

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2018  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Earl Haugen Chairman, called the December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2018, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:30 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning; Jesse Kadrmas, NDDOT-Local District; Ryan Riesinger, Airport Authority; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Dale Bergman, Area Cities Transit; Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Consulting - Engineer; Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineer.

Absent: Darren Laesch, Paul Konickson, Richard Audette, Dustin Lang, Brad Gengler, Ryan Brooks, Steve Emery, Lane Magnuson, Ali Rood, Stacey Hanson, Mike Yavarow, Lars Christianson, and Rich Sanders.

Guest(s) present: Jane Williams, 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 NOVEMBER 14<sup>TH</sup>, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KADRMAS, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 14<sup>TH</sup>, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

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

Haugen reported that this is for final action of the Technical Advisory Committee on the Draft 2045 Street/Highway Plan that has been out for review and comments since the last meeting.

Haugen referred to the staff report and pointed out that it does list the action taken by our partner agencies on each side of the river. He stated that Grand Forks Planning and Zoning has taken action and their City Council will meet on Monday; and East Grand Forks' Planning and Zoning has taken action and their City Council will meet on Tuesday. He added that both Polk County and Grand Forks County have taken final action as well.

Haugen stated that they did give a presentation to the MnDOT working group; and talked about the comments that we received on those drafts, the concern about getting the current T.I.P. better recognized in this draft, and that was done; and they also gave a presentation to NDDOT upper management and Mr. Johnson has provided some comments that were incorporated into the document as well, so with that we have a resolution for consideration of the MPO Board at their meeting next week.

Haugen said that staff is recommending the Technical Advisory Committee approve forwarding a recommendation to the MPO Board that they adopt the Draft Final Street/Highway Element as presented.

Kuharenko pointed out that, he believes it is the fifth "whereas" in the Resolution, it talks about the bicycle plan, and he is wondering if that is something that we have to be concerned about since the Bike/Ped Plan hasn't yet been adopted. Haugen responded that this is just listing what the three main elements of the Long Range Transportation Plan are, it doesn't give the dates of their adoptions, so when we adopt a resolution for Transit it will have the same language, it will just have "transit" at the top instead of "2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan".

Kuharenko pointed out that Ken Vein's name is misspelled on the signature page.

Williams said that she doesn't see where MnDOT is listed anywhere in this document, do they need to be. She pointed out that we do talk about the NDDOT but not MnDOT. Haugen responded that because NDDOT is our lead agency, that is what it states, that NDDOT is the lead agency. Williams said, though, that there isn't any mention of MnDOT anywhere in the document at all, and that is what she is asking, do we need to have them in there somewhere. Haugen responded that we haven't included them in the past, we only identify who our lead state agency is.

***MOVED BY BAIL, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE ADOPTION OF THE 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT, AS PRESENTED.***

***Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Halford, Johnson, Ellis, Riesinger, Bergman, Bail, Kuharenko, and West.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

*Voting Nay: None.*

*Absent: Lang, Gengler, Brooks, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Emery, Audette, Konickson, and Christianson.*

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF NORTH DAKOTA CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR 2020-2023 T.I.P.**

a. Transportation Alternative Projects

Viafara reported that there are two projects that are being submitted for consideration by the City of Grand Forks to the Transportation Alternative Program. He commented that this is a highly competitive grant, therefore support for these kind of initiatives is very important.

Viafara stated that the City is submitting two shared use path projects; one is located adjacent to South Columbia Road from 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue South to 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South. He explained that this project will provide a safer walking and bicycling environment for school children, commuters and recreational users, and also provide access and mobility around the school in that area.

Viafara said that the second project is adjacent to University Avenue from the Mobile Home Park to North 48<sup>th</sup> Street. He explained that in this area there are a number of low income families and people that we may deem to be within the Environmental Justice criteria. He added that this is part of the existing and proposed Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan to afford that people from this type of neighborhood have accessibility and mobility, and also to improve the comfort level when they are either walking or bicycling around the neighborhood.

Viafara commented that these two projects incorporate a number of traffic control devices that help us to decrease fuel consumption and also address the last segment of linking around the corridors and also enhance safety for the public, particularly for non-motorized users.

Viafara said that, overall, the two initiatives improve user safety and comfort, they also help us to increase the existing bicycle and pedestrian network by adding new segments, and enhance access and mobility around the neighborhood.

Viafara stated that the MPO staff is recommending the Technical Advisory Committee approve forward a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board that they approve the Transportation Alternative projects submitted for competition, and give them priority ranking.

***MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY HALFORD, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROJECTS SUBMITTED AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE MPO LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING.***

*Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Halford, Johnson, Ellis, Riesinger, Bergman, Bail, Kuharenko, and West.*

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Absent: Lang, Gengler, Brooks, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Emery, Audette, Konickson, and Christianson.***

Haugen commented that just as a reminder on the North Dakota side the Recreational Trails Grant is still open for added projects through January 5<sup>th</sup>.

b. HSIP Projects

Haugen reiterated that this program was open for candidate projects to be submitted, and they received one from the City of Grand Forks.

Haugen reported that the project is for Red Light Confirmation Indicators for the Intersections of South Washington Street and 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue South and South Washington Street and 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, and is for materials only. He commented that the total cost is \$10,000 with \$9,000 in federal funding, and is consistent with our proposed safety plan.

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE HSIP PROJECT SUBMITTED AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING.***

***Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Halford, Johnson, Ellis, Riesinger, Bergman, Bail, Kuharenko, and West.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Absent: Lang, Gengler, Brooks, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Emery, Audette, Konickson, and Christianson.***

c. Urban Grant Projects

Haugen reported that this is the second year of solicitation for this program so it is still a work in progress.

Haugen stated that they received one application from the City of Grand Forks to reconstruct 3<sup>rd</sup> Street between DeMers and University Avenue. He said that the total project cost is \$3.5 million with a federal grant request of just short of \$2.5 million.

Haugen commented that this project includes possible treatments such as curb bump outs, ornamental street lighting, street scape amenities, etc. He stated that the project is working with the Downtown Action Plan activity that is taking place, there are still some details being work on, as far as the streetscape theme to try to connect all of the downtown. He added that in the 2045 Street/Highway Plan element we do have this stretch of the downtown identified as one of the Main Street Urban Grant Projects.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

***MOVED BY HALFORD, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE URBAN GRANT PROGRAM PROJECT AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING.***

***Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Halford, Johnson, Ellis, Riesinger, Bergman, Bail, Kuharenko, and West.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Absent: Lang, Gengler, Brooks, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Emery, Audette, Konickson, and Christianson.***

d. Urban Regional Roads Projects

Haugen reported that as indicated in the staff report, and in the solicitation letter, the NDDOT was not opening the 2023 year for candidate projects; however there were instances such as urgent issues or phase construction that was allowed. He stated that outside of the 2023 year the current years of the T.I.P. are fiscally constrained, but the City and the District still submitted a worksheet for a 2020 request, and that was the NEPA document for 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Congestion.

Haugen said that there was also a 2022 chip seal project on North 5<sup>th</sup> Street; they are already going to mill and overlay that so this would be a follow-up project to that work being done in 2020.

Haugen referred to the summary sheet and pointed out that you will notice that they are still showing a regional traffic signal upgrade project for 2022; that currently is listed as an illustrative project in the T.I.P., and it can remain illustrative in the 2022 year or a request can be made to consider it for a later year we can probably consider it with the next T.I.P. cycle since 2023 is closed.

Kuharenko stated that it shows it in the S.T.I.P. that it is a pending project, and so they ended up including it just as a reverification more than anything, and that is part of the reason they didn't include a new scoping worksheet because the year didn't change and the dollars didn't change. Haugen commented the pending and illustrative are the same, just different terms, there is no money attached to it and to get money attached to it either money either has to be found somewhere for that year or else apply for a subsequent year and then prioritize it versus all the other projects for that year.

Haugen commented that on the regional side the State always want to have that plus-one year as sort of a heads up that a project is a possible candidate for that year, however it isn't a formal submittal for our consideration. He added that in the document we received are two projects; one is for an interchange that addresses congestion on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, and we just note that it is not in the Transportation Plan and is beyond our fiscal constraint; and the other is the reconstruction of South Washington Street between Hammerling and 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, but that is identified in the short-term of the 2045 Street and Highway Plan.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Bergman asked if the intersection at 32<sup>nd</sup>, is that South Washington Street. Haugen responded that it is an interchange that addresses the congestion on 32<sup>nd</sup>, that is how it is identified. Bergman asked if it is an interchange on I-29. Haugen responded that the documentation identifies 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue as a possible location, but that is still up to the NEPA document, etc., so it isn't an intersection, the best guess is that it is an interchange, but that isn't a for-sure decision.

Kuharenko reported that they essentially set it up as a construction project to follow-up the NEPA document.

Haugen commented that there are a couple of other projects that were shown on the summary sheet; those are the ones that we are taking care of prior to the adoption of the next T.I.P. so they will be addressed with a different action, hopefully next January, because they are tied in with some other T.I.P. amendments that we have to do next January.

Haugen said that as Mr. Johnson is here he would ask him; since we've got a closed solicitation on the Regional Program from the State, we got a submittal for a NEPA project and a Chip Seal project for the year prior to the one announced as being closed; and he knows that the chip seal is no big deal, but the NEPA is a bigger deal, so what is NDDOT's thought. Johnson responded that he would agree the chip seal is not a big deal at all, you can submit that one; but the environmental document is a little different as they typically don't line item those in the S.T.I.P. unless it is like an EEA or EIS level type document, and even then it is rare as they have preliminary engineering identified in the S.T.I.P. in our District 9, so if it is determined that we should move forward with any project, whether it be this interchange or another one, we kind of just move forward with the PE in terms of timing for funding so identifying this funding as part of this process he doesn't think needs to be done right now.

Johnson commented that the other element that is tied to this; this feeds right into the Urban Interstate Priorities Process that some of you are aware of that they work with the counties and the districts and the cities on to identify Urban Interstate needs across the State. He said that the local government division has been tasked with doing a decision document with all of those nearer term priorities to determine how they want to proceed with them, if they should proceed with them, and how many they should proceed with and this is on that list, so that is controlled by that decision right now and they haven't reached that point yet. He added that he doesn't know of the timing for when it is going to happen, but that's the more appropriate spot for it because if they don't get the green light to move forward on that project, there is no need to identify funding for it right now.

Kuharenko stated, though, that if it is green-lighted they would still have to submit documentation to get it into the S.T.I.P. correct. Johnson responded that they would just authorize engineering funding, they don't line item each project in the T.I.P. and S.T.I.P., there would be way too many.

Haugen commented that part of the decision, if you do go with the decision to do the preliminary engineering; is we have to identify another phase, which currently isn't identified in the documents, so it is his understanding that Federal Highway can't sign off on a document unless

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

there is a shown fiscally constrained plan of implementation, so we simply can't just do the PE without any additional actions that have to be done. Johnson added that you can start it, they just won't act on it if there is another level of authorization.

Haugen stated that it seems like we have one candidate project and that is the Chip Seal project for consideration during the actual next T.I.P. years, and then we have two projects in the plus-one year with one being identified as being consistent and within fiscal constraint and the other not.

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY BAIL, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE URBAN REGIONAL PROGRAM CANDIDATE PROJECTS SUBJECT TO THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES PER DISCUSSION.***

Kuharenko stated that for him, he is looking at this from the City side, and he knows the City Council's approval was based on list that they submitted; and so even though it may not be considered by the MPO to be eligible for this program, he would push more for the list that the City Council approved be moved forward. He said that that way it will be moved forward to the MPO Executive Policy Board, and there are two members from the Grand Forks City Council on that board, so that would be his preference.

Haugen asked what the motion is stating. Kuharenko responded that the motion would be to move the recommendation and the priority ranking as approved by the Grand Forks City Council to the MPO Executive Policy Board for further consideration, something along those lines. Haugen asked if we are finding it as being consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan as part of the motion. Williams asked if we could do a plan amendment to make it consistent. Haugen responded that we could not do that within today's time constraint.

West asked who made the request for the NEPA project. Kuharenko responded that it was a request made by both the City and the State; and approved by the Grand Forks City Council to bring forward to the MPO. West said, then, that the City Council has already heard it and thought it worthy to move forward. Kuharenko responded that that is correct and added that that is how it was moved forward to the Technical Advisory Committee. West asked if the DOT is okay with that. Haugen said the District may be yet the HQ may not.

Johnson commented that that is the other issue on the table; there is the full gamut of this is a locally funded interchange or this is an interstate funded interchange; we don't know that yet either, and that is part of that decision making process. Kuharenko stated that one of the reasons they ended up pushing this forward is because if there are congestion issues at 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South, 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue is a State Highway, and so what do we need to do to address that, and so whether or not it is an interchange or something else, we would have to see, and that is what the purpose is of the NEPA document going through engineering, it is to determine what is needed, or if anything is needed at all, that is also part of the reason why for the local funding they are looking at, instead of the typical funding split, they are looking at the City putting forward about half of the cost of that project just to get it off the ground.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Bergman said, though, that we just heard from Mr. Johnson that a NEPA document isn't something that is needed. Johnson reiterated that we don't typically identify those line item by line item in the T.I.P. and S.T.I.P. Bergman said, though that they can still do the document right. Johnson responded that you can make the request to get it going; typically they won't start unless we have funding identified for the construction project, and in this case we don't have that money identified. He said that in other instances where this has happened it has been a management decision to move forward and start the document anyway, and worry about the construction money later, or it has been a locally funded effort completely. He said that, again, he goes back to a decision document that management has to review and sign off on to determine; one, should we go forward with this at all, and two, who is going to pay for what and when.

Johnson stated that, speaking candidly, there are a lot of concerns in Bismarck with where they are at in the season, the Legislature is going to be starting, and with funding the way it is and the initiatives set forth by our governing bodies, that a new interchange in the rural part of an urban area is not going to be supported very well, but he can't make that call, that is what management has to do.

Haugen asked for clarification on the motion; are you trying to address the 2020 NEPA document as part of the motion. Kuharenko responded that he is so that it can be further discussed at the MPO Executive Policy Board level.

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY BAIL, TO AMEND THE MOTION TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE URBAN REGIONAL PROGRAM CANDIDATE PROJECTS AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING.***

***Voting Aye: Halford, Ellis, Riesinger, Bergman, Bail, Kuharenko, and West.***

***Voting Nay: Kadrmas and Johnson.***

***Absent: Lang, Gengler, Brooks, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Emery, Audette, Konickson, and Christianson.***

e. Urban Local Roads Projects

Haugen reported that this was not frozen, just the regional side was. He said that for 2023 the City did submit a scoping worksheet for the Columbia Road Overpass fix, and included in the packet was a draft report from the consultant that identifies necessary corrective action. He stated that the cost estimate is 45% higher than the cost estimate that we had in our Street and Highway Plan.

Haugen commented that just as we discussed on the regional side, the traffic signal update, there wasn't a scope of work worksheet done for that so that will still be listed as a pending/illustrative in 2022, is that correct. Kuharenko responded that that is correct.



**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Haugen stated that the Columbia Road Overpass project is in the short-term and this is a 2023 application so staff recommends priority ranking for the project.

***MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE URBAN LOCAL ROADS CONDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE FY2020-2023 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING.***

***Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Halford, Johnson, Ellis, Riesinger, Bergman, Bail, Kuharenko, and West.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Absent: Lang, Gengler, Brooks, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Emery, Audette, Konickson, and Christianson.***

**MATTER OF PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE 2045 BIKE/PED ELEMENT**

Viafara reported that MPO Staff is asking the members of the Technical Advisory Committee to please provide comments and support and preliminary approval of the 2045 Bike/Ped Element. He pointed out that the draft report has been submitted for your consideration.

Viafara stated that this was submitted to the Grand Forks Planning Commission and to the East Grand Forks City Council, and so far comments and preliminary approval have been received from the Grand Forks Planning Commission and the the East Grand Forks City Council.

Viafara referred to the packet and reported that you will find an Executive Summary that is more or less outlining all of the activities that have taken place, and gives a background on the development of the plan. He said that it includes the goals and objectives, and also the analysis of this information, and at the end provides some idea of the type of recommendations that we are planning to make for your consideration.

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

Presentation ensued.

Williams referred to the Executive Summary and pointed out that in #9 Pedestrian and Bicycle Crashes it discusses pedestrian and bicycle crashes; and then in #10 Pedestrian and Bicyclists Accidents it discusses pedestrian and bicycle accidents. She stated that crash(es) is the correct term, they no longer use the term accident(s) as they are all crashes. Viafara asked if she wanted that change made in the slides or in the document, he said that he can go over it and certainly heed your advice. Williams responded that that is up to him, she is just letting you know that “accident” is not the correct term. Viafara asked if she would provide some findings for the reason for that. Williams said that she would refer him to NDDOT for that. Johnson stated that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

he doesn't know the full reason, but they no longer use "accident" as the defining an instance of a crash because they are not all accidental, but they are all crashes regardless of the severity.

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BAIL, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A  
RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY  
APPROVE THE PRELIMINARY DRAFT 2045 BIKE/PED ELEMENT REPORT.***

Halford said that currently the document is incomplete, when will they see a complete document. Viafara responded that that is what they are working on. He said that by the end of next week you will see a complete document. Halford asked if a link to that would be e-mailed out to everyone. Viafara responded that he would have to have his supervisor review it and provide some comments and guidance, and then he will make it available to everyone.

Halford pointed out that the targets in the first section say "still to be determined" on a lot of them, will those be addressed as well. Viafara responded that they are to be determined. He said that she had asked that question before. Halford agreed that she had. Viafara stated that, basically, if you look carefully at the tables you have the performance measure; what is pending is the performance target, and there are a couple of documents that we review that Department of Engineering indicated that they would like to have the performance targets that are flexible, that are doable, and that are onerous, so because of that those are really pending for us to discuss later and at the moment he has not received any particular feedback on that so his suggestion, at least for now, is for him to submit a report to you, a response, leave them how they are, and then convene through the different stakeholders, somebody that will help us, even engineering or planning, that will tell us exactly how they feel about the few targets that are missing.

Halford stated that she did not get that from past conversations. Viafara responded that it is stated on the report. He said that if you look at the report they submitted the performance measures and the targets for you guys to set, there is some indication that the department would like to have a level of flexibility, and because of the conditions of your staff, and internal issues you don't want them to be onerous. Halford said, then, for clarification if she hadn't brought up that question would it just be left to be determined and we would approve the document and then it would have gone on like that and we would have made up our own targets on the side. Viafara responded that whenever there are targets; there are a number of targets that have already been assumed; there are some targets that do not belong to the MPO because we don't have the means to track them. He cited that the MPO doesn't have the means to track the number of citations that are issued for snow removal, or the number of feet or miles of sidewalks so he has to ask the Department of Engineering to tell us every year what has happened, so because of that they are to be determined. He added that there are also some that are coming from transit as the MPO doesn't track the number of bike licenses or the number of permits a day issued for people who bring their bikes so we need to use the baselines. Halford asked why there aren't baselines shown in the plan then. Viafara responded that he can ask them to provide the baselines if that is what you want, but right from the beginning that was the understanding, the MPO is bringing something to the departments that they unfortunately don't have the information for; that is transit, engineering, or planning; and the few that you see belong to the MPO, so we will do them through the use of the travel modeling that we have and through surveys.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Haugen commented that Mr. Viafara and himself briefly talked about this yesterday morning and his understanding was that there are some targets that are yet to be identified, so he asked Mr. Viafara to put all of the language of targets in the plan into one place so we can see them all concisely; there were some that were going to be lined out because they are no longer desired, so he was going to do that; that is what he anticipated to be distributed by Friday of next week. He added that there would be a suggested target that the MPO would put in there for those items that we understand are still desired, and that is what would be distributed next week. Williams said, then that the MPO is going to identify a target and then we are going to go from there. Haugen responded that that is correct. Kuharenko commented that the last time he was aware of this they were given a number of, and this was probably a year or year and a half ago, they were given a list and they ended up divvying them to whomever was responsible for them and then worked on figuring out what the appropriate language would be, but he doesn't think there was a discussion as to what the actual target would be at that point in time. Viafara responded that that is correct, and that is why they are in the column to be determined. Kuharenko said that the reason he is a little concerned with that is because it sounds like what is being thrown out there is that they haven't been responsive. Viafara responded that that isn't what he wanted it to sound like, but we need a cooperative effort so for the MPO it is not really appropriate for to tell you what to do because you are the ones that hire the contractors so rather we would prefer that you tell us every year, this year we built this number of sidewalks, etc.

***Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Halford, Johnson, Ellis, Riesinger, Bergman, Bail, Kuharenko, and West.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Absent: Lang, Gengler, Brooks, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Emery, Audette, Konickson, and Christianson.***

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON GRAND FORKS DOWNTOWN PARKING STUDY**

Haugen reported that the big takeaway from this study is that we can't really compare this update to the 2011 studies as the survey boundaries are slightly different, but some trends are similar. He explained that there is some less occupancy with this study so fewer vehicles are parking downtown so there is more parking available. He added that the other item is that observed overtime parking has increased since 2011. He stated that they did get some parking enforcement information and it is relatively flat and is not consistent.

Haugen commented that for event management; they observed the recent holiday parade that took place and they found that it was a poorly attended event due to weather; so they were unable to get good event parking information, thus they are trying to use the experience of staff to do that, plus the video capture that we get from the signals around the area downtown to get some idea of how traffic is building up during those bigger events to get a better sense of the event piece.

Williams asked what was left to do on this study. Haugen responded that a future demand needs to be identified, and there are management recommendations to consider to help improve the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

City's management of the parking lots. He added that there is more redevelopment being proposed in the downtown area so they are trying to assure that there is enough parking to accommodate it and then possibly identify; if you look at the occupancy with the supply there is right now one might surmise that there is more supply than demand, and then perhaps some redevelopment can take place with some of surplus lots

Information only.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

a. 2018 Annual Work Program Project Update

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

Johnson pointed out that the report shows that the Grand Forks Downtown Transportation Plan has a completion date of August 2018; shouldn't it be 2019. Haugen responded that it isn't correct. He said that the Grand Forks Transportation Plan shouldn't be on this report, it doesn't begin until 2019.

b. East Grand Forks ADA Draft

Haugen reported that the East Grand Forks ADA Transition Plan draft is available on the MPO website and the review and comment period ends December 21<sup>st</sup> and approval is in January.

c. Mn220 North Study

Haugen reported that the Mn 220 North Study has a website link on our webpage and there is an open house scheduled for December 18<sup>th</sup>.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO ADJOURN THE  
DECEMBER 12<sup>TH</sup>, 2018, TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:36 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager