

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2018
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen Chairman, called the September 12th, 2018, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:37 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; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Jesse Kadrmaz, NDDOT-Local District; Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineer; Paul Konickson, MnDOT District 2; and Dale Bergman, Area Cities Transit.

Absent were: Darren Laesch, Nancy Ellis, Richard Audette, Dustin Lang, Stephanie Halford, Ryan Brooks, Steve Emery, Lane Magnuson, Ali Rood, Ryan Riesinger, Stacey Hanson, Mike Yavarow, Lars Christianson, and Rich Sanders.

Guest(s) present were: Brandon Bourdon, Kimley-Horn; Scott Mereck, WSB; and Al Grasser, Grand Forks Engineering.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JULY 27TH AND AUGUST 22ND, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY BAIL, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO APPROVE THE JULY 27TH AND AUGUST 22ND, 2018 MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2018**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT RFP FOR THE SKEWED
INTERSECTION STUDY**

Kouba reported that we received a request from the City of Grand Forks to do a study to include the US#2/US#81 intersection, the US#2/Gateway Drive intersection, and the US Bus#2/Mill Road intersection. She explained that the purpose of the study is to try to find ways to improve safety, reduce existing and future traffic congestion, provide efficient access for existing and future development, and improve mobility and connectivity for all transportation modes.

Kouba stated that they did put together a request for proposals to do this study and are looking for alternatives that can help alleviate some of the issues seen in the study area. She added that we have a budget of \$60,000 for the study.

Kouba commented that the Grand Forks Engineering Department did submit some grammar corrections as well as some corrections to the maps, so she will make those changes before the final document is submitted to the MPO Executive Policy Board for their approval.

Williams referred to the first page of the Background and Scope-Of-Work, and pointed out that Number 7 says “structures”, and she is wondering if that is referring to the review of the existing traffic signals and railroad and everything to make sure that there are no deficiencies and recommendations as far as replacement or such. Kouba responded that it is included.

Haugen commented that previously it has been identified that the railroad signals and the Mill Road signal were one above the other, so that has been pointed out to do that again. Williams added that there are also no gates, there are several things; one of the signal poles is a little too low because trucks keep hitting the back plates, so that is kind of what she is looking at.

***MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING
A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY
APPROVE THE DRAFT RFP FOR THE U.S.#2/U.S.#81 SKEWED INTERSECTION
STUDY SUBJECT TO THE PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSED CORRECTIONS/COMMENTS
BEING IMPLEMENTED.***

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Bail, Gengler, West, Johnson, Kuharenko, Konickson, and Bergman.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: Williams.

***Absent: Lang, Emery, Halford, Brooks, Audette, Riesinger, Laesch, Hanson,
Yavarow, Rood, Ellis, Magnuson, Sanders, Christianson.***

Haugen reported that this is one of those studies that we have received approval from the NDDOT that they will provide 10% of the cost.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2018**

MATTER OF EGF ADA TRANSITION PLAN UPDATE

Haugen reported that this year we have been working with SRF Consulting Group on the East Grand Forks ADA Transition Plan, and Ms. Kouba will walk us through an update on this study.

Kouba stated that we hired SRF back in April and at the end of June, beginning of July, they were out collecting data for the self-evaluation portion of the plan, and have been doing a quality control check on the data collected to make sure that the slope and the run and all of that is correct for those intersections and making sure that there are truncated domes and whether things are compliant or non-compliant. She added that they are also entering some of the sidewalks and making sure that they are flat and meet ADA requirements.

Kouba commented that overall East Grand Forks is pretty much where everybody else is in terms of compliance for ADA so they haven't found anything unusual. She stated that the next steps will be to move forward and they are now in the process of putting together a presentation for a focus group meeting with members of the community most affected by the impending improvements. A public meeting will be held the same day as the focus group meeting, a date will be set soon.

Williams asked, just out of curiosity, on the compliant, is it compliant based on current standards or compliant based on the standard of when it was installed. Kouba responded that it is compliant based on current standards. Kouba added that where the focus group and our public meeting will come into play, prioritizing everything, so things that were compliant when they put in but aren't right now might have a lower prioritization.

Haugen asked if this was broken out yet by agency. Kouba responded that it is not.

Information only.

MATTER OF DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION STUDY UPDATE

Haugen reported that we received one proposal to our RFP for the Downtown Transportation Study. He said that the submittal came in as if we were going to do the whole RFP that we originally drafted, so in working with the City of Grand Forks, the NDDOT and the consultant, we reached a scope-of-work that focuses just on updating the downtown parking standards to get a sense of what existing parking is there, what the proposed developments that might be coming from the Downtown Action Plan would change the parking, and to see if the parking is based on the proper land use type.

Haugen commented that another thing they will be doing is to create Event Management Plans. He explained that this past weekend there were several activities going on in the downtown that changed how people could arrive and how they were able to park, and this would come up with some of those event management plans to try to help ease the pain of getting information out and assigning where people can go to park.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2018**

Haugen said that they are also then looking at the ride hailing areas that police and the City have designated already and doing a critique on them.

Haugen stated that the last piece is looking at the potential vacation of 3rd Street, where the Water Treatment Plan redevelopment is.

Haugen reported that what was removed from the RFP were the review of the one-way pairs through 4th Street, and a study of University Avenue connection between the downtown and UND, those are the two significant things that we dropped. He added that we also make a decision to drop the whole scope-of-work to look at the traffic network and trying to address that, we decided not to put that in the RFP, but the consultant did have it as a part of the submittal, so it was removed.

Haugen said that this maintains the budget of \$60,000; the work schedule is still on the same timeline as the Downtown Action Plan; and KLJ's subconsultant is still RDG.

Haugen commented that the Executive Policy Board authorized the Finance Committee the ability to executive that contract, and they are scheduled to meet tomorrow to do that. He added that, assuming we get concurrence from the NDDOT on the selection process authorization to proceed should be done by the end of the month.

Information only.

MATTER OF MN 220 NORTH STUDY RFP UPDATE

Viafara reported that last month the MPO sought authorization from the Technical Advisory Committee to engage a consulting company to advance the MN 220 North Corridor Study. He added that we also asked the MPO Executive Policy Board to approve this as well and a Request For Proposal was issued.

Viafara stated that August 31st our MPO received three proposals and a committee of seven people was established to review and to help in the selection process of hiring a consultant, and the firm they selected was Alliant Engineering.

Information only.

MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE

Performance Measure/Targets

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

Presentation ensued.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2018**

Bourdon commented that some of this will just be a review, but they are going to talk a little bit about some specific performance measures and targets and they do have final revenue forecasts that they would like to discuss.

Bourdon stated that there has been some new information develop in terms of where some draft investment direction and scenarios are starting to look based on what they had for revenues and some of the project prioritization information they received, and they will provide an update on the river crossing analysis.

Bourdon referred to the project schedule and said that there is an open house tonight at the Alerus Center from 5:30 to 7:00 p.m., with a presentation at 5:45 p.m. He stated that that will be the last public meeting and added that they will be working on getting together a draft for review on the 5th of October.

Haugen referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and pointed out that PM3 are three targets. He added that last month we discussed where both States sit on those targets and also the fact that some of these facilities aren't located in Minnesota, and if we adopted by default the State targets we would formally be adopting MnDOT's targets for the interstate system even though there isn't an interstate system, so we are suggesting that we use some of the information from both States but not necessarily adopt the State targets as a default.

Haugen pointed out that, based on the data for the Truck Travel Time Liability, North Dakota went with an ultra-conservative index of 3 and Minnesota went with a 1.5. He added that he thinks that last month we discussed where some of our surrounding States were with their information, and when we look at the data that is available through the MAP-21 tool we see where the Grand Forks MPO area is at, and that is at the 1.2 or so area. He said that we also discussed that there has been a change in vendor of the data collection between 2017 and 2018, with the 2018 data being more informed data, so for the draft target for consideration we are suggesting that we consider going with 1.5.

Haugen stated that on the regular interstate travel reliability, again our data shows 100%, North Dakota's shows 85%, and Minnesota shows 80%; and we are suggesting that we go with 90%. He said that this give us a little room for forgiveness, but not a lot so that it would be less valuable.

Haugen commented that for the non-interstate travel reliability, again we see a difference between 2017 data and 2018 data. He said that we also know that North Dakota went with 85%, Minnesota went with 75%, and we are suggesting something similar as North Dakota's 85%.

Haugen stated that we show these PM3 proposed targets for the MPO but the we are also back to the PM2, the pavement and bridge conditions. He said that, again we discussed this last month; in some cases, because of the data availability and the inconsistency we are pretty much going to recommend that we adopt the State's targets. He added, though, that in some cases, again because there are no facilities on the Minnesota side, we default then to the North Dakota

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2018**

number, but we aren't saying that we are adopting it as a State target, it will become an MPO number and an MPO target it is just the same as North Dakota's target.

Haugen said that the MPO column is what they are asking the Technical Advisory Committee consider recommending to the MPO Executive Policy Board that they consider adopting. He added that we do have, technically until the middle of November to make these decisions, but as you heard we are trying to have a draft document ready for review in October reflecting what these targets are. He said that they think they have enough information to make this recommendation for our consideration ahead of that 180 day timeline, so with that staff is asking for a motion to recommend forwarding a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board to approve these targets.

Haugen commented that you will notice that on the State's side, after two years they have to make a report to the feds about their progress and at that time they can make a decision to adjust a target or keep it as is. He added that on the MPO side we just have four-year targets that we are adopting. He pointed out that there are nine total, and of the nine four are State targets and the rest are MPO targets, and that is what staff is requesting the Technical Advisory Committee approve today.

Kadrmass asked what the benefit of using 1.5 instead of 3 for the truck travel time reliability is. Haugen responded that the benefit would be to make a better argument if we are having 1.7 index, if that is a real truck freight mobility reliability issue in our MPO area versus saying we will wait until we hit 3 to raise it as a concern. He added that that is why Congress gave MPOs the ability to adopt their own targets to take a statewide average and make it more specific and local, which is sort of similar to the discussion we had with Safety Targets.

Kadrmass asked if this is what the other MPOs and Bismarck are doing as well. Haugen responded that Bismarck is currently adopting the State targets because they are just in the process of preparing to update their Long Range plan, and they expect that when they adopt their plan a year from now that they will be adopting some of their own targets. He added that Fargo/Moorhead, because of their change in directorship are adopting the State targets for now as well, but they have not officially adopted the PM2s and PM3s yet.

MOVED BY KADRMAS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE MPO TARGETS, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Kadrmass, Bail, Gengler, West, Johnson, Kuharenko, Konickson, and Bergman.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: Williams.

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

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2018**

Haugen reported that the next few slides discuss environmental measures. He said that our current Long Range Transportation Plan adopted a performance measure for tailpipe emissions, so this information is to tell you that when you look at the 2015 numbers compared to the numbers that we were working off of in the 2040 plan we had, between 2006 and 2010, a significant reduction in vehicle miles traveled; between 2010 and 2015 we had a significant increase in vehicle miles traveled. He explained that between 2006 and 2010 the gas economy did not change, and we saw an improvement on gas mileage that the average vehicle was achieving. He stated that for the actual emissions, even though we saw an increase in vehicle miles traveled we actually achieved a decrease in the fuel consumed, which also then led to a decrease in our emissions, so our trend continued going down, but our rate of trend didn't continue as fast as of right now as it did in the past.

Williams said that in the 2040 plan we had talked about basing this on population; because our population is increasing it makes it difficult to continue to have a downward trend if you are just using straight numbers, so was population taken into consideration at all. Haugen responded that it hasn't yet on this calculation.

Haugen commented that this is just to bring everyone up to date on where we are standing with that current target in our plan with the 2015 data, and the trend is still to be planning from this point of view but next month they will show the actual target and the way they worded it.

Bourdon reported that the next few slides discuss investment direction. He explained that they are in the process of getting input on investment direction; and they have gotten public input on issue areas and investment priorities, have considered State and local plans, and have included input from all areas to make sure that they define the available revenues.

Bourdon commented that they talked about goals, performance measures, objectives; really some of the things that we reviewed back in August when they went to the public and got input and asked where are your biggest areas of concern, and this diagram shows the results of that. He went over and said that there was a focus on safety and pavement condition, but there were also concerns with signals, congestion and access. He said that they then, at the January public meeting, did an activity asking where people would focus your investment priorities, and the results of that are shown on this diagram as well. He pointed out that the highest priority was maintaining infrastructure with state of good repair projects at 30%; new river crossings at 29%; new freeway interchanges at 16%, etc.

Bourdon stated that taking that information, and working through the Technical Advisory Committee members, they were able to define the current revenue scenario, and they went through, based on the periods buckets, where the total revenue sits. He referred to the diagram and pointed out that they included Safety, ND Main Street, State of Good Repair-Interstate, State of Good Repair-Non-Interstate NHS and minor arterials, and Local Projects. He said that the percent share is shown and they are at basically \$436 million dollars, with the bulk of that tying in to the State of Good Repair for the Interstate, NHS and minor arterials; and a good portion to Grand Forks local projects that don't fall into some of the federal aid categories and sales tax.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2018**

Haugen reported that we distributed this out, and each of the agencies received this ahead of time, how that pie chart, and the projects are distributed within the pie charts, so for the Minnesota side, they gave them a fiscally constrained list of projects already, so there wasn't a whole lot of work that they had to do there; on the NDDOT side all the projects they identified they found funding for, but they did have to shift some of the regional dollars over to the Interstate System to fund it; but with the fiscal constraint there are a couple million dollars left on the table, but not enough to really play with.

Haugen stated that on the East Grand Forks side, with their City Subtarget available every fourth year, it make their list of projects a little more tricky as they had to work with the project ranking from the tool that they distributed at the end of July and came up with a list that shook out with East Grand Forks.

Haugen said that on the Grand Forks side they started with the City's request on the NHS system. He added that Grand Forks also did request that we consider a 60/40 match ratio with the federal funds, and when they did that there was some remaining federal funds still on the table, so they shifted those over to the minor arterial network; and using the tool that ranks projects they identified minor arterials to fit with the funding. He stated that they are still working on the other two agencies, the counties, and are also still working on the other two categories; safety and North Dakota Main Street.

Kuharenko stated that he saw the spreadsheets that were sent out earlier this week and he is wondering what is being used for the base, are they using 2015 as the base or 2018 as the base. Haugen responded that it is 2018 and 2023 is sort of the first year of the general fiscal plan. Kuharenko said, then, that 2023 is the target that you're inflating to, the short-term timeband; so what are the mid-term and long-term years. Mereck responded that there are three timebands; the short time band starts on the out year of the T.I.P. Haugen added that 2023 to 2027, and so our year of expenditure is at the mid-point of that 2024/2025 time-frame so the mid-term is 2028 to 2038, and so whatever the mid-point of that band is what they gave the year of expenditure to. Kuharenko said that he would assume then that 2039 to 2045 is the long-term. Haugen responded that that is correct. He added that, so they didn't say that a project had a year of expenditure of 2024 versus 2027, everything was on the same year of expenditure. Kuharenko asked what they ended up using as a rate of inflation. Mereck responded that NDDOT and MnDOT recommended they use factors, and he can send that out. Bourdon said that he could send that and then just make sure that all the time-banks are mostly clear. Haugen added that those two things didn't change between 2040 and 2045. Kuharenko said he just didn't know what they were off-hand. He added that as he was going through the document he wasn't sure, he saw that there was a factor in there, and he took whatever the estimated value was and multiplied by 1.132 for the short-term, but he wasn't exactly sure how that related back in inflation rate or what years they went over. He said that he knows that in the costs that they sent over had an as bid estimate based in 2015 dollars so it sounds like it might be a couple of extra years of inflation that they might need to shift in there as well. He added that he knows that in our previous discussions, where we ended up talking about the 60/40 split, that is more in relation to if they end up looking at total project costs because there is your engineering; whether it is designed construction, if you need to do right-of-way acquisition, utility relocates, or other

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2018**

project incidentals; whether it is impractical or eligible for federal funding, they end up covering those entirely as a city cost and so the cost that they end up providing the 2015 dollars, and those are for construction costs only, so they probably need to figure in some kind of a factor if they are going to go with the 60/40 split versus the 80/20 split.

Haugen said that he knew that but they didn't do the calculation. He explained that they took the construction costs and added contingency, admin, and then construction if that raised it 50%, then split that 60/40. He said that they just took what was there, 60/40. Kuharenko said that if we are just taking that; what they gave was a construction estimate, and do that 60/40 that isn't capturing all the costs. He stated that if you are going to do it on a 60/40 basis, typically they end up using 15% for design engineering, 15% for construction engineering, and 3% as a token amount; and he thinks that the federal expenditure; if it is 80/20 under construction, should still be the same if you are at a 60/40, so that should help clear things up.

Mereck asked if they were going to recommend what type of inflation adjustment they want used for those other considerations. Kuharenko asked if he was talking about inflating the construction dollars to projects costs. Mereck responded that he believes they gave them construction estimate for all the projects; and he thinks the suggestion is to add on some administrative and contingency costs to that, so the question is whether or not they have a recommended additional percentage that they would like them to add for those types of things. Kuharenko responded that they would like to just have it multiplied by 1.33.

Grasser commented that he thinks that when we originally had the 60/40 discussion we were trying to determine what we had available for local dollars for matches and things like that, and they wanted to recognize that the local match is more than 80/20, and they were talking about it on a macro scale, that was the discussion for the 60/40; and maybe it should have been 80/20 plus another 20% local or 25% local, maybe that would have been a better way of stating it, but he is a little concerned, even on this conversation, that it depends on what roadway or what type of project that we are actually doing. He explained that if you're doing a project on Highway #2, we don't have those kinds of local match inflators with that, where we get into higher local contribution is where we are responsible for the engineering and things, so it depends somewhat on the project and we might have to have a memo or something that defines which project you add what kind of inflators to; because, again, work on Gateway Drive, while there is zero percent City contribution on that but like Washington and some of the other State Highways we have a ten, and those tend to remain fairly well under control, there might be a few extras in there depending upon what they are, but when we get into the Urban Program, that is where we run into things like bikepaths, and those types of programs have a way different ratio because of how the engineering interplay comes into that so we might want to be a little more thoughtful and define what those are. He added that just so we are all producing the same estimate, if we are doing an estimate that doesn't include engineering, 80/20 is fine because those costs are usually project eligible, and then the City portion would be those non-eligible items so it may be better to come up with a different percentage like 80/20 plus because we have to be careful about the percentages and using them in the right way for the situation being dealt with.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2018**

Bourdon stated that he agrees that it is important that we make sure we are on the same page, but he also thinks we have to keep in mind that we are working on the Long Range Transportation Plan and are trying to maintain some level of consistency. He said that he has been doing quite a few of these, and we want to do what is right and make sure that the local funding is properly accounted for, but he thinks this is more tied to the big amount of local funds you have so it is more something they have to get on the page with and talk about what is reasonable given this is a Long Range Transportation Plan, and when he says that he isn't ignoring what you're saying, he just thinks this is an issue that they need to work out with Grand Forks because that is more tied into that local funding level. Grasser agreed, adding that that is why he thinks we need to probably establish in writing what those ratios are that we agree with because they always struggle a little bit when they see a number, did it include the engineering, didn't it include the engineering, because that makes a big difference on the local side. Mereck added that one important thing to keep in mind is that this is a planning study so all of the cost estimates in the plan are going to be planning level cost estimates, they aren't going to be preliminary engineering types of estimates that he knows a lot of you are accustomed to working with on a regular basis, so it is going to be an increment of accuracy a little bit higher than you would deal with with the preliminary engineering estimate, and with that there is a little bit more generality that goes with the estimate, and that doesn't mean that they aren't trying to be as accurate as we can be but we also want to be as consistent as we can be across all the agencies that we are estimating costs for because it ends up working better for their methodology to compare back to our fiscal constraint.

Mereck commented that obviously when you go through the planning process the next step after the project is selected and put into the T.I.P., you go through a more detailed more rigorous pre-engineering environmental review process that gets into more detail of what those regular costs are, and the contingencies, and all the other factors that go into the overall project cost. Grasser said that he doesn't know if he cares what is in your number, it is just that once we arrive and understand what went into that number we apply the right percentage to that number, we can't take a percentage of an inappropriate number and expect to have a reasonable result. Mereck stated that he might be coming up with that percentage to apply relatively equally based on the type of cross section of your project so they aren't writing three pages of different numbers. Kuharenko commented that he thinks that is kind of what they are saying, if they are going to go with the 80/20 then the numbers they ended up giving you work quite well with that, but if we are going to be looking at splitting it out at a 60/40 basis we need to just incorporate into that factor to take into consideration that extra engineering. Grasser added that it might be a better approach, when we get down to the project level, to maybe leave it at 80/20 with the numbers that everybody is generally generating and then just recognizing at the local level plus another 20%, he thinks that will help keep the federal and local flow closer to reality.

Bourdon stated that he thinks that with this conversation he thinks we can get where we need to be, it is just making sure that we are on the same page, so he will follow up on this.

Haugen referred to the list of projects that was distributed earlier and asked that everyone please look through it to see if there might be some projects that might be justified as safety funding, instead of normal state of good repair project. He stated that on the North Dakota side you can't

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2018**

install a new traffic signal, but you could, perhaps, revise traffic signals or at one time Stanford Road and Gateway Drive and North 36th Street Alignment might be a project that could be classified as safety. He added that in East Grand Forks there are a few recommended round-about locations, which could be identified as safety improvements; and that would be the other thing that is one reason why we haven't addressed the safety yet because they made a request, got little feedback, and are making the request again to see if there are some projects that we can try to make an argument that there should be a safety consideration and fund it through the HSIP process. Grasser said, then, in that light they've got traffic signal upgrades proposed in the T.I.P. and S.T.I.P., and a lot of the traffic signal things that they are doing are going to be pedestrian oriented such as push buttons and heads, so could there be an argument made that some of that is safety related, or is that too far down the trail already. Haugen responded that it is on the illustrative side of our T.I.P. and S.T.I.P. currently so it is still seeking funding so it is a question that should be asked, but at some point different staff people communicate as to what is eligible as part of HSIP and that wouldn't be so there might be an argument that possible could happen, so yes you should make the request to see if there is a part of those applications that could be considered.

Grasser asked if Mr. Johnson had any guidance in relation to this; if they went through some methodology and came up with the idea that 10% of those traffic rehab projects are safety related, has anybody done that or would that be a path that would be very difficult. Johnson responded that he hasn't had any experience with that, it would be something unique, and he isn't sure how you would figure out what that potentially would be for the baseline.

Haugen commented that the one thing that he thinks is clear is that in the past they don't like to mix safety funds with other funds so if it is a standalone safety project it needs to be justified as a stand-alone safety project, so if you part out some of those components you end up having two separate projects instead of two funding sources for one project. Johnson agreed, adding that Federal Highway has directed to separate safety improvements out as stand-alone safety measures. Kuharenko added that, if memory serves, just the general timeline for the HSIP program, as well as the T.I.P. going into the S.T.I.P., those are programmed different years as well because they are typically four years out whereas the HSIP is typically two or three, so you also have that gap as well, that tiny gap that can be problematic if you were to try to line up two different funding sources. Haugen stated that this plan is the first plan that is planning out safety to the 20-plus year horizon. He added that there are a lot of projects that aren't being recommended or assigned in the fiscal constraint side of things, so if you can find projects that might justify the safety side we are encouraging you to let us know.

Williams asked what category the Washington Street Underpass project falls in. Haugen responded that it is a T.I.P. project that is already programmed. He added that it isn't really part of the work that we have been working on for 2045. Williams said she asked this because that project certainly has a lot of safety items involved with it. Haugen responded that it isn't a project that we use as a project to base our forecasted revenue because it is such an outlier, and it is already programmed in the T.I.P. so we aren't trying to plan for it in this 2045 timeframe.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2018**

Haugen commented that the Main Street is just seeing how we are going to address those utility locates and if there are replacement projects or not on that list.

Bourdon stated that the next few slides show a list of potential discretionary projects. He said that most of them have been discussed in the past. He pointed out that the Point Bridge approach on the East Grand Forks side has been added to the list, and stated that there has been a lot of discussion on river crossings and 32nd Avenue and Merrifield are potential discretionary projects.

Kuharenko commented that under our potential discretionary projects he isn't seeing anything regarding an I-29/47th Avenue Interchange. Haugen responded that the bulk of this list is coming from that tool, again, the priority ranking that was in that tool that we asked you to review, and they got little feedback on, so these are the output of that tool. He added that they didn't rank the river crossings in the tool, so review the tools to see how it shook out and where we can make the improvements.

River Crossing Analysis

Bourdon stated that we have been looking at five river crossings, and we actually started this process earlier in the year, and there really aren't many changes except to address the discussion we had at your last meeting, specifically whether or not trucks were considered as part of the crossing and there were some adjustments to how they presented costs, so he will give a brief review of the next few slides.

Presentation continued.

Williams asked, when we are talking low and high, is low like the elevation of the Sorlie and high the elevation of the Kennedy, or in-between there. Haugen responded that the low; politicians always talk about the Point Bridge, so it is floodable approaches is what the low is, so it isn't really like either the Sorlie or the Kennedy, its like those other types of bridges where the approaches are not meant to be safe from flooding.

Haugen commented that he did make a request to the Polk County Commissioners to see what their stance is on the potential 47th Avenue Bridge, and the MPO Executive Policy Board had a question of Polk County on where they stand on Merrifield, so those were two questions we raised for Polk County. He said that they haven't responded back yet, so he will follow up on those two issues. He added that he also made an offer to all of the Grand Forks Council members whose wards would be impacted by these crossings to attend their ward meetings if they wished.

Johnson stated that, and this is more of an observation than anything, but in regard to the information that was e-mailed earlier today, he finds it very interesting that the lowest ranking potential river crossing also coincides with the quote/unquote I29 Study identified highest interchange need along I-29. He said he finds the two things to be interesting. Haugen responded that he thinks they have been saying all along that there has been a disconnect between interchange and interstate traffic with the river crossings in our travel demand model.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2018**

He commented that in the I-29 Study we specifically added tasks to the consultant to delve into that issue and they found that there was, even at a more refined level, still a disconnect. He added that the exception to this is the Merrifield crossing, which has more connection to I-29 than the other locations have shown in our model in the past, so he thinks this result is kind of reflecting the consistency with those past reviews. Johnson said that he does remember that part of the I-29 Study, but it is still an interesting dynamic that wouldn't ever push or guide you to that decision.

Bourdon reported that there is a public meeting tonight at the Alerus Center, and they will continue to have some back and forth between now and October 5th, and there will be some separate outreach to it together on the main street and safety and some of those projects on ?? just because the draft is only as good as we have the time to incorporate it into ??? He said that another thing they will do, some way or another, is to touch base with Grand Forks folks on those ?? to make sure we are all on the same page.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2018 Annual Work Program Project Update

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

b. UPWP Project Solicitation

Haugen reported that we do have an open solicitation for our next two-year work program so if anyone has any projects they would like considered, please make sure they are eligible before we get too far into the process and then we find out they aren't.

c. T.I.P. Project Solicitation

Haugen reported that we are getting to the point in the year where we will start opening up solicitations for our next T.I.P. cycle, 2020 to 2023.

d. 2045 Land Use Plan Update Discussion

Gengler stated that he would be in touch with Mr. Haugen soon to try to get together to talk about the various options for the 2045 Land Use Plan Update.

e. T.I.P. Amendment

Bergman asked where we are at with the T.I.P. stuff for the Bus Barn project? Haugen responded that we have to amend the Transit Development Plan first, so where are you at with that; Ms. Kouba has been working with you on it. Bergman commented that the project has already started so we better figure out how to do this because if it gets held up, which it is now

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 12th, 2018**

because they are closing out the federal grant website, that could be an ugly business, and it won't be on his side, so he would suggest we get something done with it, and pretty quickly. Haugen stated that he thinks that has been their message since you got the award.

f. MnDOT Autonomous Vehicle Study

Haugen reported that he sent information concerning that MnDOT has a connected vehicle, autonomous vehicle study going on so there is a bunch of different sub-committees. He asked that if you didn't get that e-mail let him know and he will get you connected to that study link.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY GENGLER, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO ADJOURN THE SEPTEMBER 12TH, 2018, TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:56 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager