

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2019
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen Chairman, called the April 10th, 2019, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:48 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning; Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Consulting - Engineer; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; Ryan Riesinger, Airport Authority; Paul Konickson, MnDOT; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; and Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Local Government (Via Phone).

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

Guest(s): Mohammad Smadi, NDSU-ATAC; Michael Huot, Property Owner; Nancy Graham, MnDOT Acting Planning Director; Patrick Hopkins, MnDOT Planning Engineer; and Jim Mertz, Bolton And Menk.

Staff: 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.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen stated that because we have some new people present today, he would ask that everyone please state their name and the organization they represent.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2019**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 13TH, 2019, MINUTES OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE THE MARCH
13TH, 2019, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS
PRESENTED.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF ITS REGIONAL ARCHITECTURE PRESENTATION

Haugen reported that this is our Technical Advisory Committee kick-off of our update to our ITS Regional Architecture.

Viafara stated that we have Mohammad Smadi from A.T.A.C. here today to give us a presentation on the ITS Regional Architecture. He said that Mr. Smadi's role is to provide information on the new update for the Regional ITS Architecture.

Viafara commented that last time this was updated was about five years ago, and one of the ideas is to assist in the development of elements to implement new ITS initiatives and strategies; most of them are included in the Metropolitan Plan and also to assist different agencies that are users of the system in terms of making every effort to address their needs.

Viafara stated that the key objectives for this update are:

- 1) Address changes in regional needs
- 2) Changes in the number of stakeholders as many have moved on to other positions or are no longer in the agencies they represented.
- 3) Changes in the scope of services that were considered when the scope was under due consideration
- 4) There are new ITS deployment projects in the region
- 5) Bring some ideas about the National ITS Architecture

Viafara said that a wide range of stakeholders have been invited to attend this presentation and the one that will be at 3:30 today to provide further guidance and insight into what is expected to be, so with this in mind he would like to introduce Mohammad Smadi.

Smadi commented that he would be giving a brief presentation today just to introduce the process. He said that as part of the overview he will quickly go over the conditions of what the public transportation systems are and what the architecture provides for us; then he will touch on the previous versions of the Grand Forks/East Grand Forks Regional Architecture; then he will discuss what the update process is; and then he will talk a bit about what the next steps will be.

Presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) ensued.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2019**

Smadi summarized, stating that Regional ITS Architecture is a planning tool for ITS deployment. He said that the architecture is a living product, and that happens through constant updates.

Smadi stated that one nice thing about the architecture is that it is technology independent, so we focus on services rather than specific pieces of technology, and that gives the architecture a little bit more of a life because technology, as we all know, changes faster a lot of the time; and when we are planning we focus on what our needs are and what sort of services can satisfy these needs.

Smadi commented that this effort will help us meet the federal requirements for ITS project funding. He explained that federal requirements require us to have an up-to-date architecture in place in order to be eligible to receive funding from the Highway Trust Fund.

Smadi referred to a slide illustrating how the regional ITS architecture is an integral part of the planning process, and went over it briefly, pointing out that there are four objectives; safety, infrastructure condition, congestion reduction, and system reliability, that are supported by the regional ITS architecture. He added that they then come up with the service packages that address each of the planning objectives, as explained here for Objective 3, congestion reduction.

Smadi pointed out that the Grand Forks/East Grand Forks Regional Architecture was developed in 2005, updated in 2008 and 2014. He stated that there isn't really a set update horizon, but as Mr. Viafara said, a five-year timeframe seems reasonable. He pointed out that there are six services areas within the architecture; and there are subservices within those, such as for Centers there is traffic management, emergency management, transit management, information service provider, archived data management, and maintenance and construction management. He stated that for each of those they would customize it for what exists in Grand Forks; who are the players, who are the stakeholders that own and operate the center, and all the interconnections that are required in order to perform.

Smadi commented that the reason we update is because the architecture needs to be a living document and that is done through constant updates; and we need to account for changes in the region with stakeholders, priorities, goals, objectives, project status, etc. He said that there are also changes in the national architecture as well; and the latest version of the national architecture integrates connected vehicle services. He explained that previously this wasn't the first product, but in this version these are combined and it really reorganizes the whole architecture of different service areas now and we also have different service packages.

Smadi referred to a slide and stated that this is how we started, with this ITS picture that shows vehicles and communication efforts. He said that this is kind of what we are going towards at this point, this is the connected environment where we have vehicles that interconnect among each other, and also with the infrastructure; and we also have the user personal devices, the smart phone essentially, that also interacts with the vehicle and the infrastructure. He stated that this kind of environment provides us with options that we did not have before. He explained that if you wanted to get a message out to motorists you will use dynamic message signs, and that is

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2019**

really one of the few avenues that we had to get information out to the drivers, whereas now the information can go directly to the vehicle and would be displayed to the vehicle operator directly, so in this connected environment each vehicle can potentially be a sensor for us providing valuable data.

Smadi commented that, as Mr. Viafara mentioned, later this afternoon we will have the official project kick-off, and then after that we will be meeting with stakeholders based on their focus area. He stated that then he will work on updating the system inventory based on the results of the small group meetings; will update the regional needs based on the MPOs consistent plan and also update everything else that you would like to add. He said that they will also update the different service area.

Smadi stated that they are hoping to implement the updates in October/November and will have a draft and final report for your review in December.

DISCUSSION:

Bergman said that he has a lot of questions. He said that you are talking about having national and regional and trying to make that stuff all incorporated together, but they have had difficulty trying to make things work together; an example is they have Synchronatics for their GPS stuff, which changes their head signs, which they had to fight with GFI, a paradox company that has the stuff, and they refused to talk to each other until they paid them \$800 to have that conversation to just send the information, so how is it going to work if we start getting bigger than that. Smadi responded that they have a transit feeding, and he would have to look at what you had in the previous regional architecture. He said that one thing that the architecture focuses on is the use of standards; so he isn't sure if your vendors were using standards as required so that is something that he would be happy to work closely with Mr. Bergman on. Bergman commented that it would be interesting to see how they are going to come up with all that, they used the same connection point 21808, it is just the language they are using back and forth, a simple little process, and we have to pay all that money for something so simple.

Bergman commented that he understands vendors wanting to keep their stuff, that is all fine and dandy, but if it just needs to talk; we've got that same issue right now, if we start looking at and use GTT stuff on the opticoms that they have, and sometimes they have had a lot of difficulty getting even those to talk back and forth; so when he writes specs now he includes that they have to be able to talk to anyone they have because he refuses to listen to them say that they don't. Smadi added that they can also talk about some things that they can do on the architecture side to kind of help alleviate some of these issues that you are having.

Information only.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT MINNESOTA SIDE 2020-2023 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that normally in April we are producing a Draft T.I.P. document, and under our ideal processes we would have a document that covers both sides of the Red River, however

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2019**

today, as well as in the recent past, we are looking at only the Minnesota side document for consideration.

Haugen stated that a public notice was issued letting the public know that this document has been available in our offices and on-line for review and comment. He said that they did have MnDOT do some corrections that he will go over right now.

Haugen referred to the 2020-2023 T.I.P. document and went pointed out that some of the numbering was incorrect. He stated that 19a and 19b have been changed to 20a and 20b.

Williams asked about East Grand Forks Project #3, where it states that the local share is coming from the City of Grand Forks, and asked if that was correct. Haugen responded that it is correct.

Haugen referred to East Grand Forks Project #14, the Bygland Road/Rhinehart Drive intersection project, and stated that the project number should be changed from 129 to 119.

Haugen reported that they have been working with the District Office and the MnDOT Central Office for Transit to reach an agreement on the funding amounts for the transit projects. He said that they have gone back and forth several times and they believe that these are the numbers that should be incorporated into the Draft ATIP and the Draft STIP.

Haugen stated that we did publish a public notice for the public to submit comments by noon today. He said that other than MnDOT comments they did not receive any other written comments by noon today. He asked if there was anyone present for comments, there was no one present.

Haugen said that with the changes discussed staff is recommending that the Technical Advisory Committee forward a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board approve the Draft Minnesota Side 2020-2023 T.I.P.

Williams asked, if the expenditure is from Grand Forks for the local, does it need to be shown on the North Dakota side as well. Haugen responded that it does not need to be. He added that if it were a joint procurement it would need to be, such as the bridge projects we have been doing where we show both sides, but in this case this is Minnesota Federal dollars being used and the local match is being provided by the City of Grand Forks, there are no Minnesota State Funds, there are no East Grand Forks funds attached to the project. He said that it is a way for Minnesota FTA dollars to contribute to facilities that are used by East Grand Forks but are located in North Dakota.

Haugen commented that he would also like to make everyone aware that our T.I.P. also serves as the Transit Operators Program of Projects.

MOVED BY KONICKSON, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD TO APPROVE THE DRAFT MINNESOTA SIDE 2020-2023 T.I.P., SUBJECT TO CHANGES AS DISCUSSED.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2019**

Voting Aye: Bail, Halford, Riesinger, Konickson, Johnson, Kuharneko, and Bergman.

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Kadrmass, Lang, Ellis, Emery, Gengler, Audette, Laesch, Hanson, Rood, West, Magnuson, Sanders, and Christianson.

Haugen reported that as noted in the staff report North Dakota is still working on a document. He said that the North Dakota MPO Directors met with NDDOT staff on Monday and there might be an opportunity that we will have a draft in May. Johnson agreed that that may be a possibility. Haugen stated that we are all trying to work towards having a combined T.I.P. document this fall.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION PLAN RFP

Haugen reported that in our work program is a study of the Downtown Transportation between Grand Forks and East Grand Forks. He said that there was a lot of discussion on the scope of work; and he would like to note that the dollar amount in the staff report does have an extra “1” in it, so the budget should be \$120,000.

Haugen stated that the consultant will begin in 2019 and complete the work in 2020. He referred to the scope of work and went over the timeline briefly, pointing out that they hope to have this on the NDDOTs Qualification Based Selection site by the end of April; the proposals are requested to be in by the end of May, which will give us almost two weeks to review and a selection made. He added that on June 18th we hope to finalize the final scope of work, present it to the MPO Board on June 19th for their approval, and then a document will be submitted to the NDDOT for their concurrence, process, etc.; so the notice to proceed will be at the end of June. He said that the first draft is scheduled for May of 2020 and the final draft by the end of June 2020.

Haugen pointed out that there will be a seven member selection committee. He added that they will be working with the soon to be released Downtown Action Plan for Grand Forks. He said that they are also working off of the Greater Minnesota Mobility Plan that identified some mobility issues in East Grand Forks and are also working with the knowledge that the Sorlie Bridge project being just a repaint and the DeMers Avenue reconstruction just providing the capacity that is there to-date, that in the future we have higher demand than what the capacity shows so a lot of this work will be to try to see how we can address the traffic issues without looking at capacity expansions.

Haugen said that, kind of piggy-backing off of the ITS Regional Architecture, MnDOT is scheduling updates to the traffic signals in Downtown East Grand Forks in 2023. He added that one of the issues in past studies between the two downtowns has been difference of equipment and their inability to communicate and coordinate well, so we are hoping that in conjunction with this and the ITS Regional Architecture update the equipment that is installed on the Minnesota side will better coordinate and communicate with the equipment on the North Dakota side so that we can take advantage of some of the coordination progression etc through the signal system.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2019**

Haugen commented that we also know that we are doing the Grand Forks Downtown Parking Plan so some of the analysis and data that is being used for that will feed into this Downtown Transportation Plan.

Haugen stated that a Steering Committee will be formed for this. He said that he did notice that he left off the NDDOT Central Office and the North Dakota Federal Highways; they have in the past requested that they be included on all Steering Committees, so he will add them to the list.

Haugen pointed out that beside the general public meetings, they also added presentations as part of the general public meetings to both City Councils to assist with the process.

Haugen commented that there are a lot of recent studies where data was gathered to work from; the MPO staff, with temporary help just collected turning movement counts at all remaining intersections that we don't have video counts taking place already.

Haugen stated that the last piece is the study area is covering essentially the DeMers overpass touchdown point to the DeMers Avenue intersection with Central Avenue in East Grand Forks and University to the north, and the railroad plaza to the south.

Haugen reported that the draft scope of work was provided to key agencies several weeks ago for review and comment. He said that they did receive some comments, which have been addressed, and with that they would like to see if there are any further comments, changes, or a motion to recommend approval.

Halford referred to the scope of work; Item H – Other Requirements, where it says that the consultant will update the Study Project Manager on an on-going basis, and asked if that would also go to the committee as well. She pointed out that there are five meetings scheduled so would they also get those updates at those meetings as well. Haugen responded that they will get updates at the meetings as well.

Williams stated that she has a question on terminology; this is a study so is it going to have alternatives in it or are you developing a finite plan. Haugen responded that it will have a mixture of both, it will have alternatives. Williams said, then, that it isn't really a plan it is a study. She stated that a plan infers that you've done your footwork and now you have the plan and now implementation is next, so this is a study. Haugen responded what the definition of "is" is, it is going to have components of all of these things in it, it will have alternatives, it will have a range of alternatives, some will be reviewed and possibly removed from further consideration because of inconsistency with the overall transportation plan, so that is the plan component; and it will also have study things that aren't in the plan, they aren't true alternatives, as many of us would consider alternatives as being when you do a round about or a traffic signal, or dual left turn lanes displaced, etc.; there will be study things that we will look at different ways for traffic, particularly multi-modal ways to look at how traffic demand can be met without looking at vehicle capacity expansion, so it is going to have kind of all three of those pieces so one thing versus another probably isn't as accurate as to try to take it down to a specific one or the other. Williams said, then, that it is a non-binding document, it isn't something that once it is done it

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2019**

has to be implemented. Haugen responded that ultimately it could be binding, it could be considered a fantastic document that we want to adopt and update our Long Range Transportation Plan to incorporate. Williams said, though, that that isn't necessarily how it is going to go. Haugen responded that until we go through the process we don't know how it will end up.

Kuharenko asked if we maybe want to call this a study instead of a plan, because if we are looking at the alternatives, we don't necessarily know if it is something that we are going to want incorporated or have as binding, so if we call it a study instead that might give us more flexibility in the future. Williams added that a plan is something that you are going to do while a study is going to give you alternatives to develop a plan. Haugen responded, again, that this might get us to both; some point to a plan and some point to a study. Williams stated that this is similar to what Mr. Grasser said in an e-mail about the word "project"; she thinks this is kind of the same thing and she doesn't want anyone to get the idea that when it is done that this is going to be "the" plan, this is a study to develop a plan, and that all depends on dollars and everything else.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY HALFORD, TO INCORPORATE THE PROVISIONS DISCUSSED FOR THE STEERING COMMITTEE; TO REVISE THIS FROM DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION PLAN TO DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION STUDY; AND TO ENSURE THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE GETS A MONTHLY UPDATE.

Voting Aye: Bail, Halford, Riesinger, Konickson, Johnson, Kuharneko, and Bergman.

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Kadrmass, Lang, Ellis, Emery, Gengler, Audette, Laesch, Hanson, Rood, West, Magnuson, Sanders, and Christianson.

MATTER OF LISTING OF OBLIGATIONS

Haugen reported that normally with our Draft T.I.P. document we include two items that are described in the staff report; one is a progress report on all of the projects that are scheduled to be done this construction year or are being funded out of this year's federal fiscal year; and then the other one is the Annual List of Obligations.

Haugen referred to the staff report and pointed out that it explains what the Annual List of Obligations is and why we need to do it. He explained that the Annual List of Obligation is more of a direct requirement from the Federal Government where we identify what federal funds were programmed versus what were obligated to the projects. He added that the requirement is that we also make sure that we provide enough information so that someone can look at the T.I.P. and be able to see what relationship to the T.I.P. the project obligations are, and to meet that requirement we have been using our T.I.P. spreadsheet by just adding in a highlighted section. He cited an example of a project in East Grand Forks and went over it briefly. Haugen stated that they asked all of the agencies that had projects identified to give us both the progress report and then also the Annual Listing of Obligations. He said that for the most part

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2019**

we were able to get that information, and Mr. Bergman is now giving us his information for his projects, so we will include them in as well.

Haugen commented that a lot of the obligation lists come directly from the NDDOT on the North Dakota side. He said that for the Minnesota side, since there are very few MnDOT only projects, most of the information comes from the locals.

Haugen said that you will notice that there are a couple of projects on the North Dakota side where the consultant has been hired but there has been no expenditures yet, so we aren't showing any obligations for those projects yet. He added that some are bid this week, but when the projects go to bid we also have an agreement already signed with the feds as to what their obligations will be for those projects. He pointed out that on the reconstruction of downtown DeMers the numbers for that one block stretch are a little less, so you can see that in this case the obligation is considerably less than what it was programmed to be.

Haugen commented that the other point of this exercise is to also manage our T.I.P.; to see what T.I.P. modifications or amendments we should be doing. He referred to the traffic signal on DeMers and Columbia Road West, and explained that it came in considerably higher, the obligations are considerably higher, so the federal amount rose beyond our limits so there should be a T.I.P. amendment coming on that project.

Haugen reported that one thing that was discussed at the NDDOT MPO Directors meeting on Monday is exactly when are these things really expected to be provided. He stated that because we haven't been doing Draft ND T.I.P.s in the past, all of this information has been put into an appendix of our Final T.I.P. document, and there it becomes kind of "old news"; so you will notice in the staff report that we really don't have an action item on this, so we are treating it as an informational item and we will get further guidance and agreement from both States as to when these documents, or what documents should be included in, or a separate document at some point.

Haugen stated that a lot of the projects are either already bid, or are in progress; although there are a few that are intentionally going to be bid later in the year, and those are noted.

Information only.

MATTER OF JOINT CITY COUNCIL BRIDGE MEETING

Haugen reported that a copy of the agenda for the Joint City Council meeting that was announced last week is included in the packet. He pointed out that the meeting will be held at 5:30 p.m. tonight in the Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers.

Haugen stated that he was asked to give a presentation on our 2045 process, so he is preparing that, but it is information that we have all seen before, as far as the Technical Advisory Committee and the Executive Policy Board, and hopefully both City Councils, Planning Commissions and State Agencies have all seen it as well, so he isn't creating anything new he is

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2019**

just copying and pasting old stuff into a shortened document that still provides sufficient information.

Halford said that she has a question on this; we are in kind of a unique situation with the timing of the closure of the Sorlie and Point bridges right now, but where do you think our traffic levels are at on that one bridge and then is that something that that level of traffic would be at where we would expect it to be at in 20 years from now, and what that level of service is if we do or don't add another bridge, is this kind of where the traffic might be at in the future. Haugen responded that he can't give an answer on that, unless someone else knows the exact number of traffic pouring over the Kennedy. Mertz responded that there is about 20,000 now and in 2035 it is expected to be about 30,000 for the Kennedy Bridge Plan, but that was the last he saw. Haugen said that he thinks Ms. Halford is asking, because the other two bridges are changing how people cross, there is only one, so the media went and found numbers and assumed that everybody from the Point will go to the Kennedy, everybody from the Sorlie will go to the Kennedy, but right now he can't say whether that is true or did the fact that there is only the Kennedy that there are people that are taking a trip just to see what it is like, adding to the volume, so unless someone counted the traffic, and he is sure that yesterdays traffic will be different than todays traffic, versus Fridays traffic because people will adjust, so he really can't answer that question.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2019 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that the monthly progress report is included for your review.

Williams commented that they have been going back and forth with the classification thing, and it is being shown to start mid-summer, but we were talking about May, is that correct. Haugen responded that to him May is summer, school is out for some of the time. Williams said that to her May is still spring, so she just wanted to verify when it was that you were going to start, but she guesses it will start in May. Haugen responded that that is correct.

Information only.

b. Skewed Intersection Open House April 11th

Haugen reported that tomorrow night, in the Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers is the Skewed Intersection Study Open House.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2019**

c. Mn220No Open House April 16th

Haugen reported that next Tuesday, here in the East Grand Forks Training Room, will be the Mn220No Corridor Study Open House.

Information only.

d. NDDOT/MNDOT POSITION CHANGES

Haugen reported that on Monday we heard that the North Dakota Federal Highway liaison has been reassigned to Virginia Federal Highway, he is going to be leaving at the end of May so, on a temporary basis our Federal Highway lead person will be from Minnesota.

Haugen said that if you aren't familiar with North Dakota Federal Highway, it was Stephanie Hickman that retired at the end of the year and her job has been filled, and it is a staff person out of Montana DOT, so that position will be filled. He added that, for those that are familiar, Wendall Meyer was the District Administrator, but he has shifted to Minnesota, so that position is vacant. He said that there was communication saying that they might hold off on; Richard Duran was our liaison, but they might hold off filling his position until the final District Administrator is filled so that is why there is a temporary assignment.

Haugen asked Mr. Johnson if he had any further information for this item.

Johnson responded that, as some of you may be aware, Chad Oren was the Assistant Director of STIP Development is moving to Project Development and the Transportation Director, Tom Sorel announced his retirement and he will be done at the end of this legislative session, but he will remain the interim director until the Governor appoints a new director.

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO ADJOURN THE APRIL 10TH, 2019 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager