

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen Chairman, called the November 14th, 2018, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:36 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck (via phone); Allen Grasser (Proxy for David Kuharenko), Grand Forks Engineering; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Jesse Kadrmas, NDDOT-Local District; Ryan Riesinger, Airport Authority; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; and Dale Bergman, Area Cities Transit.

Absent were: Darren Laesch, Richard Audette, Dustin Lang, Ryan Brooks, Steve Emery, Brad Bail, Nick West, Lane Magnuson, Ali Rood, Stacey Hanson, Jane Williams, David Kuharenko, Mike Yavarow, Lars Christianson, and Rich Sanders.

Guest(s) present were: Bobbi Retzlaff, MnDOT; Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning; Brandon Bourdon, Kimely-Horn; and Scott Mereck, WSB.

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

SUSPEND AGENDA

Haugen stated that Mr. Bergman is on his way, however until he reports present we do not have a quorum, thus he would like to suspend the agenda in order to discuss those agenda items that do not need action.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON MN220 NORTH CORRIDOR STUDY

Viafara referred to the staff report included in the packet and pointed out that it indicates that the purpose of this presentation is to provide information on the Steering Committee and how it was formed. He stated that these members of the community and businesses on the corridor have indicated their desire to participate as members of the Steering Committee. He added that the committee will be meeting at 4:30 p.m. tomorrow in this room to present a presentation from the consultant to discuss the existing and future conditions of the corridor.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

Viafara commented that we know about the boundaries and the extent of the corridor, including the nine intersections that make up the entire corridor. He said that items that the consultant has been discussing and reviewing are venues, because most of the new development patterns are kind of gearing towards north of 23rd, or at least in this particular quadrant of the City. He added that they like to understand more about the roadway conditions, each of the crossings with traffic lights, with access to the service roads, and then an analysis of the configuration of the infrastructure, how is the pavement and all of the indicators of the quality of the infrastructure.

Viafara stated that if we notice roadway access is something very important because in this particular corridor, based on the comments by the consultant, roadway access is kind of irregular in the sense that the access points are not really regular, so that is something that we sense some kind of a challenge in terms of land use and also in terms of access to the service roads and also to the neighboring or abutting communities.

Viafara said that one thing with the assessment, it is important for us, a number of intersections are completely uncontrolled; we have a couple of the schools related land uses and from a safety point of view, and also considering the high volume of heavy trucks; we have recently the City of East Grand Forks built a multi-use path around one of the medians on the north side of Center Avenue.

Viafara commented that the last point that the consultant are studying is the forecasted traffic demand. He said that this is important because as values and volumes increases and new households and new businesses and new activities are being now fostered around these particular areas the consultant has made available a tech memo that in case.

Viafara stated that the overall background and objectives of the study are the ones that review the land uses; and particularly mobility, access and safety. He said that there is the need to evaluate the corridor, review the kind of geometrics of the roadway on 20th Street and north of 17th Street; and also consideration to see what exactly what kind of treatment will be given to Central once it crosses north over 23rd Avenue to reduce the number of lanes.

Viafara said that one of the other objectives is access and the last is the treatment of multimodal pedestrian activity, safety or related to that.

Viafara reported that at the end, what the MPO and the City of East Grand Forks and MnDOT expect to have is a report that will address a number of infrastructure recommendations, what kind of improvements, the cost of those improvements if they were to be advanced with the demands, and kind of an implementation and programming for that particular kind of recommendations.

Viafara stated that these are some of the issues that they have been discussing; the presence of heavy trucks, particularly during the harvest season. He said that if we take into account now the numbers are in the percentage of 8%, so in theory when we do kind of forecast in theory, it is becoming closer to the outer limit because when we compare the capacity and volume then the issue of public streets and private access, what kind of volumes are we expecting in terms of

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

levels of congestion and a number of intersections, 17th is one of them, US #2 is another; so what kind of deficiency, most of the deficiencies appear to be located around the intersection of US #2, that's where we find a number of accidents and more congestion.

Viafara said that another analysis is the type of safety in terms of the analysis of the numbers, the type and seriousness of the number of crashes and traffic accidents that appear in these intersections.

Viafara commented that, important for us, as you can see these are the parcels where most of the plan, we may call them sub-areas, that is where future development will most likely take place around the corridor, so the corridor has quite an impact on access to this space. He added that they will also look at lane reductions north of 23rd and frontage road access.

Viafara stated that there is something that sometimes can escape, but is also the locations, has been an analysis of the locations of some of the bus stops; because some of those are on the road, and impede movement.

Viafara reported that this is basically what the consultant will be discussing tomorrow, and most likely then we may have some kind of public outreach through the Herald tomorrow inviting people to attend public meetings that are scheduled for the month of December.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON US 2/US 81 SKEWED INTERSECTION STUDY

Haugen commented that this item is for discussion/information purposes. He said that they did do the RFP for the U.S. #2/U.S. #81 Skewed Intersection Study and Ms. Kouba will give us an update.

Kouba reported that they put this RFP out towards the end of September and received the proposals in October. She stated that they received two proposals and held interviews on November 1st. She said that the Selection Committee did select KLJ to do the study.

Kouba explained that KLJ introduced a lot of smaller scaled options in addition to the larger, move the entire road kind of options. She said that they seemed to want to be able to give us a scalable idea of alternatives throughout the whole corridor, and they stuck pretty much to the tasks we requested, although they did introduce a couple of options that the Steering Committee just wasn't interested in, but we are going with what we requested through the RFP.

Haugen pointed out that included in the packet was the detailed Scope of Work with the timeline and the hours. He added that this will be going forward to the MPO Executive Policy Board for execution of a contract with KLJ.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

Grasser commented that he likes the idea that we are looking at a host of alternatives instead of just going with the Grand Slam one that has a low probability of happening, so he is glad to see that.

Information only.

Bergman reported present.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared that with Mr. Bergman reporting present we now have a quorum.

RESUME AGENDA

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 10TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 10TH,
2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2019-2020 UPWP

Haugen reported that this is our next two-year work program, so we aren't finishing up the last year of our last two-year work program, we are starting with a new two-year work program.

Haugen referred to the packet and pointed out that a complete draft was included for your review. He said that he will kind of go in reverse order and begin with the identified funding availability by year.

Haugen commented that generally we are getting about half a million dollars in appropriations each year of our targeted funding grant, which is made up of federal funds that come from both the Minnesota side and the North Dakota side. He added that we typically also have some carry over from the previous year; just with the last two studies we just talked about, we just started them this year, we will finish them next year, so the previous year's consolidated planning grant funds are going toward those projects primarily. He said that we do also get a small amount of regular Minnesota State monies that is used to match the federal funds we receive, and then for the Mn220 North Study, MnDOT has agreed to provide local match towards that effort and on the US #2/US #81 Intersection study NDDOT is offering some local match funds as well; so that would be our 2019 revenue.

Haugen pointed out that for 2020 we do not show previous year carry-over, but we do show that half a million in funds; and then since we are not formally asked for or reached an agreement

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

with either state for special studies to help with local match we don't have those additional local match options coming in as well.

Haugen reported that with that funding we do have categories of regular required MPO work activities that we have to do on an annual basis; including program administration which keeps the office open and the lights on, getting our work program and finances managed, etc; and then we also do our program support where we have our coordination activities taking place; public participation, education and training, and some of our equipment. He stated that when we get into individual studies, that is the largest part of our budget, and in 2019 we are basically finishing up on our 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan, and there are some performance targets that we will have to visit; and in 2019 Safety is the primary one, so we did set aside some dollars, but again not as heavy as we have been in the last several years in making sure our transportation plan is updated because after this year we should have an up-to-date transportation plan.

Haugen stated that more funds were available this year to look at corridor studies; we've already had a couple start and they are underway; the downtown parking plan is a carry-over; US 2 US 81 and the Mn 220 North Corridor ones are carryover studies. He added that we do have the ATAC Traffic Counting Program where we are looking at our video systems and then counting traffic, so this category is maintaining the cost of those performance items.

Haugen commented that the one new item that we are identifying to start in 2019 is the Downtown Transportation Plan. He said that they have had a lot of discussion on this as we went through the RFP, and it ended up being the Parking Plan last year. He stated that they are being asked to take a look at the issues along DeMers Avenue through both Grand Forks and also in East Grand Forks as MnDOT has done, as part of last year's work, a mobility study statewide and this segment of DeMers Avenue was one of the locations in Northwest Minnesota that they have identified as having mobility issues; and that brought it into a position where they have some special funding that could come up with solutions. He said that there is a pot of money that we could quickly get some program taking place in the area of the Minnesota Side of East Grand Forks, and so the work program is essentially setting aside the information that we are going to work on the transportation issue between the downtowns, we've set aside a budget and the details of what the actual RFP will be and all the other things involved with this study will be worked out as we go through the RFP process, so they are setting the budget amount and will iron out the scope of work for the project through the RFP process.

Grasser asked, you said that a request was made to do this plan, who made that request. Haugen responded that the Grand Forks City's Administration Office, and then MnDOT on the Minnesota side. Grasser asked if he could get that correspondence sent to him. Grasser stated that he knows that there were quite a few e-mails going back and forth, looking at trying to get the downtown thing going, and there were a lot of open-ended questions like what you are talking about, kind of the same ones we've had since the original scope of work was done six or eight months ago, and he thinks with those open-ended questions; he knows that that hadn't gone on to the City Council for approval, so he is a little confused as to what the approving mechanism is for some of these projects, he thought they had to be City Council approved.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

Haugen responded that generally the answer is yes, they do have to have City Council approval, but this particular one they had MnDOT already on board, and the administration; even talking with Mr. Feland, he saw the e-mail and he wasn't sure if that was something that he was supposed to get onto a staff report, or if someone else was doing the staff report, but in the end he said that they want to move forward with doing this transportation portion of the downtown planning activity, so that is why you are still seeing it here. He stated that this is based on the last communication that was exchanged; it wasn't on the staff report that City Council approved.

Haugen reported that also, under Special Studies, Cities Area Transit has asked that in 2019 we take a look at the UND Shuttle System, and the potential for them to operate it. He stated that the other thing we put some funds toward are further implementation of performance measures and targets, and even though we have some funds in the plan update, there are still some rules and activities that are coming out of FAST that we are trying to address and capture in this area.

Haugen commented that in 2020 we shift the focus away from that true transportation component and are starting back up under the land use component, so you will see that a large portion of our funds are reserved now in our Land Use Category, and we do have East Grand Forks and Grand Forks starting their 2050 Land Use Plan updates. He said that the believe is that we will probably be able to complete East Grand Forks' plan by the end of 2020 but the Grand Forks plan will probably move into 2021 for completion.

Haugen explained that the body of the text kind of goes into those things, and a little more information but still not enough for a lot of these to issue out an RFP or contract someone with a scope of work on. He stated that the other important piece is; even though we are just now finishing up our transportation plan for 2045, this work program needs to show our federal partners and state partners how we are progressing toward our 2050 update, and so in here; he didn't mention the one piece of Regional ITS Architecture, so in 2019 we will have ATAC so a Regional ITS Architecture update. He added that one of the big updates that will happen this go-around will be the beginnings of the integration of connected automobiles, connected and automated vehicle component of the ITS, and in 2020 we will start the Land Use Plan updates and in 2021 we will do our Bike/Ped and our Transit elements, and in 2022 and 2023 we will focus on Street and Highway and wrap-up so that by the end of 2023 we can give our state and federal partners up to 30 days before the end of our 5-year cycle, so that is why you see January 31st, 2024 as the end of the 5-year cycle.

Haugen commented that we also have to make sure that we are covering the emphasis areas of Federal Highway and Federal Transit. He said they are continuing to emphasis the ladder of opportunity; also performance based planning and regional planning cooperation so you will see language in our work program kind of identifying how we are addressing the emphasis areas. He added that these emphasis areas were established in 2016, and typically they are annual renewals of new emphasis areas, but since 2016 the agency did not release any new emphasis areas, and are just saying to continue to use the latest released emphasis areas, so that is what this document is doing.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

Haugen stated that this has been a brief overview of the work program, the major activities that are taking place during it, the financial components on it; the local match has been fairly consistent, around \$60,000 from both communities, so that should remain the same, but there should be a little bit more state match coming in for those specific studies discussed.

Grasser commented that he is trying to understand; when he looks at the document there is a lot of work products in it, many of which have not gone through City Council; and he understands where a lot are probably more of a routine type thing, but he is trying to understand what are things that aren't approved by City Council ahead of time, he thinks ultimately, one way shape or form this document will get approved back to the Executive Policy Board, correct; but he is just trying to understand what things actually need a specific council action, and maybe which don't, which are considered routine or operational, is there a way of clarifying that for the future; which ones actually need specific City Council approval on. Haugen responded that for us to put them in the work program that would be specific corridor studies that the City wants initiated. He added that we do also have State Agencies that can make requests, those probably wouldn't; like MnDOT seeking East Grand Forks' concurrence on the Downtown, he doesn't know if they are required to, so a State Agency can ask for us to do a study.

Haugen stated that the components like ITS Regional Architecture, that is a routine thing that the MPO is required to have so we wouldn't seek City Council approval to do something like that; the T.I.P. is the same thing. He added that the counting program was approved many years ago and it is a continuing program, so similar things to this program would not be approved by the City Council; nor would the Bike/Ped or Transit plans, they are required elements.

Haugen said that the Land Use Plans are an example of what we would ask each City whether or not they would like our assistance in updating, so they would go through their City Councils. He added that special studies for Cities Area Transit would go through the council for approval, which is what we have done for the UND Shuttle project. He said that after 2020, if we do take over UNDs shuttle program we would look at the route structure as well.

Haugen asked if there were any other questionable documents or projects that Mr. Grasser would like verification on. Grasser responded that he would just like to have something, again maybe there is a list or something that we could produce showing those that are routine type things, or where they might come from that otherwise don't need council action. He stated that he is looking at this and there are a lot of work and studies in here and he is just trying to differentiate which ones need council action and which ones don't and where they come from. He said that, again, he doesn't have a big problem with most of them, all of them make sense, but he is, again, just confused as to which ones; sometimes you articulate it verbally, but he needs a piece of paper or something at some point to show which ones need council action and which don't just so he has clarity and they can talk to staff if something is on the list that they hadn't talked about before, or if it is considered a routine type item.

Ellis asked if Mr. Grasser has issue with the studies that are in the work program currently. Grasser responded that he has a concern on the Downtown Transportation Plan study, that is probably the only one that he really; again there are a lot of studies on here that haven't gone

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

through City Council, so he is just kind of asking the question, where did they come from. He added that it sounds like there are a couple of different categories; kind of routine or other agency requests, and sometimes it is hard to tell when you look at this just where they came from to see if they are just work products that don't have an apparent source that goes through their city council, so that is what he is looking at. Ellis asked if Mr. Grasser would like to have this item suspended and brought back in December, or to give it preliminary approval provided that you get the list that you are asking for, because she is just wondering what type of a motion he would prefer so that we can move this forward. Grasser responded that he doesn't need a motion on it necessarily, he is just looking for clarity and maybe a follow-up, again, just kind of listing how these things end up in the work program, not necessarily even a line-by-line, but what instigates work products that show up in here that didn't go through city council. Ellis responded that she understands that, but she is just saying that in order to move this matter along because Mr. Haugen is looking for approval of the work program, so do you want it suspended to the next meeting. Haugen commented that the ramifications of suspending this and moving it to December is that it impacts our cash flow in January because the Feds still have up to 30-days to comment on it, so if we don't submit anything to them until December 19th when the MPO Executive Policy Board would next meet, if the Feds wait the 30-days allowed, from January 1st through the 15th we would have no federal funding ability to off-set those costs, so that is why we are seeking approval today, to allow that 30-day review and if there need to be adjustments made in December there is time to do so and hopefully there are just small things to tidy-up. Grasser responded that it isn't so much about this one, but he is looking to understand this better for the future so instead of being at the 11th hour like we are, and having questions about where things come up and not having time to really go into them like we are just articulating right now he is trying to get ahead of that curve, and so he just thinks some clarity about how that works because they are going to have some new staff members on the Grand Forks side, and if we can clarify some of these things for our staff in the future; he isn't suggesting that we should not move forward with this, but, again he is just trying to clarify in his mind, the downtown one is the one that he is kind of concerned with because he knows there were a lot of e-mails ahead of time about getting council approval, and council didn't approve it, so that is the one that he is a little bit concerned about and he thinks that probably the reason for that is some of the terms are a bit ambiguous, but if we can work through that in more detail through the scoping process then he thinks we are probably okay.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE 2019-2020 UPWP, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF A LIST EXPLAINING WHAT DOES AND DOESN'T NEED CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL TO BE INCLUDED IN THE WORK PROGRAM.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Gengler, Johnson, Ellis, Riesinger, and Bergman.

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Lang, Bail, Brooks, Riesinger, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Williams Magnuson, Sanders, Emery, Audette, Konickson, West, and Christianson.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

MATTER OF SOLICITATION OF 2020-2023 T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS

Haugen reported that this is the next round of project solicitation for our 2020-2023 T.I.P. He stated that they announced pretty much all of the North Dakota programs, and this month is when we will initiate the Minnesota side. He added that there are a lot fewer programs on the Minnesota side so it is really impacting MnDOT State Trunk Highway and also if Polk County would ever want to use federal funds in our study area, which they never have yet to-date, they are on notice of those candidate project solicitation timelines.

Haugen stated that there was a deadline on the Transportation Alternatives on the Minnesota side, there were none submitted from our MPO area so we are off the hook on having to review them any time soon.

Haugen commented that on the North Dakota side there are two programs that are being announced; one is brand new and it is another round of FTA funding toward transit, and yes it does seem like we are doing a lot of FTA solicitation for transit, and it is unusual that we are doing this much as this will be our third solicitation when we normally have just one solicitation per year. He added that the other solicitation going on is the Recreational Trails program. He stated that it isn't formally announced by the North Dakota Park and Rec yet, but it officially starts December 1st, and the Technical Advisory Committee doesn't meet again until December so we are announcing that solicitation of the rec trails on the North Dakota side, and the applications are due the first of January.

Haugen reported that yesterday the MPO Minnesota Directors met with MnDOT and he thinks there is a solicitation that MnDOT Transit will be doing as well, so it seems like Transit is getting its share of funding.

Grasser asked, on the regional side, are they not taking applications for a particular year, or are they just not taking regional projects period. Haugen responded that they are not taking regional applications because of the four-year period ending in 2023, but they do like, and they still want that plus-one sense of what the 2024 project would be, it isn't formally being submitted for consideration, it is just kind of a heads up kind of what we are thinking might be our 2024 project a year from now; but otherwise they are not accepting applications for the Regional Program.

Grasser stated that they are actually are planning on getting a regional list approved at the local level, at the Grand Forks City level with the idea that we can then present something, perhaps, in the outyears, and/or if a decision comes later to request a project they won't miss the City Council's approvals, so they are kind of doing that just on a come, more or less. Haugen asked if this would be leu of, or in place of the traffic signals, because those are on the illustrative list. Grasser responded that they are still on the list, this would be a list for the regional and a list for the urban projects just like they would normally do, and so whenever we need to provide information of council approval of a document, it can't be submitted, but at least he wants to make sure they have the city council requirement covered, and so just to be proactive on that they are just going to create a list that their City Council has looked at and approve it makes

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

sense. Haugen asked if they were including the signals on this list because they aren't technically programmed. Grasser said they would be on the list, he just wants to be in the position that they have a list that all the other things that they have previously programmed are basically on the list, they are just adding to it.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON THE 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT

Haugen reported that Scott and Brad are here today to give a brief presentation but first, in your staff report they have had some preliminary approval occur already at various agency levels; both planning commissions have given preliminary approval, Polk County Board of Commissioners have given preliminary approval, and it was presented at the East Grand Forks Working Session and the Grand Forks COW. He stated that they are moving things forward on to both City Councils on Monday and Tuesday evenings, so it is progressing through the month of November on schedule.

Haugen commented that they do have some new information for some Technical Advisory Committee members that haven't been able to attend or participate in those presentations, and that is what Mr. Mareck will go over now. He added that it has to do with the investment end of things; if you will recall at the last Technical Advisory Committee meeting there was action taken, and this is sort of cleaning up what resulted from that action.

Mareck referred to a power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and went over it briefly.

Presentation ensued.

Mareck commented that there is a federal rule that says the following projects are included in the transportation plan so the MPO must be financially constrained. He said that that means that we have to do a projection of all reasonable revenues at the federal level; both DOTs, North Dakota and Minnesota; both Cities, which have a variety of different revenue sources, Grand Forks obviously has the new sales tax and also at the county level where there is property taxes and other revenue sources; so doing kind of a baseline of what is currently being brought in from those sources and then projecting that out with some collaboration from those various agencies to make sure that the projections are reasonable. He referred to the "What Is Our Financial Plan" slide and explained that when they did all this they come up with an overall pie-chart showing those different sources in terms of what is available for the MPO plan.

Mareck referred to the Revenue Forecast slide and explained that this is a summary of the result of the process they went through. He stated that there are different funding sources that are tied to different programs; for instance for Safety there is a projection of about \$18 million in funding; for North Dakota Main Street, which is kind of the Downtown Urban Program that includes streetscaping, multi-modal, transit, bike/ped types of projects there is a projection of about \$19 million; for Interstate there is a projection of about \$10 million; for Other Federal

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

there is a projection of about \$210 million; for State there is a projection of about \$20 million; for Local there is a project of about \$140 million; which gives us a total of about \$417 million in Highway Revenue funding.

Grasser asked if, and he knows it is late and it has been shown and articulated a number of times, but could they get the background of how the \$139.9 for local was arrived at. Haugen responded that Chapter 6 of the draft document details all of that. He added that that chapter isn't in the TAC packet but has been available on the website for the last month. Mareck added that there is a pretty detailed accounting of how all of those numbers were arrived at, so if there is something that isn't in the report that your interested in he is sure they could probably drill down further and get more information.

Mareck stated that we have that overall revenue projection that all of you were a part of developing, and they appreciate that participation; and the investment direction really kind of ties back to the goals, objectives and performance measures and targets that were established earlier in the process so a lot of that is detailed through federal law on certain things that the MPO has to invest in, and then we have specific measures and targets that are established for project areas, bridges, pavements, etc., where we have to meet certain performance targets for the overall system.

Mareck said that part of the investment direction also is obviously driven through public input; what elected officials, staff such as yourself, and citizens and what they want to see the MPO invest in. He stated that they did have a number of public meetings, website input, and other opportunities where people could provide input through this process.

Mareck commented that also looking back as State and Local plans, they've had comprehensive plans, State plans, County plans that set investment direction vision that the MPO is integrating into its overall process.

Mareck gave a little bit of an executive summary of what some of the emphasis areas are; again, at the federal level and also both DOTs, there is a real strong emphasis on preserving the exiting system, and a lot of that is just simply tied to the fact that there isn't enough revenue to do a lot of the fun expansion things that we would like to do and so maintain our bridges and our pavements in good condition so they are safe and are what our citizens expect is number one. He continued that we are also looking at maintaining the actual facilities themselves, on a national and regional system, which would be the Interstate System and the State Highway System; and then your high level County and City roadways. He stated that all of this is set forth federally by the FAST-ACT, which sets the federal framework and federal law that the MPO's follow.

Mareck referred to the Financial Planning Activity slide and explained that this is an example of some of the input they received for the investment direction at one of the public meetings. He went over the information briefly, and explained that they also had a methodology that kind of got into a little more detail tying our goal areas to the actual projects; and they attempted to assign scores to the projects and grading them.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

Mareck stated that another big consideration is inflation, so a dollar today will buy a lot more than a dollar will in the Year 2045, so there is a very significant decrease in the buying power of what we have today moving forward and that reduced, unfortunately the amount of project that we can include in the plan.

Mareck referred to the Current Revenue Scenario slide and explained that it is a screen shot of what ultimately came out of our planning process; the investment direction; the scoring of projects; the input from citizens, the TAC, and the MPO Board; and it shows that we have \$266 million of documented projects that are in the current revenue scenario which is what we also call a constrained plan, projects that we can afford to build. He added that, as you will recall he said earlier that we have a revenue of \$417 million, and he will explain in a minute why there is that discrepancy. He pointed out that there is \$5 million in Safety projects; \$39 million for the North Dakota Main Street program; \$29 million for the State of Good Repair – Interstate Program; and almost \$200 million for the State of Good Repair – Non-Interstate, which is your minor arterials and your State Highway System.

Mareck referred to the Current Revenue Scenario-Fiscal Constraint slide and explained that this is a pie chart that shows the discrepancy between the revenues on the left of \$417 million and what he just described on the previous slide of what is currently documented as far as actual projects for investment. He stated that there are two reasons for the discrepancy: first there are \$55 million of unallocated City of Grand Forks' local dollars that will be programmed through the City's CIP process; and second a big chunk of the discrepancy is tied to the Safety Projects, so on the North Dakota side there is a five-year safety program and this is a plan that goes out to the year 2045 so you have a discrepancy of what is committed on the safety program versus the horizon of the plan, so the MPO will be working with NDDOT and the communities on the west side of the river to, in the future, identify what safety projects there are that will utilize those revenues. He said that similarly, on the Minnesota side, we do have a State Safety program and a Polk County Safety program, however there has not been enough discussion to get to the point of actually documenting what the safety projects are for the East Grand Forks/Polk County MPO area, so those two factors are the reason for the gap in the investment versus the actual revenue.

Mareck commented that another big thing that we need to include in the plan, and this is intuitive, but we need to make sure that we are integrating the existing projects that are funded and programmed in the MPO T.I.P. into the plan; it is a requirement at the federal level that your existing T.I.P. program be consistent with the Long Range Transportation Plan, that is the reason we put the plan together, to build the projects. He referred to a slide that lists some of the projects that have recently been constructed that were part of the T.I.P. in 2017 and 2018, and some of the bigger projects that are coming up and moving forward in 2019 and 2020 and explained that all of the MPO's T.I.P. projects will be integrated into the new Long Range Plan.

Mareck referred to the Key Projects in MPO 2022 T.I.P. slide and explained that these are just a couple of projects that are coming up in the out-year of the T.I.P.; the US 2 and US Bus 2 Intersection Improvements project in Minnesota; and the Washington Street Underpass Reconstruction and the North Columbia Road Reconstruction in North Dakota.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

Mareck stated that they also include in the plan kind of an executive summary of some of your larger investment projects, those that are \$5 million and greater, just to get a feel for where those larger investments are taking place. He referred to the next few slides and pointed out that they indicate where these projects are located in both Minnesota and North Dakota, and went over the information briefly.

Mareck explained that, drilling down just a little bit further into the actual program itself; at a very super high level the way that the investments were allocated again was; first allocating to basically the Interstate and the State Highway System, which would be the red roads on the following maps. He pointed out that on the Minnesota side those major improvements were on US #2, Bygland Road, Sorlie and Kennedy Bridges. He stated that on the North Dakota side, again focusing on the red roads, which would be I-29, DeMers, Washington, 32nd Avenue, Gateway Drive and the bridges on DeMers and Gateway Drive.

Mareck commented that there are a couple of projects that they wanted to bring to your attention that did not make it into the constrained or current revenue scenario; 32nd Avenue and also a State of Good Repair project on I-29 north of Gateway Drive. He stated that they do have some improvements on 32nd Avenue in the plan but there was a major reconstruction along 32nd Avenue in the Year 2045 that was scheduled but was not able to be included. Haugen added that the reconstruction of 32nd Avenue is in the mid-term in the plan. He said that there was a follow-up maintenance project that was identified in 2045 that didn't make the fiscal constraint, and it was at the last horizon year. He added that that is the same thing that is going on on Interstate, north of Gateway Drive, there is a project to maintain the interstate in the plan, it was that second project that was identified in 2045 that just got pushed down to the fiscal constraint, and that is what the two black lines are saying; that otherwise we were able to fund all of the requested State of Good Repair on the NHS system on the North Dakota side, except for these two 2045 identified follow-up projects that we just couldn't fiscally constrain.

Mareck said that, to that point, one thing to keep in mind is that the plan is required to be updated every five years, so that doesn't mean that these projects will never be able to be funded, federally, it is just that for this snapshot in time, at this point, there wasn't enough revenue to allocate funding to them.

Mareck commented that the other element of the plan that they would like to talk about are the local roads; the North Dakota Urban Local Roads Program got \$130 million dollars that was included in the investment of the current revenue scenario; so there is a variety of projects sprinkled around Grand Forks. He referred to a map showing where these projects are located and stated that he would like to thank the City of Grand Forks for providing a lot of the investment direction on those projects.

Mareck stated that, as we discussed earlier, the \$55 million on the local side that we will get from sales tax, is currently unallocated in the MPO plan, so those projects will be identified through the City's CIP process moving forward; and again we have documented about \$300 million dollars of potential projects where those monies could be utilized, so there is a large pool

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

of need out there, it is just a matter of working through them locally to determine how the community wants to invest their funds.

Grasser said that they are having a meeting on Monday to try to decipher some of the language that needs to be in this plan; but he is wondering if they can't also, on that slide, recognize that plus the unidentified, all of their local streets, are also unidentified need, correct. Haugen responded that they are trying to do it with the statement "additional dollars on the City Local System". He said that they have documented on the federal aid, but they haven't done anything on the local side, there aren't any dollar amounts, so that is why it just states "additional dollars". He asked if that was sufficient or do you want more language added. Grasser responded that maybe they can talk about some language options on Monday. He added that he would like that statement beefed up somehow, but he doesn't have the exact word right now, but he wants to really make sure that they emphasize that the shortage that they have in there, it isn't just on the State system, but it is also on the local system, and he doesn't know if we are talking about strictly project money or if there is maintenance money mixed up in some of that discussion too. Haugen referred to the slides and pointed out what each one is showing.

Grasser commented that he kind of understands all of this, but he isn't sure how firmly that comes across; like if they gave a number on the local streets, if you could just plug in a number or do you have to go through some complicated process. He said that a number of years ago we identified that we thought we needed a budget in the nature of about \$10 or \$12 million dollars a year on the local side to eventually bring the whole system up; and that would be like at least a twenty or thirty year cycle to do that, so if you start looking at that \$10 or \$12 million dollar need that they identified locally over the planning lifetime, you start getting a really really big number relative to emphasizing the short-fall. He added that his concern is that people may look at the unallocated dollars as being more freely available than probably what they are, and that is why he is looking at language change. He said that he understands what you're saying, he isn't disagreeing with that, but he wants to do as much as he can to emphasize that we are still very very short of dollars.

Mareck stated that he thinks that lateral, we have the \$700 million that we talked about earlier, the needs for the region that have been documented for a variety of different programs; so the \$700 million versus \$400 million of revenue; that would give you roughly \$300 million dollars of unmet need, but yet there are a lot of other local system needs that are not completely contemplated as part of the MPO plan, and how do we tell that story without getting into the gory details of trying to develop that number.

Mareck explained that in addition to the overall capital program, there is also an ongoing need to document operation and maintenance needs of the system, and this is a federal requirement that this be done to make sure that we are being comprehensive in our view of the overall needs. He added that we have documented some of the operation revenue and needs on both the North Dakota and Minnesota side. He referred to slides discussing these issues for both North Dakota and Minnesota and explained that they aren't probably as comprehensive and complete as we would like, but it is a work in progress and so over time they hope to make it a more robust element of the MPO plan.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

Mareck referred to the Potential Discretionary Projects slide and commented that we also do want to recognize, as part of the plan, though there is \$300 million of unmet needs; that this plan is really kind of a marketing tool that can be used by the MPO and all of the communities to talk to your legislators, your congressional delegations, Governor's, etc., to kind of champion some of those unmet needs that they have documented in your community. He went over the discretionary projects listed and stated that these are all very high profile, high impact projects for your region that have a very strong purpose and need that we would definitely like to get included in the plan, so if there are opportunities, some leverage or some special revenues through congressional earmarks, or state funding costs that aren't contemplated in the plan, those are things that can be worked on.

Haugen stated that this was really just the major modifications that they had from the last Technical Advisory Committee meeting, for this section of the plan. He said that they aren't going to go into the River Crossing portion, unless you want to, so, referring to the November and December calendars, he said that this is where they are going to end the presentation.

Haugen referred to the November calendar and pointed out that they will be attending the City Council meetings next week for preliminary approval, as well as the MPO Executive Policy Board. He added that they also have a presentation scheduled to give to North Dakota Upper Management the following Tuesday afternoon.

Haugen referred to the December calendar and pointed out that December 19th is when we hope to have action from the MPO Executive Policy Board; some clean-up work so that we can formally submit the document to our State and Federal partners on December 28th. He said that at that time they will have their 30-day review period, and that allows us to meet the January 31st drop-dead date of our current five year cycle.

Halford stated that she was not at the last meeting as she was on maternity leave, and preliminary approval was given to the Street and Highway Element, and she is wondering of that includes the Transit and Bike/Ped Plan under it as a whole, or are they separate. Haugen responded that they are separate. He added that there is a meeting scheduled for this evening on the Bike/Ped Plan.

Halford asked when the Bike/Ped Plan will be approved; is that going to screw with our funding since it is not going to be approved. Haugen responded that it is still coming. Halford asked if it needs to be done by January, or does it affect our funding. Haugen responded that they have had some discussions with the lead State Partner on this, and so they are working towards that. Halford said, then, that it is possible, but hopefully not. Haugen responded that they might be asking for a 30-day extension; just as they did with the TAM Plan, they asked for a 30-day extension. Halford said, then we will be asking for approval at the end of January. Haugen responded that that is correct.

Haugen said that they needed to show progression on this piece of the plan and this gets us to our 2050 cycle.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 14th, 2018**

OTHER BUSINESS

- a. 2018 Annual Work Program Project Update

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

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO ADJOURN THE NOVEMBER
14TH, 2018, TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:50 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager