging that, for example the Interstate Program can include more projects than just state of good repair.

Karlsson, referring to the spreadsheet, said to keep \$2 million, \$4 million, \$4 million in mind for Interstate; and then if we look at Interstate in North Dakota in the short range we are at a total of \$17 million dollars, again comparing that to the \$3 million; and then in the long range we are looking at a total of \$11 million dollars and again that is compared to the \$4 million dollars in funding available.

Haugen said he has a question for North Dakota; when we look at the Interstate Program, is some of that accessible to the Regional Program or is the Interstate completely separate and distinct from the revenue that is shown on the regional side, in other words can we combine the North Dakota Programs when we look at the District List. Noehre responded that Interstate and Regional funding cannot be combined.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Friday, July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Noehre asked where they got the \$3 million, \$4 million, and \$4 million; is that what you came up with from your projections from previous TIPs. Haugen responded that that is correct. He added that they essentially they looked at our last eight years of T.I.P.s to what projects were funded from our programs, how we aggregated, giving an annual average from the programs. He said that for the Interstate they might have gone back more than eight years because there were fewer projects. He stated that that is essentially how they calculated the base amounts of revenue was going back to past history and what we received from those programs and used an average annual number with the exception of the Kennedy and Sorlie Bridge projects; currently the Kennedy is sort of an outlier, and in the end the Sorlie ended up being a lot less than the last plan assumed it would be. Karlsson commented that to get the Interstate funding they analyzed trips from 2012 through 2021, so they analyzed ten years of trips.

Grasser said that it sounds like we didn't just go back eight years, we went back in history and then also grabbed, maybe, projects that were programmed in the T.I.P.s, so we're looking at past and future for doing those averages. Haugen responded that that is correct, they are going with projects that are programmed in the T.I.P. as being reasonably expected to be included in our financial forecasting. Mary added that they looked at documents that have been adopted by the MPO. Grasser stated that the question he would have, the concern, if that would then capture the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South HSIP project which he is interpreting is anonymously large dollar amounts, probably, compared to what we might normally see, so he is wondering if that isn't going to skew that number higher; it makes our problem worse, but 32<sup>nd</sup> is a big project and he isn't sure that will be repeated again.. Mary agreed, adding that, if you remember, we talked about that at our previous meetings and they removed that project so it is not in the revenue forecast. Grasser said that it is just hard to mentally get his head around what is in and what is out.

Haugen said, just to talk about the Interstate, when we saw the revenue forecast versus the project costs just keep in mind that those project costs are quite a bit less than they were in the current plan for the Interstate Program, or the Interstate Project Types. He added that it is good to know that we have lower costs but it is more humbling to see that the revenue is not reflecting the same good news.

Williams asked if this is total revenue that we are looking at now. Haugen responded that it is. Williams asked if the pedestrian and bicycle projects included in this. Haugen responded that the stand-alone TAP projects are not part of this financial report. Williams said, then that you are looking at all of the bicycle and pedestrian items to be TAP funding. Haugen responded that out of the Street and Highway Program there have not been any bike/ped projects funded so we aren't showing any in this Street and Highway Element.

Williams said she has a question for NDDOT; does any of the work that is listed in here include urbanization. Haugen responded that they do have a discretionary project for the mile between 55<sup>th</sup> and 69<sup>th</sup> on Gateway Drive, the rest of the work is basically state of good repair. Williams asked if those dollars include bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Haugen responded that he would defer to them, but they are using, there is a sheet that the NDDOT provides for mile costs for typical projects and he believes the one mile cost for an urban, he believes it is called Reconstruction Urbanization, is somewhere around \$9 million dollars, so that is inclusive of facilities. He added, though, that he doesn't know what has all been incorporated of that \$9

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Friday, July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

million. Noehre commented that what is included in that \$9 million; you would have to go back and look at all those projects individual numbers they used because that is the average that has been used across the State.

Williams said, if you were scoping a project today, would it include the pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Noehre responded that he would say it is safe to assume that some of that stuff is in there, but it depends upon how much you wanted to add to it and go over that \$9 million. He said that the answer is “it depends” on if you want decorative lighting, sidewalks, paver stones instead of concrete, and all those kinds of things that will elevate those costs, so at some point you now that the sky’s not the limit. Williams stated that the reason she asks is because it lists separately in the bicycle and pedestrian plan in that same area of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan having a shared use path in there, and so what she was trying to wrap her head around is that she wants to make sure that we aren’t having a project in there twice; once in the Streets and once in the Bike/Ped Plans. Haugen responded that that is a good comment and they will keep track of it and make sure it doesn’t go through separate documents.

Noehre stated, going back to the Interstate, what was it, \$11 million over to 2045, if he remembers right was the forecast; it was \$3 million, \$4 million, and \$4 million. He asked if it would handle everything in the spreadsheet over that same period. Karlsson responded that in the long range does total \$11.30 million. Noehre said, then, that he would suggest that dollar amount is maybe somewhere in-between those two, probably won’t be exactly what is in the spreadsheet, but it is not going to be as low as what you have for an average cost.

Haugen said, back to just the Interstate, what was the short-term total cost estimate; and then the long-term, is that just the projects that were identified in the long-term time-band or is it that the total 2045 project. Karlsson responded that she hears two questions, and the answer to the first is that the short-range total is \$17.2 million dollars for the North Dakota Interstate; and the second question was if the long-range included all of the 2045 projects. Haugen said that the last question was you had mentioned \$11 million and long-term, it must have been just \$11 million on the long-term band. Karlsson responded that that is correct, just in the long-range band, it did not include the mid-range, did-not include the mid-term band, which she does think is important to keep in mind that there were no projects allocated or assigned to the mid-term band. Haugen said, then, that \$17 and \$11 equals \$28 million out of \$10 million revenue forecast, so there is a significant difference.

Haugen commented that part of the struggle with a tool and prioritizing is that there is a lot of financial gaps in some areas but then there is also a thing of performance targets that we’re setting; and trying to decipher the projects that are coming through that help us achieve those targets. He added that some of the targets are at a level where we probably would never get close to having a financial penalty imposed because of the target.

Haugen stated that just on the Interstate system those targets with paving conditions, and he believes, and Mr. Johnson would agree, were set at a point where they felt safe that they would never have to impose a penalty. He added that the only revenue that we have, is there guidance from headquarters on other ways, a difference between 10 and 28 in revenue forecast, using the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Friday, July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

forecasts so far. Johnson responded that there isn't, not really. He said that he isn't sure what the best way is to close that gap, and he didn't hear the entire conversation.

Haugen asked Ms. Karlsson to go over the regional system. He added that the revenue forecasts were the same, based on history. Karlsson asked if he wanted to look at the revenue as well. Haugen responded no, just give us the short-term cost estimates.

Noehre said that before we do that, the question is; what are we calling State of Good Repair, does it include 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Interchange, or connect to 42<sup>nd</sup>. Haugen responded that it is just their pavement preservation projects. Noehre asked even if it is reconstruction, but not adding capacity it is a state of good repair. Haugen responded that that is correct.

Haugen commented that he thinks we are trying to get the financial sum or the cost estimates for the short-term on the regional side. He said that would finish all the rest of the NDDOT projects.

Karlsson stated that there are some projects that could be funded using multiple sources, so some of those are a combination of Urban Local Road and Urban Regional. She asked if she should go over all those projects that can be funded from multiple sources, or do you just want me to look at those that are only eligible for Urban Regional. Haugen responded that it would be the NDDOT projects, the State Highway System, so just the Urban Regional Program.

Karlsson referred to the spreadsheet and commented that for Urban Regional not all of the projects have not been assigned to a time-band so they have not been able to inflate those dollars so what is shown in the report here are uninflated 2018 dollars. Haugen commented that NDDOT did provide us the year for each of their programs. Karlsson said that starting with just the NDDOT projects by time-band, for short-range we are looking at \$8.8 million dollars; for mid-range we are looking at a total of \$31.8 million dollars, and then for long-range we are looking at a total of \$5.3 million dollars. She added that it does appear that there are three projects that have not been assigned to time-bands for regional. Haugen commented that the bottom two are the two bridges and we did have a meeting on how to assign those, both agencies would share half of the cost of both. Haugen said that the third project is a mill and overlay project 8 miles east of Grand Forks to 2 miles west of Columbia Road, so that is 55<sup>th</sup> Street westward.

Karlsson reiterated that the short-range was \$8.8 million, the mid-range was \$31.8 million, and the long-range was \$5.3 million; and again no estimates with those last three projects. She stated that if we look at Urban Regional we have \$16 million in the short-range, \$37 million in the mid-range, and then \$36 million in the long-range, so if there are no additional projects beyond state of good repair; state of good repair does not max out the funding available if they are in the Regional Program. Haugen commented that was why he asked his urban question of whether we could combine the Interstate and Regional pot, because we are short of projects on this first cut of fiscal constraint on the Regional side, strong on projects on the Interstate side in the timebands. Noehre said to just count on getting more Interstate dollars, and somehow it helped them; but going back to that other one in the spreadsheet it did have a year in there of 2021, but he doesn't remember if he put a cost in for it or not but you have to figure out where the distance

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Friday, July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

is between 69<sup>th</sup> and where the MPO boundary is. Haugen stated that the 2021 project is in our T.I.P. section so this spreadsheet has a future project.

Haugen stated that, again, we will be sending out this spreadsheet for that one last look. He said that they think they have everyone's list, but there are still some gaps that need to be addressed.

Grasser said he might be jumping ahead, but if he remembers right we are accepting a LOS D on our roadways, and as he recalls we had a number of potential grade separation projects on Highway 2 that would be under the Regional Program and talked about now. He asked how state of good repair relate to LOS, is there a point when you get past a LOS D that state of good repair monies will come into play in order to remedy that capacity constraint or will those dollars have to come out of a different program, or do just assume we run everything down to gridlock. He said that he is just trying to understand where capacity improvements come into the state of good repair. Haugen responded that they come in after we have shown that we have a financial capability of adding capacity to raise the LOS. He stated that this is the guidance we got in our last plan, but they haven't asked if it needs to be revised or changed or if it is the same guidance, but if we are doing a reconstruction then we address the capacity issue with that project; if we are doing just a mill and overlay or a concrete panel replacement, etc., then we aren't addressing capacity and are just doing pavement work. He added that he believes that is what we've heard when we ask about cost estimates; and we've talked about the reconstruction that's cost \$9 million dollars on the urban system because they are counting forward, and it is a bigger project, it isn't just a simple reconstruction curb to curb, it includes those other components that are substandard or missing and need to be addressed. Noehre commented that those are right of way to right of way, not curb to curb, in both directions.

Haugen stated that so far on the regional side you can see that there is a lot of revenue that is left on the table with the current scope of work for the state of good repair, but on the other side we have an interstate system that has a lot of work with little revenue; and they are both almost all of the State Highway System and that National Highway System, with a few exceptions, so those would be the ones that probably would get our first financial resources that are available to make sure that they are state of good repair.

Johnson commented that, thinking about the interstate system, and correct him if he is wrong, and the need that is going out in terms of our not having a lot of projects over the past six or so years that's why everyone is showing a revenue of \$10 million, but there is \$289 million dollars in need because of the life cycle; and while the interstate pavement lasts so much longer it almost takes a long range plan and a half horizon before we have to fully get back into it, so he thinks there is probably a reasonableness to assume a higher revenue number now, how we get to that number is maybe up for discussion yet, but he will visit with their programming staff and show the numbers and the timelines that Mr. Noehre has laid out in his spreadsheet and see if they are comfortable with a higher number that we can use with more confidence. He said that he understands what you are saying, historically the two pots have been separate; Interstate and Interstate funding from the rural side of the program, and Urban Regional is from the Urban side of the program too, so that the desire would be to continue to keep those separate from a programming standpoint, so he will look into this some more to see if he can get a better number for you.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Friday, July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Haugen asked, just to clarify or verify, even though in the FAST ACT is doesn't have a separate Interstate Program, as far as appropriations; NDDOT will continue to have a separate Interstate Program just as you have created your own programs for Regional and Urban. Johnson responded that you're right in that it is still one pot of money, but they internally code them to keep track of them as part of IM verses NHPP verses Urban Regional or Urban Road, it is just an internal tracking and coding mechanism that they use, but you're right there is not a dedicated interstate line item anymore. He added that they are doing that today, he doesn't have any information or reason to believe that they will stray from that process or designation, so that is our best bet to continue that program.

Haugen said that this would be the time to ask Mr. Johnson about the Asset Management Plan and how that might address the timing of projects on the NDDOT assets. Johnson responded that that is a good question, but he isn't sure what the status of that work is at right now, it is being spearheaded and led by their Planning Division, and he knows that they have been working on this but he isn't sure where they are at, what they've shared with anyone at a higher level, but it hasn't working its way down to them yet. Haugen said that the essence of that is that it is a 10-year fiscally constrained Asset Management Plan, which would be helpful for the first ten years of this long range transportation plan at the MPO level. Johnson agreed, but said that he just doesn't know if they have gotten to that point yet, but he doesn't believe they have.

Haugen asked Ms. Karlsson to walk everyone through the East Grand Forks short-term, mid-term, and long-term versus the financial entity.

Karlsson reported that for East Grand Forks, they, again do not have all of the projects assigned to a timeband so there is that caveat. Haugen commented that he believes they did virtually all of them; he knows there is one that wasn't assigned a timeband but he thought they gave us timebands for the rest of them. Karlsson responded that it looks like there are at least two that are missing, and those are the Point Bridge east approach and then the River Road/U.S. #2 to 23<sup>rd</sup> Street N.W. Haugen said, again, last month they noticed that the River Road project is in the mid-term, they did provide us with that. He said that the Point Bridge project is the one that wasn't assigned a timeband, but that is most likely because they don't have a good idea of the timeframe for that project yet.

Grasser asked if on the Minnesota side do the regional dollars go into East Grand Forks or are we now talking only for local. Haugen responded that we are talking about only local City Subtarget. Grasser commented that for him it would be easier if he could compare interstate and regional on the North Dakota side and the regional on the Minnesota side, so are we going to go back and reconnect on the Minnesota regional side or is their program different. Haugen responded that their program is different. He explained that their Asset Management System is more advanced than the North Dakota side so they have already done their fiscal constraint of which projects they can finance so they basically have a ten year T.I.P. document, and that is what they have given us. He added that for the Kennedy and the Sorlie Bridge projects they have given us an estimate of follow up work to the work that is now being done so for the long range they have given us projects on which to focus. Grasser said that for 2045 then we would not be in line of the next planning horizon on the MnDOT side. Haugen responded that one the Minnesota side, on the Regional System on the State Highway System, they are identified

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Friday, July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

through Asset Management work that needs to be done on their State Highway System. He added that they had a fiscally constrained program at Headquarters so the District Office provides a ten year improvement program, an improvement plan, so we have a number of projects that they have identified in that ten year period, and then to give us some sense of the longer terms, since they don't go past ten years at the District level, they've identified the two bridges in the longer term of our planning document to do work. Grasser said that the reason that process doesn't work on the North Dakota side is because we don't have asset management; because it seems like we are doing a ten year plan on one side and are trying to do a twenty-five year plan on the other. Haugen responded that we are trying to do a twenty-five year plan on both sides, the ten years on the Minnesota side is more defined through their long existing asset management process; where North Dakota is just introducing a fiscally constrained asset management plan because of the FAST ACT. He said that Minnesota has been there and done that for several years so they have a more refined system base to identify the projects, when and where and how they fit their financial resources, so we are doing a twenty-five year plan on both sides, one just has a more informed ten year period, but as we discussed North Dakota with its fiscally constrained asset management plan that is required, they will start having more informed ten year asset plans in the future.

Haugen reported that when we look at the revenue for East Grand Forks, one of the things that complicates things is the every fourth year issue on the Minnesota revenue for these projects, so not only do we have to be fiscally constrained, but we also have to know where the four year cycle hits on the timebands.

Haugen referred to a slide and commented that when we talk about the Interstate and North Dakota Regional Program, and the totals we were using, we need to add in the North Dakota match to those; he thinks we were just identify our discussion total amount, so North Dakota's match is \$2 million and \$5.5 million and \$5 million for a total of \$4.5 million get added to the revenue total for the Interstate and Regional Program.

Noehre asked if they used the bridge dollars to come up with the Urban Regional forecasts; for the Kennedy and Sorlie. Haugen responded that they did not.

Karlsson stated that the project costs for East Grand Forks are; short-range - \$6.7 million dollars, mid-range - \$8.1 million dollars, and long-range - \$24 million dollars. She said that this is compared to 1, 2, and 3 for City's subtargets. Haugen added plus the 2, 2, and 4 for the City match. He said that, again, we have, just like the interstate, more project costs than we do revenue. Bourdon added that there is also \$3 million for the Polk County as well.

Haugen asked for clarification as to how they came up with the revenue for Polk County. Karlsson asked if the question was how they came up with the revenue forecast or is it how that relates to the projects that we just listed, the project totals. Sanders responded that they would like clarification on how you came up with the \$3 million in revenue forecast for the area, and then what projects to you have that are equal to or more than the \$3 million. Karlsson responded that for Polk County they did the State Aid, they took a portion of the State Aid projects, and that was identified with help from the County; and that is how they came up with that revenue forecast of \$3 million for the County. Sanders said, then that you basically are taking a

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Friday, July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

percentage of his regular State Aid and putting it in per year to come up with a 2045 estimate at \$3.1 million. Haugen commented that he believes the percentage is a percent of your highways that are in the MPO area versus your entire system. Haugen asked how they came up with the projects. Sanders asked if they had any projects that you show. Karlsson responded that they show two projects for Polk County that come up to about \$500,000. Sanders commented that just so you know right now he has those scheduled for 2021 for an overlay. Karlsson asked if he has the 73 and 76 scheduled for 2021, they should not be 2028. Sanders responded that that is correct.

Sanders asked if they show an overlay on 72 at all from the east limits of East Grand Forks out to Trunk Highway 220. Karlsson responded that they only have the two projects for Polk County. Sanders said, then, that you will need to add one; the 72 overlay will be done in 2023 if the money comes in the way it is supposed to, or whenever the City wants to do their Bygland Road project. Bourdon said that they will send out the spreadsheet as it currently is, but with a line added and ask that you fill it in.

Haugen stated that from here we have the MnDOT District projects defined and fiscally constrained; we have Grand Forks County projects by timeband and fiscally constrained; the one they haven't worked, but do have the numbers for would be the City of Grand Forks, a sense of timeband for the projects that they provided for the Universe of Projects. He asked if there was some sense of timebands for these projects. Grasser responded that they have given timebands for the NHS System projects, which are the ones that they have a general, the feel they have a sense of providing something that may come to pass, but the question is on their collector streets, which he's done an extensive documentation why we can't reasonably put a timeband on those; is the question they keep asking, the question is how do they handle that because they can't reasonably put timebands on whatever they have, 80 or 100 miles of collector type of streets, all in poor condition and all in need of work, so that is their challenge. Haugen said that hearing that they will put them all on short-term and show that there is a big gap between them, and that some of them will be financed in the near few years. He added that we have had revenue dollars that we had available. Grasser said that he isn't sure he has a comment. He stated that it is a matter of timing, to work an unworkable system into the regulations, and he relies on the MPO to figure out how to fit that square peg into a round hole. He added that what he contemplated, that he thought would be appropriate is to write right into the document and having a discussion about basically that number he previously wrote, for the most part the challenge at times to take that system and provide the level of detail in the years and the type of work and the cost estimates that go along with that. He said that you can create a list, the question is does the list have any meaning, and if you create a list that doesn't have any probable implementation strategies, how do you handle that. He added that he is trying to avoid a discussion where they have a list, and then we don't follow the list, but how do we handle that administratively; do we follow a list or do we follow an intent on how to create those lists, and we have had these discussions before, and again, he thinks that if there is a way of identifying that, it is a list, but what do we do, is you suggest putting them all in the short-term, or however we handle that through the process. He said that he would feel better getting everything transparent as to the validity of that list, especially on the local level as he is concerned that if a list is put together, and it appears that its coming out of the Engineering Department, they would hope that their City Council would look at it and if it appears that it has the stamp and sanctioning of the Engineering

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Friday, July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Department, that it has some likelihood of actually occurring, and he is concerned about that from their optics and their relationship with the City Council. He added that if they put their stamp on something they would like it to be something that they feel has a reasonable chance of occurring, and they really don't know which projects they will do next year but they are going to evaluate a number of them this fall, and the question is out of each category, 20 miles of streets, which one or two or three miles are they going to do, they still don't know; so how we translate that into the Universe of Projects, they rely on guidance from the MPO.

Haugen stated that they will work on that, but it seems with the fist glance that you have the NHS System, which would be our top system, and then the minor arterials would be the next focus; focus on what projects are identified in the Universe of Projects list that are on the non-arterial system, because that would be the next level of importance as far as traffic is concerned in the metro area, and then we would shake them out and what is left are the collectors. He added that perhaps part of the discussion, we would have to do a functional reclass at the end of this exercise. He stated that just as we saw on the Minnesota side there was some non-classified roadways that were in the past classified so maybe that's part of our discussion, to maybe consider some of these collectors as possible not being part of the federal aid system anymore. He said that it doesn't remove pavement condition and the poor quality of the pavement, but it would remove it from the federal aid process. He added that off the top of his head he would cite the frontage roads being something that may or may not be appropriate. Grasser said that that is a good discussion point, he pondered that himself, but the problem is they never know when there is going to be some sort of windfall program that may show up.

Grasser commented that they actually spent a pretty fair amount of those dollars on collector types of streets. He added that that is where, a lot of times, our biggest need is, at least from the public when they are looking at the rideability, so he doesn't have any good answers. He said that he thinks recognizing the variability of that program would help a lot so that when they need to adjust this in the future we can recognize that what we gave was our best shot, kind of in the dark, not in the dark, its not that unscientific, but we are really struggling with the rapid deterioration that we are seeing in some of these streets that was exhibited this last spring. He added that on some of those streets they thought had another couple three years left on them and all of a sudden they just absolutely went crazy on them, so that is part of what they have to observe this fall, do we think we have something at that time, kind of a tipping point, that might reprioritize that street, it is an evaluation they aren't quite ready to make yet.

Karlsson said that she just want to make sure that she is understanding Mr. Grasser; do we have an agreement that in terms of invested priority of what is shown in the MPO plan for now that we should identify, and she isn't sure this applies to Grand Forks, but to identify if there are any Grand Forks roads that are on the NHS, that that would be the top priority and the second priority would be if there any Grand Forks roads that are arterials, that that would be the second investment priority, and then the third investment priority would be any Grand Forks collectors, do we have agreement on that sequence of priorities. Haugen responded that there might be some State Highways that are minor arterials that we have to include. He added that on the Regional side we show a lot of revenue with less projects for state of good repair.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Friday, July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Grasser commented that if we are talking from a perspective of potential use of federal dollars he thinks that that level of prioritization makes sense; if we are talking local dollars without federal participation, minor arterials may or may not be the priority in that case because they may have better rideability and so, again, if we were potentially accessing federal dollars and federal projects he would agree that we would go from NHS to the minor arterial, that would make some sense that way, but that doesn't necessarily mean we are going to spend our own dollars that way. He added that it looks like they are pretty much going to capture federal dollars on the NHS system, there might be dollars left for one or two large projects after that time period, so that is part of what they are seeing on the local, and he doesn't know if you are seeing the same thing when looking at revenue on the spreadsheet but that is generally how they have been ???

**BREAK**

**RESUME MEETING**

Haugen commented that at the agenda discussion we talked about the tool and how we are starting out with it. He said that at some point we do have to come up with a fiscally constrained program of projects and the tool that they started off with is the scoring format we distributed with our T.I.P. solicitation.

Haugen stated that some of the Technical Advisory Committee members may not remember but back maybe ten years ago our Federal Partners reminded us that as part of the requirement we needed to score and show how we prioritized projects in our T.I.P. program. He said they did the reminder with a Federally funded program called TELUS (Transportation Economic And Land Use System) tool that they sponsored and we used that, using the goal statements out of our planning documents, and objectives as the starting point to score projects. He said that as we are working through the transportation plan update it seemed like the logical starting point to make sure that projects that we have on the list at least address one or more of the goal statements and objectives we have in the document. He added that while that is the starting point, we have more that needs to be involved in this process, but it is a starting point.

Haugen commented that, as we go through this, some of the questions we have is how we incorporation performance targets; at some point we have to include a section in this Long Range Transportation Plan that says these are the projects that we are planning on doing, here is how, project helps us achieve those targets but at some point we have to say collectively we anticipate how projects help us achieve or progress towards those targets so some of the information we have in the Universe List of Projects may not give us the information that allows us to achieve those targets, some of that information is yet to be developed, so we still have a deadline coming up so the tool is a work in progress and they are trying to come up with the criteria needed to help us differentiate projects. He added that we do have more project costs than revenue that we can start identifying in some documented fashion, so that projects that we are putting in the fiscally constrained are projects that help us achieve the performance that we are stating we are trying to achieve.

Karlsson referred to the tool and went over it briefly. She pointed out that the Introduction Tap of the prioritization tool. She explained that what it ultimately does is list all of the projects that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Friday, July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

we were looking in the meeting today at the list of projects by funding program area. She said that this introduction tab includes each of the goal areas in the transportation plan, so Goals 1 through 10, and then assigns a weighting to the significance of each goal area, and as Mr. Haugen said, the weighting that they have included so far came from that T.I.P. prioritization tool that you have. She stated that for Goals 1-8; Economic Vitality, Security, Accessibility and Mobility, Environment/Energy/Quality of Life, Integration and Connectivity, Efficient System Management, System Preservation, and Safety they took the weightings that are in that prioritization tool that you have, the TELUS tool, and added Goals 9-10; Resiliency and Reliability and Tourism. She explained that the weighting they assigned to those two goals are half of what is in the TELUS prioritization tool, half what you had identified for local plans, so in that category they had five points out of a hundred assigned to local priority and they took those five points and divided them evenly to Goal 9 Resiliency and Reliability and Goal 10 Tourism.

Karlsson commented that, going from highest percent or share of the point goals to lowest percent or share of the point goals they rank as follows: Goal 3 – Accessibility and Mobility – 15 Points; Goal 5 – Integration and Connectivity – 15 Points; Goal 7 – System Preservation – 15 Points; and Goal 8 – Safety – 15 Points.

Karlsson reported that, going back, in terms of incorporating and responding to performance targets, what she sees is that with this weighting that we currently presented you have placed the highest emphasis on those goal areas that encompass the Federally required performance measures as listed above.

Haugen asked if for the Integration and Accessibility, are those tied to the travel time liability performance targets. Karlsson responded that travel time reliability and freight reliability are tied to the travel time liability performance targets.

Karlsson said that the next tier of goals by significance are those that they've assigned 10 points to and those are: Goal 1 – Economic Vitality – 10 Points; Goal 4 – Environment/Energy/Quality of Life; and Goal 6 – Efficient System Management.

Karlsson said that the third tier of goals by significance are those that they've assigned 5 points to is: Goal 2 – Security – 5 Points.

Karlsson said that the fourth tier of goals by significance are those that they've assigned 2.5 points to are: Goal 9 – Resiliency and Reliability – 2.5 Points and Goal 10 – Tourism – 2.5 Points.

Karlsson referred to the spreadsheet and commented that there are two tabs provided for reference only, and they are the 2019-2022 T.I.P. and then the existing/committed network projects; and, again, those projects don't need to be scored and don't need to be prioritized because that work has already been done through the T.I.P. project selection process, but they wanted to make sure you had access to those lists of projects.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Friday, July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Karlsson said that what they then want to make sure they do is to create an opportunity for you to identify the project priorities within fiscal constraint; really helping us identify those projects that need to be in the fiscally constrained plan versus those that would be in an additional revenue scenario.

Karlsson referred to the spreadsheet and went over it briefly. Haugen commented that this is the Universe List of Projects that was distributed early, discussed this morning, updated, and hopefully will have its last review and correction soon; so that is the first columns of this tool, and then instead of having it all on one sheet they have separated it by tab or sheet for individual programs. Karlsson added that they divided them into four buckets: Safety and Operations, Multi-modal (or the Main Street Program), Discretionary, and State of Good Repair, so those are the four buckets that they have assigned the projects that need to be prioritized into.

Bourdon commented that they are separated that way, ultimately because as they go through and rank the projects, because the color of money is different, we need to have them segregated so we can say - okay, by agency or program there are this many projects that are available, there are 20 that are on the Universe of Projects list that could get funded in that category, and once we rank them in order we can draw a line so, hypothetically, if there is in one bucket \$20 million dollars of need and there is only \$10 million dollars available we have projects prioritized for that \$10 million dollars already prioritized.

Haugen stated that we still have individual funding programs within these tabs; so like state of good repair we have all the separate funding programs: Interstate versus Regional, versus City Subtarget, versus Urban Local, etc., but part of it is the project description that describes them as pavement preservation versus discretionary which are more capacity and activity issues; multi-modal or Main Street are very specific programs, just on the North Dakota side, and then the Safety projects are very specific to just individual stand-alone safety projects.

Bourdon commented that that is a great further breakdown, so they will have things broken down by category to help us get our heads around stuff and get things into some larger logical silos; and then with each of the tabs there's yet other silos as to what drives that project or what is driven by a certain funding source so there will be a variety of breakdowns based on where the funding can be applied in the program.

Karlsson referred to the spreadsheet and opened the State of Good Repair tab and explained that within that tab we have funding source, and that tells you the eligible funding programs for each project; and there are sub-pots within these the bigger pots. Bourdon added that they also have a breakdown of whether or not it is on the NHS system, a little project description to give you a better idea of what the project entails, and so all those different things help us get a better characterization of the project. He commented that there is also a current cost and then there is inflation applied to that cost based on what timeband is selected, so when we say that a timeframe is a short, mid, or long-range that helps us get an idea of what that cost will end up being. He stated that all that information is part of the piece to the left that helps them rank and go through this fiscal constraint exercise.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Friday, July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Karlsson said that for each timeband they have assumed that projects are inflated to the mid-year of that timeband, so all short-term projects have been assigned the mid-range of the 2023 to 2027 timeframe; and this is true for mid-term and long-term projects as well.

Kuharenko said that we are pretty much going to be filling how it is going for every single project in the Universe Of Projects list, is that what you are looking for. Haugen responded that that isn't what they are looking for. He added that he believes that they will populate these yes or no, and you will review their work and are certainly welcome to score each individual program project yourself, but in the past this has been sort of how they've done the past several Transportation Planning updates, it's what the staff and the consultants have done to then show you how our results are, and then you can gauge if you think what they did is reasonable, if the results are coming as something that you think would be similar to if you did them yourself, and then if there are some projects or a period where there is discussion we will discuss the ranking.

Noehre commented that some of these probably don't need scoring if they go together; for example wouldn't need a score a short Interstate segment because once the larger segment is selected and prioritized that short segment has to go. No need to prioritize it further down the list. Haugen responded that he thinks they will want to show that at least one of the goals is met with that project, and it will be an individual listing because it happens at a different time, maybe it doesn't even happen in the same timeband, but we want to show that at least it meets the preservation goals, so then we can say that all the projects in our plan are at least meeting the goals that are listed in the plan. He added that it might get a score of maybe just a 1, but it's a different level of prioritization; the first cut is what we are trying to do with this. Noehre said that he doesn't have an issue with that, good excellent; can't use that score and then shuffling the list. Bourdon responded that in your plan you've got a set order on the pavement projects, and you're doing it in a specific way to preserve the pavement so it doesn't make any sense to do a mill and overlay before the chip seal and the order of your plan right now is to do them in a certain order, correct. Noehre responded that that is correct, but he was thinking more that it doesn't make sense, and they wouldn't allow doing an overlay and then do a chip seal six years later because that is the way it came out in the tool. Bourdon agreed, adding that pavement management is always very specific based on where you are in your life cycle and where you are in your program, so he understands what you are saying. Karlsson stated that she thinks what she is hearing is that we will want to make sure that we group those projects together, that they are a package of projects even though they may be over multiple construction years. Noehre commented that that is just one example; another example is the interstate construction prioritization numbers that we come up to in the tools say that they probably need to be 25 years apart, and that isn't going to be acceptable, they have to be somewhere around 15 years apart, so you either have to just say they are 15 years apart or work the tool so that it works out that way. Bourdon said that the biggest question becomes, okay the funding has to line up to allow that to happen, if the funding lines up to allow everything to happen in the right order that's great, but if your showing \$30 million dollars in project and \$10 million dollars of funding that isn't possible, so he thinks that you guys going back and talking about the funding will help tie that together. He added that the engineering side of him says we don't go in and flip the order and timing of all your stuff cause that is part of pavement management, it is pretty prescribed, and that is kind of what has to happen or you mess with your whole life cycle and cost of pavement.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Friday, July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Karlsson said that if you can help them by telling them which projects need to be grouped together, and what that timeframe is that is non-negotiable between those projects, that can help them make sure that they include them as a mini-program within the plan and make sure that we can draw the line, as best they can under fiscal constraint, to say that this group of projects can be funded, whereas this group of projects would fall out of fiscal constraint. Bourdon responded that he thinks it makes sense if the DOT comes back and says they don't have enough money for our list of projects, so the biggest issue is to help us sort out the funding; and then if that gets sorted out then some of this should logically fall into place based on the information you provided. Noehre said that this helps, but how he looks at this is that the spreadsheet that we put together, that is the list, and that is what he is going to do everything in is power to ensure it gets funded. Bourdon agreed. Karlsson stated that what they will do is to make sure that they check that either all of the project falls under funded, or all of the elements of that project fall under unfunded.

Karlsson referred to the Discretionary Tab and explained how they scored these projects. She said that along the top they list each goal area and what the goal statement is, and then they also list each of the objectives, and they do that for each of the ten goal areas. She stated that at this point, as they went through and scored this, they said that a project either achieves the goal or it doesn't, it is very much a yes or no. She added that they have not gone through and said that this project achieved this goal area better than this other projects as the feel that with the number of projects there are to score that the level of specificity is not helpful.

Karlsson continued, explaining that, again, they go through that binary exercise to determine that it either achieves the goal or it doesn't achieve the goal, or advances the goal or doesn't advance the goal and then they apply that to the weighting, and we end of with the total number of goal areas met, and then the total points received.

Bourdon referred to the spreadsheet and gave a demonstration on how the tool works.

Haugen explained that, just to describe the project Mr. Bourdon is using for the demonstration, it is an East Grand Forks project. He said that if you were driving up from the Murray Bridge and look straight ahead, that is 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, and it currently does not intersect with U.S. #2, so this project description would be making a road connection between what is 10<sup>th</sup> Street, by Burger King in East Grand Forks, east. He said that that 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue intersection would involve putting in a new roadway and a new connection to U.S. #2 that connects to an existing right-in/right-out left turn in to the northside at that area over by Subway on Gateway Drive.

Grasser asked how this fits with the state of good repair, or is this non-federal funding. Haugen responded that from a fiscal constraint point of view, we want to do the fiscal constraint first on the state of good repair, and in some categories we will have some dollars left on the table, so then this discretionary ranking will help to identify projects that we are showing all of our state of good repair needs in that program are met and we have dollars available for discretionary, so this ranking will give us a starting point on how to prioritize those projects in the discretionary list that are eligible for that program's funds. He added that in East Grand Forks we just saw that we probably don't have fiscal dollars left based on the initial run of fiscal constraint so this discretionary list then becomes, if they want to go after outside funding sources, some of the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Friday, July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

State competitive funding sources or national funding sources, to give some sense of the priority or higher value project in the metropolitan point of view to seek funding for it.

Grasser said that where he was going with the question is are we missing a goal area that breaks a project that has state of good repair with a project that doesn't have state of good repair as part of its project; in other words it is kind of outside the normal funding prioritization or desire, as he understands the highway bill, so he is wondering if there needs to almost be another goal like meeting current FAST ACT or something like that. Karlsson responded that that is a great question, and as an example if this project met safety, system preservation, efficiency, and access and mobility, if it met all four of those criteria it would score higher than a project that didn't meet those criteria; so that is how the prioritization tool would work, it would give higher points, or more weight to those projects that meet multiple goal areas as opposed to just one. Grasser commented that to him a new project that is extending into an area that is providing ADA ramps, bike paths, mobility, all of them, they are always going to score higher than a mill and overlay type of project; and in his mind a mill and overlay project doesn't do a whole lot to enhance safety and stuff with it; so, again it is going to depend on how you are going to define all of these things that you are talking about, but to him if you are providing bike and ped safety in an area that it currently doesn't exist, that would have to rank that project very high versus a mill and overlay project in an area in which you are already covering your bike and ped issues, so from a raw number standpoint it seems like you are going to come up with the wrong project list.

Karlsson explained that, going back to what Mr. Haugen said earlier, think of this as a two step process; the first step is just maintaining the state of good repair of your system, and in looking at which project can we afford that just maintains the state of good repair. Haugen pointed out that the scoring on the state of good repair tab is separate from the scoring, it is the same scoring system, but the totals and everything else are on separate tabs. Grasser said then, that this is ranking on different tabs and won't be competing directly with other projects, now it makes sense to him.

Bourdon continued with the demonstration.

Karlsson reported that they think that the results shown are reflective of the importance of your local asset management plans. She reiterated that, as Mr. Haugen discussed earlier that the Minnesota side has an asset management plan where they've been able to go through and really figure out what their priority of projects need to be based on many of the things that we talked about before; which projects need to be grouped together and that they absolutely be done separately; which projects need to be a priority, maybe not because of their functional class but because of the level of deterioration; and of course an MPO plan is not intended to get into that level of detail, in terms of asset management and here we are today, we have scored some of these projects and there isn't a lot of differentiation between them in terms of state of good repair; so they are looking for input on how we draw that line of what is in the fiscally constrained plan versus not in the fiscally constrained plan, particularly for the state of good repair projects.

Haugen said that if you look at what is on the screen right now, it is the Interstate projects the NDDOT submitted; and from this scoring tool, as we currently have it, all of the interstate

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Friday, July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

projects are going to be ranked exactly the same so what is the next level of prioritization; if we can't find additional funds to fund all of these, obviously we have to identify which ones will be in the fiscally constrained list. He added that right now they are all ranking/scoring the same so we have to look at the next level, and what should that next level be, that is sort of the spark that they are trying to ignite, and as you look at this how do we make that next level cut, what type of tools do we want to use. He said that this is assuming, again, that we don't have the finances to fund all of them. Bourdon commented that we can't, on some projects, just say that well this happens to work dollar wise so we will put the chip seal after the mill and overlay when obviously it isn't set up that way and it won't work based on the plan.

Noehre asked if the projects shown on the screen are all in the same timeband, currently. Bourdon responded that there is one long-range, and three short-range, so you're right. He asked what he has heard that someone has said it is okay that if you didn't have enough money you do your short ranges before your long ranges, and your long ranges drop out. Haugen said you can extend the timeband.

Noehre commented that the next part would be the pavements; two things we can look at would be age, meaning being longer in the timebands, years, and so those years they can still stay in the timebands but the actual year would a lot longer than the other.

Karlsson stated that what she is hearing is that if we can't fund all of the short term projects and the short-term timebands, that those projects that are assigned to near fiscal year, we would be the top priority in the mid-time band, is that fair. Noehre responded it was. Bourdon commented that within that it looks like you might have some further breakdowns based on year of implementation. Noehre responded that that would be one, and then after you use just years, but in reality once it gets closer you actually use more criteria like condition, cost, and how to reshuffle them, they would still be in the same band, probably, you just have to shuffle them first. He added that it is most critical in the short-term. Bourdon he thinks what is going to be important is to draw bringing those lines of funding with an initial fiscal constraint, as it gets more into the details of asset pavement management we will want look for some data as to how that would go rather than having us on the plane again to decipher all of your plan that somebody is a lot more involved in developing.

Noehre commented that North Dakota does have a pavement management asset plan, the District certainly does and then the Division that works on it in Bismarck does it for the whole State as well. He said that what they are not doing that others are doing is fiscally constraining them out farther in the S.T.I.P., and also incorporating other assets into it other than just pavement, so it isn't like they don't have a pavement asset management plan, they aren't reporting it to the detail that some others are.

Haugen said, again, this is the tool that we are starting from, and we have a lot of work to do before we get to that fiscally constrained recommended plan. He added that there are some additional steps and additional analysis, but this hopefully will allow to sort through to get us to the next stage. He stated that the next stage to him is what is fiscally constrained as far as where the road lines end up with in this, and then often the discretionary one works with discretionary projects that provide where we can focus on which ones really ought to move on that we can

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Friday, July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

have in our back pocket if we get to that level, but we don't spend a lot of resources and energy on projects that are so low on the initial stream or the second stream.

Noehre said that he has a question on that, to follow up on Mr. Grasser's question; in that, is there an opportunity in this to managerially adjust those state of good repair and discretionary projects; like, for example the project that was up for East Grand Forks, although he isn't entirely familiar with East Grand Forks roadways, but say that after the state of good repair there are no dollars left for discretionary, but what if that particular project is truly important to the MPO or the City, is there a way to override these numbers and say that, no that's actually going to take priority over the state of good repair projects. Haugen responded that the challenge there, of course, is we have to show that we are able to maintain the existing system before we start overspending resources outside and adding to the system. He added that there is a difference between both States; Minnesota's got a very strong, their going to have that stance and then create the statewide competitive projects to address those other ways of other things like the 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE extension, but he thinks, on that particular project, you all know we are starting the 220 North Study, one of the key intersections on 220 North is Gateway Drive/Central Avenue, it is congested and has a high crash rate. He said that some of their early analysis is kind of suggesting that this extended roadway will take the traffic away from that intersection and so we don't have to do a grade separation in order to make it safe and a parallel roadway might solve and not have to do a massive project on state highway, so even though our first cut is trying to maintain what exists, and keep it in good condition, there is still an opportunity to meld the two together to make sense as far as what should really happen in a certain year.

Noehre commented that there is opportunity to share dollars from one to the other, is really what he is asking too; for example, reconstruction can be a state of good repair, but you can also patch it together for another extra so many years and use those dollars somewhere else.

Karlsson stated that she thinks that that is a really important policy discussion that needs to be had. She said that she has helped with the Statewide plan here in the State of Minnesota, as well as the MPO plans, and that has really been the point of the Statewide Plan to figure out where the thresholds are for those policy decisions, of, like you were saying, where there is a regionally significant important project, because it is so significant to economic competitiveness that it has to be right up there in importance in funding priority, with state of good repair projects, so she thinks that that is a fantastic question. She added that it is absolutely it is a policy discussion that needs to be had.

Williams said, so, if we did find that, using Washington Street as an example, we were going to have to do something out of order, would that mean that we would make findings based on that and then to a Long Range Transportation Amendment; to move those would it require we do that or is there enough lead way just to leave it the way it is. Haugen responded that the general guidance would be if there is a significant change in the scope of work and a significant change in the dollar values, and a difference in the timeband would trigger an amendment. Karlsson said that she would add funding source to that as well. She explained that if, for example a project would receive competitive funding and its not in your fiscally constrained plan then it would need to be amended into the plan with that new funding source.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Friday, July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Grasser when you talk about a policy decision, a policy decision to be made by whom, or what group. Haugen responded that it would be the MPO Executive Policy Board. Grasser said that an example of one that he has been struggling with; we talked earlier about the fact,; we will probably see all of our federal dollars allocated on the NHS system, there should be not much left for anything else, but it does appear there might be a few dollars left, and one of the projects that he had in his mind would be, or would have been 48<sup>th</sup> Street out in the Industrial Park, that road is in really tough shape; yes you can always use some sort maintenance on it but at some point in time those roads get to be so poor that he thinks your investment just becomes poor, we can't just keep doing mill and overlays, and doing short-term fixes and doing shorter and shorter-term fixes and think we are going to build our way out of it; at some point we need to reconstruct to get that longer-term life back into that system, that's his theory and perception. He stated that the question he is getting to is, then, we kind of left it off that priority list, because we felt that maybe reconstruction wasn't meeting the definition of state of good repair, quite frankly he doesn't see that anything short of reconstruction is the best thing to do out there, so what he is hearing today is there may be a way of getting that in under the state of good repair definition, although he is a little unsure how, but if we could figure out how to get it under the state of good repair, then to him that would be one road that he would try to rank into some timeband as a priority. Haugen commented that he thinks reconstruction is a state of good repair project. He added that the NDDOT has several listed in their state of good repair. Grasser asked if that would be the case even if they are going to widen the pavement. Haugen responded that when we get to reconstruction then our guidance has been that they address all of those issues that are in that segment of roadway, so a mill and overlay you are able to just touch the pavement curb to curb; but when we do a reconstruction we are looking at the right-of-way to right-of-way and addressing what needs to be addressed in that right-of-way.

Grasser stated that another example, and again they struggled with extending South Washington beyond where it ends today out to 55<sup>th</sup>, or even to 62<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South. He said that if they reconstructed that they would probably put in four lanes, so does that still meet the definition of state of good repair, or would we be pushing that boundary to far. Haugen responded that he thinks that is pushing it down to the urbanization category because you're not reconstructing you're urbanizing, so that is not state of good repair.

Grasser said, going back to the definition; Mr. Noehre hit some good points on ranking projects, and he thinks that when we get into the urban system too, again, somehow you have to massage these within the numbers and categories that we currently have because they aren't separate categories; and he isn't necessarily criticizing, but to him on the urban side we are prioritizing based on, a lot of it has to be how many people are driving that road, what is the ranking of that road, so NHS, and ours ranks the highest, and it seems to him the best intent in the highest volumes, and so, again, as part of a priority ranking they would tend to adjust that into the traffic volume or ranking system into that prioritization, and again, as Mr. Noehre said, maybe by year, but the flip side to that is that we didn't identify our collector because there isn't any way to do it. He stated that he is trying to suggest ways that we would prioritize those.

Grasser commented that, skipping ahead to a little bit different subject, and he is debating in his own mind; but we are still using terms like major/minor arterial, but in his mind he isn't sure that minor arterial is necessary a term that has a lot of value at this point in time. He added that it

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Friday, July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

seems to him we are either NHS or we are arterial streets, and he isn't sure that us trying to split the hair; we had that discussion internally, what is minor arterial, what is major arterial, is a minor arterial just waiting to become a major arterial; the difference between minor arterial and major arterial in our minds is getting very hard to differentiate, and now with the new FAST ACT, with the NHS, that to him almost substitutes the major arterial class. Haugen commented that we have minor arterials, principle arterials, are you thinking minor collectors and major collectors. Grasser responded that that isn't what he is thinking; he said that he is thinking that we have simply an NHS System, and we have an arterial system, and then we have our collector system; and he isn't sure he can always differentiate between NHS, Principle, and Minor; to him it's NHS or its maybe Non-NHS, arterials and collectors. Haugen commented that all principles are on the NHS system. Karlsson added that as Mr. Grasser said, they are two separate system; functional classification system, Federal Highway requires that we have it and that every jurisdiction has it, so that is a point of references and sort of a nomenclature that Mr. Haugen and herself are comfortable with, but he knows that a lot of engineers aren't comfortable with the functional classification system.

Karlsson stated that, as Mr. Haugen said, NHS, you can substitute that word in our mind for the principle arterial system, and then as you said the remaining arterials happen to be called minor arterials in that functional classification system. Grasser commented that what he was eventually working his way toward, and he's not sure from a point allocation standpoint, he previously said they should do it by capacity and classification, but he isn't sure he would rank a minor arterial versus a principle arterial that is not NHS much differently from one another when you get into the allocating of points, to him they are very very similar. Haugen stated that he is fairly certain that we have no principle arterials not designated NHS. He added that, for our Minnesota friends, we do have a minor collector system and a major collector system, but we don't have it in North Dakota yet.

Kuharenko commented that, and this kind of goes back to what we have for the ranking; but he sees that what you have on the screen right now is four different sub-categories, and he is guessing that this is one area where it was either all points or no points were awarded and all you needed to do was to get just one of the four sub-categories. He asked, in trying to differentiate these projects out a little better, especially because we have so many of them, would it be beneficial to maybe say if Goal 1 is worth so many points, and you have four sub-categories, that Goal 1 is worth 10 points, and again you have four sub-categories, so each of those sub-categories is actually worth 2 ½ points, that way if you have a project that hits all four of those sub-categories within that goal it is worth all 10 points and you might be able to differentiate more instead of having a whole bunch of projects that are worth 10 points, 30 points, etc., and that is the first point he'd like to make.

Kuharenko said that the second point he'd like to make, because he knows we've got state of good repair and we've got our discretionary projects; and he knows that once we get down to kind of the City only funded projects, they have been trying to split those out based on how fast is the City expanding and how quickly are we developing; and so are we going to end up almost overriding some of the expansion within the City with state of good repair projects, and essentially saying that potentially all the money is scored, or a majority of it is going towards

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Friday, July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

state of good repair and not necessarily, and almost dictating to the plan as to what we should be doing instead of basing it off of anticipated growth.

Bourdon commented that it is finding the balance of letting roads deteriorate a lot versus expanding the system. Kuharenko responded that growing as the City has been. Karlsson said that she thinks, again going back to that sort of policy discussion that we are talking about here; just remember that we did go out for public comment on what the priorities, what the policy priorities are and the two top priority policies that we heard were: 1) state of good repair and tied with that was new river crossings. She added that expansion fell far below state of good repair, and that can be overturned, but you also need to acknowledge that that is what you heard from the public.

Haugen summarized that he thinks we've accomplished what we tried to do today; we introduced this tool to start discussing the fiscal constraint. He stated that our next step is to distribute out this tool, and the first thing we would ask you to do is to look at the list of projects in your jurisdiction and make sure you are comfortable with it. He said that it is missing some cells on some of them, not many, but let's try to populate those cells.

Haugen commented that he thinks that with that we may have all projects scored at initial, or we might send out what we just saw right now to everyone, projects and those cells populated as best we can before we can score all of them; that is what he thinks our next step is.

Bourdon stated that in terms of all the ranking of sub-categories he thinks we will start out kind of doing the digital one or zero on some of them and see how it shakes out initially because honestly, when it gets into every sub-category we are going to likely need some help, and those really close to the projects are going to be able to fill some of them in more; you might see that based on the initial look there are certain areas where we will focus more of that versus others, so he thinks an initial look will help us kind of figure out where to put emphasis rather than putting a bunch of emphasis initially where it might not make much of a difference.

Noehre asked if there was a column then to indicate priority one, two, three, etc.; is there some place to enter that information in on the spreadsheet. Haugen responded that at the end of the scoring it will show that information, it isn't there yet, but we do have a column at the end of the Universe list of projects, there is a column that has notes, and they would ask that if you wanted to add a note on the project or highlight something that would help them with the scoring or the ranking that you would put it here.

Bourdon referred to the Interstate projects on the Universe of Project List and gave an overview on how the tool, and specifically how the note column will work for the ranking of the projects. Haugen requested that the note column be located at the far right of the spreadsheet columns so that after all the scoring is done there will be another opportunity to add footnotes. Bourdon responded that they will add one to the far right, after the number of goals met and points received, and that would be around Column CH. Noehre commented that he understands about bringing in the notes but it is a spreadsheet so he was envisioning another column there so you could keep the chip seal with the overlay because bringing in the notes, those can get lost.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Friday, July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Discussion on project scoring methods ensued.

Haugen said that he would like to send out this spreadsheet as you see it today so that those Universe List of Projects can be finalized and then maybe next week we can redistribute it with all of the scoring in place. Bourdon stated that they will need input back relatively soon so that they can eventually continue to meet the schedule for this plan.

Haugen commented that, just so everyone is aware, those tabs on HSIP and Multi-modal or Mainstreet, we are not going to score those yet, they are still working on them. He added that part of the HSIP, his thought last night was, there might be some discretionary projects that are really addressing the safety issue so could be included as and HSIP project, so he will do a review of all the discretionary projects and try to identify if there are any candidates for HSIP funds. He said that the challenge there is, like on the Minnesota side, 70% of the HSIP dollars basically go to the systematic corrections and not the dark spot corrections so most of the discretionary projects could be in another spot or high crash locations, so the money doesn't correspond and it's hard to try to show some of the profits.

Bourdon stated that they will send this out shortly with the notes column and any quick final tweaks, and will work with Mr. Haugen so that next week they can send out ranked state of good repair and discretionary projects as the mainstreet or multi-modal and safety is sorted out. He said that once that gets sent out they would ask that people try to get together as a group among agencies, as needed, to review this and get back to them in a week or so because just getting the project list has taken a lot of time and they are getting to the point where they are going to have a rough time getting the draft report out by the needed timeframe in order to get it reviewed and approved. He added that they are planning to hold a public open house in August, so ideally you are presenting a lot of what people will see in the draft, so he asks for everyone's cooperation, and he knows it is challenging with the variety of things going on with construction and such, but any effort you can make to sit down and get this information to them would be appreciated.

Haugen reminded everyone that we are delaying our August Technical Advisory Committee meeting from August 8<sup>th</sup> to August 15<sup>th</sup>.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY GENGLER, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO ADJOURN THE JULY 27<sup>TH</sup>, 2018, TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 10:52 A.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager