

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen Chairman, called the October 10th, 2018, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:31 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck (via phone); David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Jesse Kadrmas, NDDOT-Local District; Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Richard Audette, Airport Authority; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Paul Konickson, MnDOT District 2; and Dale Bergman, Area Cities Transit.

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

Guest(s) present were: Jane Williams 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 SEPTEMBER 12TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY GENGLER, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 12TH, 2018 MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

MATTER OF AMENDMENT TO THE TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Kouba reported that we are updating our Transit Development Plan. She explained that back in July 2017 we adopted a five-year Transit Development Plan, however Cities Area Transit recently received a 5339 Competitive Grant which now needs to be amended into the Transit Development Plan, as well as some other projects that are either new or have had some changes made to them, some have been funded and others are candidates for funding.

Haugen commented that this amendment triggers the inclusion of a section outlining how performance-based planning and programming is taking place. He pointed out that attached is a three-page section documenting the Transit Asset Management Performance Measures. He explained that this followed the framework that we have been provided when we were inserting the Safety Performance Measures, TAM is the next performance measure that we have to insert, and then in mid-November we will have to insert the other performance measures as well.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN FINANCIAL CHAPTER, SUBJECT TO PUBLIC INPUT.

Kuharenko asked Mr. Bergman if everything is correct. Bergman responded that from what he saw when he read through it there weren't any changes that he hadn't seen yet. He did add that the TAM plan is not totally complete because there are some more changes coming about from the State, but that will be an ongoing issue.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Lang, Bail, Halford, Brooks, Riesinger, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Christianson.

Haugen commented that as noted on the agenda the actual public hearing will be held at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting next Wednesday at noon.

MATTER OF AMENDMENT TO THE 2019-2022 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that this amendment to the 2019-2022 T.I.P. is related to the previous agenda item; it is incorporating the 5339 Grant awarded to the Cities Area Transit.

Haugen pointed out that there was a blank opening for Project #10 for the year 2019, and this new project is being inserted there and has a total of \$3.6 federal funding going toward the Public Transportation and Maintenance Facility for updates, renovations and expansion to the facility.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

Haugen commented that, again, because this amendment is being done after October 1st, we have to include Transit Asset Management into our T.I.P. document.

Haugen pointed out that, just as the previous agenda item, the public hearing for this amendment will be held at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting next Wednesday at noon.

Bergman asked of the Performance Based Planning is supposed to have MTP in it as well. Haugen responded that this is for the T.I.P. so it is T.I.P. He added that they are very similar but there are some slight differences.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE FY2019 T.I.P., SUBJECT TO PUBLIC INPUT.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Lang, Bail, Halford, Brooks, Riesinger, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Christianson.

MATTER OF CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR FTA 5339 GRANT SOLICITATION

Kouba reported that, as you know we did this earlier in the year, but there was a second round of solicitation for the 5339 Grant in August with a submittal deadline of October 19th to the NDDOT. She stated that applications needed to be in to the MPO by October 3rd and the Cities Area Transit was the only agency to submit an application.

Kouba referred to the staff report and pointed out that it lists the Cities Area Transit 5339 project requests and their priority ranking.

Bergman commented that because of the change, now, with the University we would probably ask the State to consider moving #9 up to #5. He said that they are waiting on the final signed documents from the University for that project. Haugen asked if staff is asking; he knows that there was discussion last week and they were encouraged to have it reprioritized by the City Council. Bergman responded that he visited with their City Administrator and he said he isn't taking it back to the City Council because they would look at the whole document and what you're going after, and that is how he put it, so he is mentioning that now. Haugen asked, then, if Mr. Bergman is asking the MPO to move #9 up to #5. Bergman responded that that is correct.

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE 5339 GRANT APPLICATION REQUEST, SUBJECT TO SHIFTING PRIORITY #9 TO PRIORITY #5, AND SHIFTING THE REST DOWN ONE SPOT EACH.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

Haugen asked if City Staff was going to have communication with City Council on this action so that when it goes to the MPO Executive Policy Board the Council members aren't confused. Bergman responded they would.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Lang, Bail, Halford, Brooks, Riesinger, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Christianson

**MATTER OF PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY
ELEMENT DRAFT PLAN**

Haugen reported that included in the packet is the staff report, as well as some additional information. He added that the project list was e-mailed out a couple of weeks ago for review as well.

Haugen referred to the staff report and noted that, as indicated, we are still trying to make a December 2018 approval deadline, and we need to start the 60-day approval process in October.

Haugen commented that we do have a draft document, and access to it was provided to you on Friday, via e-mail. He explained that this is a technical document and staff is asking for comments from this committee by October 23rd, and once those are incorporated, in order to meet the participation deadline 10-days prior to the first Planning Commission meeting on November 7th in Grand Forks, we would have a cleaned-up draft posted on the website on October 29th. He said, then, that that draft would be the one that would be available during the month of November. He added that they also have presentations scheduled before the NDDOT Upper Management in mid-November; and before MnDOT in mid-November, and then we will make adjustments to the draft as needed prior, again, to a 10-day review period before the December Planning Commission meeting.

Haugen stated that we are seeking preliminary approval; and added that it is a draft that is subject to change and not etched in stone.

Haugen commented that since there are some projects that aren't listed in the LRSP exclusive, they included the HSIP in the packet that went out last Friday. He added that as this is our first real integration of the Safety Planning documents into the Metropolitan Planning Documents there are some mixed matches going on. He said that there are still on the North Dakota side, during the short-term a list of projects that are still identified in those documents that essentially fulfill the funding forecast that we have for this program; beyond that short-term there are really no projects left in the safety plans, but there are projects and they have been asking and having discussions for the last couple of months of projects that we have identified from corridor studies or other studies that have a strong safety component to them to see if those should be shifted over, but they didn't receive and feedback on that so he identified a couple of projects just to sort of plant a seed, but the big thing they note is that the Local Road Safety Program needs to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

updated. He added that he knows that both States are updating their Street and Highway Safety Plan and Polk County is currently updating their County Safety Plan, and that will help feed, then, the rest of the outer years of the document, and give us an opportunity to revisit some of the projects in the short-term.

Haugen stated that on the Minnesota side there is a greater discrepancy, there are a lot of project identified with costs attached, but there isn't any revenue forecasted for those projects.

Haugen reported that really the timeframes that are identified here are because these are, again, district plans or county plans, and they are shorter-range documents and don't go out twenty-plus years so they are all identified in the short-range; and then East Grand Forks has a couple of projects that are in the possible long-range timeframe, they are roundabouts that are eligible as HSIP funded projects, so again, just as we were commenting about North Dakota, we need to work to develop this integration of these safety plans into the MPO Planning Process.

Haugen stated that, lastly, just highlighting where the plan is at with the financial constraint issue, and how the projects shake out. He referred to a slide, which we have seen before, and explained that it shows that over the course of the time horizon our purchasing power erodes because project expenditures are rising faster than revenue is rising. He added that one thing to note is that we are forecasting more revenue than we did in the 2040 plan, but as we go out to the outer years that gap still gets larger; and this is particularly true for the City of East Grand Forks, they significantly increased the revenue coming into the City, and that has helped quite a bit on the cost erosion factor, but from a Metropolitan Plan point of view it is still a large gap.

Haugen continued with the slide presentation, noting that many of them we've seen before. He referred to new slides and pointed out that they try to graphically show the project lists. He explained that the first graphic shows the Interstate State of Good Repair. He stated that all of the projects that the State identified for the Interstate System were funded with the exception of a stretch of I-29 to the north. He explained that that stretch of I-29 is having a mid-term project done on it, but then it's the last project in the Year 2045, which is tiny bit on our fiscal constraint edge, so we couldn't fiscally constrain it in with other project on the regional system so we decided that 2045 was enough to move it out and still be fiscally constrained with all the other projects.

Haugen said that the same thing happened on the principle arterials for the rest of the NHS system; the red lines here, all of those projects are being recommended. He stated that there are a couple on 32nd Avenue, that again the State identified in the Year 2045; in the mid-term 32nd Avenue is programmed for reconstruction, so the 2045 project was a follow-up concrete panel repair type and it was right at 2045 as the year it was identified, so again for fiscal constraint by pushing those out beyond the planning horizon, these two segments, we were able to fund all the rest of the projects that were identified for the NHS system.

Haugen reported that they then went to the Minor Arterial system, and many of them are identified with the remaining funds, after the Interstate and NHS system are programmed, and you can see that those are highlighted in yellow. Grasser asked what the funds that are identified

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

there are available. Haugen responded that the red are all federally funded projects; the yellow are a mixture of some federal funds, but mostly local funds. Grasser commented that, again, they went through, back in May the City of Grand Forks sent a list to the MPO on what they thought the federal dollars should be focused on, which was basically the NHS system streets, and their estimates were that they would probably be expending all of the available federal dollars basically on those NHS system streets, plus the Point Bridge and couple of those critical features like that, and so, even though we have exchanged a couple of e-mails, he is still unclear really on how many federal dollars are left. He stated that, again, the MPO produced a new list of streets and from what he gathered it appeared that the latest list shows about \$14 million dollars of federal dollars and \$28 million in local dollars and he isn't sure what that list is incorporated that way. He said that he thinks the list they had, and what he thinks we should be doing and is requesting that we do is have our list, that basically incorporates only federal dollars, and not try to have the MPO account for all of the local dollars.

Haugen reported that the list identifies projects; the total percent of federal participation in the list of projects is not 80%, it is at 74%, so all of these projects have a federal aid component to them. He said that the total local dollars available, those that we identified in the short-term, so they applied the match to the federal, plus then you identified last month that there were additional local costs to add to the project, so they account for those as well. He added that to show fiscal constraint they have to show the match plus the additional local costs, and then there are remaining dollars left.

Grasser commented that they talked about the; again, it depends how you do your cost estimating, but the normal federal participation is 80/20, and you said the more anticipated local representation will probably be more like a 70/30 or sometimes even a 60/40; he isn't sure how that argument balances against \$14 million in federal dollars against \$28 million in local dollars on that short-term list. Haugen responded that there is still a bulk of those local dollars not assigned to a project on that list. Grasser said that he thinks that goes to the point that that list should only represent those federal dollars that we will be matching and moving forward, he doesn't believe that they should have the MPO trying to allocate their local dollars to projects that the MPO is creating, they are creating projects and techniques out of that. Haugen responded that every project on that list has a federal component being assigned to it, there are no 100% locally funded projects on that list, to his knowledge.

Grasser asked if the projects are all basically 80/20. Haugen responded that they are about 74% of the year of expenditure cost, and then there is another column of added City costs that are all 100%. Williams asked if that includes the projects shown in yellow. Haugen responded that some of the yellow projects are from the federal aid project list. Kuharenko commented that some of that, too, looks like it is 100% local, kind of like the 32nd Avenue project. Haugen responded that that is correct. Kuharenko stated that that is just as a point of clarification. Haugen explained that when we had our late July meeting, the City staff said that they would leave it up to the MPO to shake out how to fit a square peg into a round hole; and the remaining dollars they took what was left and they used the prioritization tool and those are the minor arterials that rose to the top and are shown as the projects.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

Grasser said that he thinks that what they are struggling with is that the result of all that came back as a project list and he doesn't know that this group has ever had a philosophical discussion about what happens to the local dollars. He explained that they have a City Council, they have a budget, and they have a six-year CIP, and they allocate all of their dollars within various categories of work and there are certain dollars that go towards matching federal funds and some that go towards 100% local costs; and that has to meet the needs of the local streets as well as the collector and minor arterial streets, again, essentially they viewed that they were out of money by the time we got done with their NHS system and their original list.

Kuharenko distributed copies of the original list of projects that the City of Grand Forks submitted to the MPO.

Grasser said that he is struggling with how do we rectify how we set up budgets and represent how we are going to move forward with their City Council; with the MPO list that is now reallocating dollars in other streets and in other manners that they haven't yet talked about with their City Council. Haugen commented that the list that the City submitted for federal aid, it appears was shorting you on the short range federal aid bill; and he isn't sure why or what the difference is, but it appeared from their analysis that there were not enough projects taking care of the federal aid revenue to the urban system, and so that is where the additional projects moved in because there were no other projects identified and we went to the prioritization tool and tried to fit the projects into that fiscal constraint.

Kuharenko asked, if there weren't enough projects available in the short-term, and they had a project in there, that was Columbia from 8th to Gateway Drive, that got moved from the short-term to the mid-term on your list but you just said that there weren't enough projects in the short-term. Haugen responded that that is correct and added that he explained why that was shifted; the first thing they did was to coincide with the Point Bridge, they moved the Point Bridge up from your list of mid-term into the short-term and moved the project that was the next one up on the list to the mid-term, and then after they made that change they discovered the federal availability of fund remaining so they didn't go back and shift that project back up they instead just filled in the short-term gap that they saw. Kuharenko asked what the short-term time-band years covered were. Haugen responded that it covers 2023 to 2027. He added that there were a couple of projects that were in the T.I.P. that weren't in there. Kuharenko agreed that they had the North Columbia, 8th to Gateway, project in 2027 and the Point Bridge in 2028, so you moved the 2028 up to 2027. Haugen responded that they did switch those two projects around, one from mid-term to short-term and one from short-term to mid-term. Kuharenko said, though that based on what you are saying there wasn't a need to do that because of the available funds. Haugen responded that afterwards, yes, there wasn't a need to do that and he mentioned that in his response yesterday morning to you that we can shift that North Columbia project back up, and then you will create a funding gap in the mid-term so we have to fill projects in the mid-term, and we would just be shifting the ones from the short-range to the mid-term to another slot back; so the first iteration is.

Grasser asked how big of a boundary is that between the time lines; he believes those timelines, short, mid and long term are meant to be guidance so we can generally characterize that; he

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

doesn't know that there is a brick wall, is there, that prevents you from having that money that may migrate between say the short-term and the mid-term. Haugen responded that there is a fiscal constraint brick wall with each time-band otherwise we would load all of our stuff up in the front of each.

Grasser commented that he doesn't think that that is a proper characterization of the way we would handle that. He said that he guesses what we are talking about is if we have one project that may bleed a million or so between one program or another, is that a reason to totally take a project out of one band to another. He added that maybe he might be asking Mr. Johnson that question; that those mid-term may be that part of a boundary that we can't deal with that flexibility. Johnson responded that he has been following along here, but it cuts in and out sometimes so could Mr. Grasser please repeat the question.

Grasser said that the question is; the argument he thinks is there is a shifting of projects because one can't be fully contained within one time-band versus the other, short-term versus mid-term, and is that boundary between, in this case mid-term, short-term such a brick wall that a project can't migrate between those two bands. Johnson responded that, well it is a brick wall he thinks in terms of what Mr. Haugen is referring to for fiscal constraint analysis, and trying to determine how much money you are getting for these five years to these next ten years to these ten years or whatever it may be, you have to have some sort of limiting boundary so that you can get through the top list and go through the analysis. He said that as the plan gets developed, and as the plan goes forward then it becomes a discussion of, maybe we need to do an amendment to move some things around; priorities change, ideas shift, and maybe money becomes available; but he wouldn't say a brick wall is the appropriate term, but there is a line in order to note that, well typically the amount of funding based on the information that they have written out today that we think we will have available in this time-band, these are the prioritized projects within that time-band, if something doesn't fit then it gets moved to the next time-band, the other option is if you don't want to look at that, and it is primarily a local decision, then you keep it in that short time-band but it is an illustrative unfunded project.

Grasser commented that even if that action has us come up short, then, in the mid-term because the project is showing up in the short-term. He explained that if they were going to do a project in the year 2027, which is the end of the short-term time-band, if we put it in as an illustrative, and expect to spend the money, that's going to, then, goof up our mid-term because we would be taking it out of the mid-term and putting it into a short-term illustrative project. Johnson responded that that is potentially true, but it would depend on what money are you using to fund it; if it is a priority change and you wanted to fund it with known and expected dollars, then yes it would mess up even the priority of your short-term and the early end of your mid-term; the other case it could be is you get a non-expected funding source like a grant award that comes out of nowhere and isn't part of your fiscal constraint then it wouldn't necessarily affect that.

Grasser said, then, that conversely if we wanted to take that short-term and put it in the mid-term, but wanted to do it right away in the mid-term can we have leftover dollars in the short-term to make sure we cover it right away in the mid-term. Johnson responded that that would be a local decision, there is no oversight guidance that you have to do this or you have to do that, it would

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

really be a preference on how the local jurisdiction is working with the MPO to determine your fiscal constraint analysis.

Grasser stated that what he is hearing on the list is that we need to do it that way. He added that it feels like; what he thinks he is hearing is that we have a certain amount of flexibility to do certain projects within a time-band, but then after that we have to find projects that fit the cash flow instead of what they think is the fiscal and local community need and desire. He said that he might be misinterpreting that but he thinks that that is the end result; if we have a five-year time-band and we have to try to line up our dollars perfectly at the beginning and the end we are going to be pretty restricted as to what kind of projects we can do. Johnson responded that that, in general terms, that is the essence of planning and fiscal constraint, it goes through all those analyses to discern how much money we have available based on trends and projected future revenue, and that that is what we can afford to spend and plan for.

Kuharenko said, let me ask you this question; and given the list that the City had provided initially; Mr. Haugen ended up mentioning that we are short on projects, essentially; are there any issues with kind of leaving money on the table, in the plan. Johnson responded there wasn't. He added that you can show that you have more revenue than projects in a time-band, again that is a local decision, and he knows that the Bismarck MPO has done that in the past, although he doesn't remember what the reasoning behind it was, but that is what they did. Grasser asked how does that local decision reflect in the MPO Long Range Transportation Plan, when we are doing project lists. He said that he is trying to figure out; if we go back to our original discussion Mr. Haugen said we had left over money so he is proposing filling in projects that take that money towards projects, and which dislocates a project that they had been planning on doing, maybe a couple; and how does that local decision then enter into the Long Range Transportation Plan when they are doing lists of projects; you said it is a local decision but how do we reflect that in the Long Range Transportation Plan, do we simply locate projects. Johnson responded that what he said was that it is a local decision working through the MPO; the MPO takes the lead and develops a plan but it is a plan of its jurisdictions from a transportation perspective, including all elements, so through that process, working through revenue and providing projects.

Haugen commented that he has already stated that they can move that project back into the short-term and then we would be moving projects out of the short-range to the mid-term. Grasser stated that he is still struggling with \$14 million dollars in federal dollars and \$28 million dollars of local dollars, it seems like we are capturing local dollars into that timeframe that the City has represented to its citizens some of these dollar resources that we have available, they have to serve 100+ miles of local streets plus our classified, so we have to make sure there is enough dollars in there to cover things just on the classified street system, and that is why when representing that and we know we are short of money, we did that list of projects, with 150 projects, and we said that if we have federal money we would do reconstruction but if we have local we can't afford to do a reconstruction so we would have to do maintenance activities, so the way the MPO is generating a list that calls for reconstruction, he doesn't know how we can afford those; again it isn't clear to him how the fiscal constraint works and the concern is that we are capturing local dollars that need to be applied and controlled locally under the MPO's umbrella, that is really what the crux of this is. Haugen said, then, that you have moved off of

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

the federal aid list to the rest of the federal aid projects and which ones they've prioritized through the prioritization tool we would show on the list of projects that are 100% local funded.

Grasser asked if Mr. Haugen was asking a question or making a statement, he asked for clarification. Haugen responded that they provided two spreadsheets; the first one was the one federal aid, and for the federal aid they accounted for the federal revenue coming in, and all of the City match available to the short-term, mid-term, and long-term bands; and then they costed out what those federal aid projects were, plus the additional City costs, to say that we have this much federal funds, we are giving right around 73% to 74% match to the year of expenditure costs, and we still have all these City, and we aren't going to get a perfect 80/20 or 70/30 split with a five-year band so we came up with 73; and that left about \$15 to \$16 million dollars in the short-term of revenue available that was 100% City Sales Tax dollars, and we still have to show that our federal aid system is being maintained, and we had a list of projects from the tool that were prioritized, so we used that list to show the projects that fit the fiscal constraint available in these time-bands.

Grasser said that he thinks that the issue is; you're going through a detailed explanation of how you arrived at what you did, but the issue is that they submitted their list based on the understanding or the philosophy of what was going on back in May; then three weeks ago they basically get a new list generated from the MPO without their understanding of how it arrived and they tried to get some clarification; quite frankly he still isn't clear, you're talking 74% but he is still, the bottom line on your spreadsheet had \$14 million dollars in federal money and \$28 million dollars in City money; he can get to about a 70/30, but its 70 local and 30 federal, so he is still confused as to how we have that extra money available because he doesn't believe they have the federal dollars; and that is what he would like to see a more detailed layout, where are the federal dollars when you can match those with local dollars, but if there are other project that are basically 100% local then those should be on a different list, and his preference is that they shouldn't be on an MPO list at all; they have explained in a memo how they go through their decision making in finding local projects. He stated that, again, the problem is that they have many many more needs than they have dollars so they have to be flexible as to how they react to those; Washington Street is a good example, this spring no one predicted that it was going to fall apart the way it did in that short of time-band, and kudos to the State in moving that up, but it is an example and they have other streets like that and they will have even more streets like that next spring, unfortunately he can't tell which ones they will be, but he knows there will be some, so, again, they have to be able to react to that at a local level and make those local decisions and those pots of dollars have to be left to the local to decide how they should be used. Haugen responded that that is why there were two spreadsheets; one showing projects with federal aid and the other spreadsheet was showing what is left, and these are projects that came out of our prioritization tool.

Grasser stated that he is going to apologize; we will just simply stop this conversation because nobody knows what we are really talking about, they don't have most of it, but again you are submitting projects we haven't going through, philosophically, and in more detail where the dollars; again, he hears what you are saying but he still goes back to the spreadsheet that says we have \$14 million dollars of federal money available, we've got \$28 million dollars of local

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

money applied to it; he can't rectify that in his mind how that is a federal aid, federally funded project at 74% federal dollars. Haugen responded that it is because there is unassigned, left-over \$15 to \$16 million dollars out of that \$28 million that isn't listed on any of the projects in the spreadsheet, that is why there was a second spreadsheet to show how that \$15 to \$16 million could be prioritized for projects to use.

Grasser said, then, that the question is, with City staff not understanding or being able to validated exactly what is going on here, he doesn't know how we move a document forward that has the questions that he still has in his head; he can't validate, from his position the City Engineer, that the plan that the MPO is producing is basically going to fit into, at least from a philosophical mode, that the City Council has gone with their six-year CIP Plan. He said that there are dollars that have to go towards expansion, there are dollars that are going to have to go towards local projects, not all of those dollars, and he isn't sure if you did this, but his concern is that they can't allocate an undue amount of dollars only to the federal aid system, and only towards reconstruction, when he is short of dollars and he can do a mill and overlay project at 1/7th or 1/8th of 1/10th of the cost of reconstruction, we aren't going to be able to do reconstruction, and that is what they reflected back, and that is now shown in the illustrative list, that they have been doing locally with the maintenance, if they have federal dollars they will do reconstruction, but if the federal dollars aren't there we shouldn't be mixing that argument in that they become reconstruction, it isn't capturing the argument correctly. He said that he is afraid that that is what he is seeing in the lists, and really preceding the lists there should have been probably a more detailed philosophical discussion about how we capture those local dollars into that, and how do we do it consistently throughout all the jurisdictions. He added that, quite frankly he would still be more comfortable, as this is going to move through the system, and he thinks that in your document you have the MPO list, and quite frankly he would rather, if it has to be changed it has to be changed, but he would rather start with the base document using the original list that the City of Grand Forks submitted, and he thinks that is a better basis in which to move ahead, he would rather understand and document why we are changing that as opposed to us arguing why the MPO needs to change their plan back towards ours, so he would ask that that be considered, as a starting point for us to have the ability, because, again the philosophy that they put into that document he thinks we can support and move forward and keep this document moving forward otherwise he doesn't know if; in his mind he can't say that the document can move forward in its current form.

Haugen said that that is an option that is certainly available to this discussion; another one is that the Technical Advisory Committee is making a recommendation and we have seven days to meet and work out and identify that federal aid list and give you the opportunity to understand what is all behind it. Grasser stated that he would rather have that meeting from a basis that we are starting out with their list and then we can see what needs to change, and how much money may be left over in the time-bands and have some of those discussion, he would be more comfortable doing that than moving the document forward because, he has to be honest, that as a staff they have been simply overwhelmed lately as they have lost some key people and they are simply overwhelmed with being able to respond to project lists from the Urban Program, HSIP, and others, and he isn't sure that they are necessarily against all of them, they just don't always understand them and they aren't able to react, so hopefully they have some of that understanding,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

but in the end we have a document that we are trying to move forward. Haugen commented that if they use the City's original list we would have a mis-match of the Point Bridge, so it would seem silly for them to produce a document that shows Minnesota funding the Point Bridge in the short-term and North Dakota funding it in the mid-term, so that is one small problem. Grasser said that he thinks that can be corrected, but now that we have a better understanding of the constraints and rules that are going into these lists that we maybe didn't understand earlier, he thinks we may be able to do some other shifting within our other projects and that we can deal with it but in a manner that is probably more consistent with their original list.

Grasser stated that they are certainly going to do the Point Bridge and coordinate it with Minnesota, that is going to happen, it is a matter of how, then, we shuffle projects to meet the financial rules as we think we understand them today.

Haugen commented that the second thing that will happen is if you move that North Columbia project up to the short-term range, you have now created an unallocated funding revenue in the mid-term on the North Dakota side Urban Road Program. Williams said, though, that that is allowed, correct. Kuharenko said that that is something he asked Mr. Johnson earlier so that isn't necessarily an issue.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY GIVE PRELIMINARY APPROVAL TO THE DRAFT 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT PLAN, SUBJECT TO MODIFYING THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS' URBAN ROAD FUND ALLOCATION BACK TO THE CITY'S ORIGINAL PROPOSAL, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF MOVING THE POINT BRIDGE PROJECT IN LINE WITH MINNESOTA'S PROJECT TIMELINE.

Haugen stated that as we move the Point Bridge again a project has move out, there will be some rescoping of the project that needs to be done on the short-list. Kuharenko responded that there wouldn't be if we go back to what they originally sent over because you ended up having those six or seven projects, which was equivalent to that Columbia Road project, so there will likely be unallocated funding in the mid-term; which may be something that will be up for discussion.

Bergman asked how this relates back to the sales tax funds that they are going to use for roads, because that is the question that if you turn around and do projects that are outside the scope that you told the public you were going to use it for; he would hate to be on the short end of that stick because somebody will probably club you; the citizens won't go for it; that is what he is curious about.

Grasser commented that that, philosophically that is kind of where they are leading to with this thing, that they have to make sure that they haven't tied too many of their local sales tax and other dollars into these specific projects that leave other projects unaddressed, because Mr. Bergman is right; and that is his big concern too because they made a lot of representations with the sales tax as far as being able to get to various roads and to the local roads and they need to make sure that they don't create a document that conflicts with that. He said that he agrees

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

100% with Mr. Bergman that that is part of the issue, that the local has to stay as a local allocation because they made a lot of representations to the voters and to the City Council, so we need to make sure that those things are not in conflict with each other. Kuharenko said that that is one of the reasons that he was asking whether or not we should end up just removing that list of projects that are local funding only, just because of that concept. Haugen stated, though, that in order for the federal funds to flow we still need to show that the federal aid system is being maintained, so in order to get the federal funds we spend them on projects and then some federal aid systems won't be maintained; the feds want to see that their investment is being maintained, so that is where some of those local dollars get rolled in to making sure that the rest of the federal aid can still come in because we are maintaining the federal aid system.

Williams asked what would happen if we didn't have the sales tax, and there weren't any dollars there. Haugen responded that there would be a lot more projects off the list. Bergman commented that that was what he was thinking, because the citizens voted for the sales tax to do their roads, they didn't say you could take those funds and use them on rebuilding an overpass or anything like that, they want their roads fixed, and they don't care what the federal dollar portion of it is, that's what he is getting at, you can't be making a list guaranteeing that we are going to take "x" amount of dollars off of the sales tax because he thinks you are going to have a real problem with the citizens. Haugen responded that there is a significant part of that sales tax set aside for operation and maintenance. Bergman asked what is the operations and maintenance though, they had it before in their plans. Haugen stated that it is significantly increased now with the sales tax. Grasser said, though, that again, philosophically, if he understands what you're telling him, if we are going to get federal dollars we have to first prioritize all of our local resources towards that pivotal system after you spend nothing of the local system, is that what Federal Highway is telling us. Haugen responded that that isn't what they are telling us because some of your federal aid system is in that State of Good Repair already, it doesn't need investments, so there are still local dollars available to invest in the local system. Grasser stated that he isn't sure there are very many left with, and we haven't really talked about the second list, but there is one list that addresses what they think should be federal eligible projects and there is another list that the MPO has identified to get to all those projects in yellow on the map; and again those are reconstruction activities which, again, they haven't had a chance to go through, nor will he have a chance to go through it and agree on what what the other allocations are going to be, but, again they can't be in a position where all of those dollars end up on just those few streets.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Emery, Gengler, Audette, Kuharenko, Konickson, Ellis and Bergman.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: Johnson.

Absent: Lang, Bail, Halford, Brooks, Riesinger, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Christianson

Grasser said that he thinks that with this there was reference to that other list of local dollars; again, without going through it all again, he is uncomfortable with that list representing more resources; than what would be left to address the rest of their system. He stated that his

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

preference, quite frankly on that one is to delete that list at this point in time and rebuild it as opposed to trying to modify it as it sits, and then at our upcoming meeting we can talk about how they are going to do that, and, again, he would rather build that list from the ground up as opposed to debating which ones; there are some processes that are represented in that list.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE REMOVING THE SECOND LIST FOR REBUILDING PURPOSE,. AND DISCUSSION IN THE FUTURE.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Emery, Gengler, Audette, Kuharenko, Konickson, Ellis and Bergman.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: Johnson.

Absent: Lang, Bail, Halford, Brooks, Riesinger, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Christianson

Johnson commented that he apologizes because he usually participates in these over the phone because he isn't able to get there all the time, and he doesn't necessarily catch all the comments and all the questions, but he has been involved in enough of these to know that all of this stuff with funding and projects and what is going to go where has come up several times at these meetings and there seems to be a common comment and discussion on; well we're not sure if we've really dug into that enough or whether or not everything is clear or everything is understood, his concern is that we've gotten to the very end of this, and there is a reason he abstained from both of those votes, is because he doesn't think that we're done here. He said that the bottom line is that if the MPO doesn't get this plan approved in January your TIPs are frozen and no projects are getting done, whether its transit or roadway, so, welding whatever oversight privileges he does have from afar, you guys need to get in the same room and figure this out; having these conversations at the Technical Advisory Committee meetings now is too much information to go over and it sounds like its too late and there needs to be some sort of effort from all parties to make sure that this gets ironed out; he has heard the same thing over and over again, and we're not getting anywhere. He stated that he is being very direct, and probably a little harsh here, and he doesn't know if there is hope here, but we need to get moving.

Grasser stated that he thinks from the City's side they agree, and not to point fingers everywhere around, but we tend to get to this eleventh hour thing, he thinks we had it with the last Long Range Transportation Plan also; and we need to figure out a plan that does not leave some of these things until the end. He said that, again, from their standpoint they find themselves pretty much overwhelmed delivering projects and bids and things like that, which shouldn't be the best excuse, but it is the reality of where they are at, so they are having an awful time reacting at this hour, but they are certainly willing to meet and get through it and try to understand what it is. Haugen agreed that it is likewise for the MPO.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2018 Annual Work Program Project Update

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

Haugen stated that you did have a request, originally we wanted to have your next two year work program to the MPO by the end of September, now after today's meeting if you can get in a request to us we can get the next two year work program out. He added that that also has another deadline that if we don't get our draft document to our State and Federal partners it starts to stop the flow of federal funds, so we have a request out for those next two years of some project ideas, and we need them documented and showing how our work program is fiscally constrained as well.

Bergman commented that transit already said that they needed that one study moved up, do you need an actual written document stating that. Haugen responded that it does need to go to your council and show that there is a full political support behind doing that study, and that the local match is being provided.

Haugen suggested that Mr. Gengler and Mr. Grasser may also have some projects that they would like to see included, and the council would probably rather see one staff report with all three departments' requests instead of three separate ones so you might want to get together to discuss this.

b. Solicitation Of Transportation Alternative Projects For Both States And SR2S In Minnesota

Haugen reported both States have their "TAP" program solicitations out. He added that each State has a slightly different process, and slightly different timeline, and a slightly different year of funding availability. He said that the major change that he is aware of is that North Dakota has two years being solicited for for the first time ever, normally it is one year at a time, so that is the major change on the North Dakota side for the TAP program.

Haugen commented that Minnesota does have a State funded Safe Routes To School program outside of the TAP funding, and that is also open for applications.

c. Railroad Crossing Solicitation

Haugen stated that since the agenda went out the Railroad Crossing on the North Dakota side solicitation has taken place.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 10th, 2018**

d. Urban Grant Program

Haugen reported that just yesterday we received access to a website for the Urban Grant Program. He asked Mr. Johnson is that means it is now open for solicitation. Johnson responded that it is open for solicitation.

Bergman asked if this was FTA funds. Haugen responded that the Urban Grant is the “Main Street” program.

Haugen said that they are still waiting for the regular Urban and Regional Roads solicitation. Johnson responded that he believes those will be out either later this week or early next week.

e. CAV Workshop

Haugen commented that we notified you via e-mail of an October 22nd opportunity here in East Grand Forks on Minnesota’s Connected and Automated Vehicle study that is taking place. He stated that there is an RSVP link that you can register individually for, and if you are able to attend it will be in the Training Conference Room at 5:00 p.m.

f. Electric ?? Corridor Nominations

Haugen stated that there was also an e-mail sent out for Electric Charging Stations or Alternative Fuel stations) Corridor Nominations, so look at your e-mails to find out more about getting a corridor designated for electric vehicles or other alternative fuels..

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY KKHARENKO, TO ADJOURN THE
OCTOBER 10TH, 2018, TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:40 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager