

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 15th, 2019
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen Chairman, called the May 15th, 2019, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:35 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Patrick Hopkins (Proxy For Darren Laesch), MnDOT Planning Engineer; Ali Rood, Cities Area Transit; Ryan Riesinger, Airport Authority; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Jesse Kadrmas, NDDOT-Local District; and Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Local Government (Via Phone).

Absent: Brad Bail, Steve Emery, Richard Audette, Darren Laesch, Dustin Lang, Ryan Brooks, Stephanie Halford, Lane Magnuson, Dale Bergman, Jane Williams, Stacey Hanson, Mike Yavarow, Lars Christianson, and Rich Sanders.

Guest(s): Jason Peterson, NDDOT-Local District; Troy Schroeder, NWRDC; and Al Grasser, Grand Forks Engineering.

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.

Jason Peterson, NDDOT-Local District, introduced himself and stated that he is the new NDDOT Team Leader for Urban Planning for the Grand Forks District, so he will now be attending the Technical Advisory Committee meetings.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 15th, 2019**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 10TH, 2019, MINUTES OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE THE APRIL 10TH,
2019, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF NORTH DAKOTA FTA CANDIDATE PROJECTS

Haugen reported that this item is on the North Dakota side 5339 and 5310 FTA candidate projects.

Kouba stated that solicitation for candidate projects for the 5339 and 5310 funding was done in March. She explained that because of delays they extended the deadline for application submittal to May 23rd to ensure that the MPOs had adequate time to approve projects.

Kouba said that the only projects that we received were from Cities Area Transit. She referred to the staff report, included in the packet, and went over the projects briefly, adding that they are listed in the priority order approved by the City Council.

5339 Funding Requests:

1. Replacement of Roof
2. Upgrade Oil Dispensing & Disposal System
3. Upgrade Lighting, Electrical & Fire Alarm System
4. Parking Lot Improvements
5. Upgrade Shop Ventilation
6. Exterior Maintenance
7. Auto Vehicle Location Equipment
8. Disc Brake Tool
9. Concrete for ADA Boarding
10. Bus Shelter Replacements
11. Shop Pickup Replacement
12. Staff Car Replacement
13. Shop Pickup

5310 Funding Requests:

1. Mobility Manager
2. Replacement of ADA Minivan

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 15th, 2019**

Kouba stated that these projects are all consistent with the MPO Transit Development Plan and staff is requesting a recommendation from this body to the MPO Executive Policy Board that they approve the 5339 and 5310 Candidate Projects as being consistent with our plans and give them priority ranking as listed.

Kuharanko referred to Items 8 and 9, and stated that he doesn't think the totals are correct and should be double checked.

Rood reported that the building remodel/expansion is underway. She commented that the first six items on this list were included in the bidding as all alternates so if additional funding is awarded they would be incorporated into the facility project, otherwise they will have to come back later and do some retrofitting; so some of these things would add cost if they aren't able to do them during the initial building phase, so that is why they are prioritizing these projects on the facility side.

Ellis commented that East Grand Forks cannot help with any of these additional projects because MnDOT will not allow funding construction projects that aren't in Minnesota; so they can purchase movable items such as buses, furniture, etc., but they can't put any funding into construction.

MOVED BY GENGLER, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE 5339 AND 5310 CANDIDATE PROJECTS, AND GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING AS LISTED; SUBJECT TO THE CHANGES/CORRECTIONS DISCUSSED.

Voting Aye: Riesinger, Johnson, Kuharneko, Kadrmas, Ellis, Gengler, Hopkins, and Rood.

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Lang, Emery, Bail, Halford, Brooks, Audette, Laesch, Konickson, Williams, Hanson, Bergman, West, Magnuson, Sanders, and Christianson.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON CAT/UND SHUTTLE MERGER STUDY

Kouba reported that the first official meetings were held for this project in order to gather input from UND staff, students, CAT, the public, and other interested parties. She stated that they did receive good input from these meetings; one was held on campus and one off campus for the general public.

Kouba commented that the biggest take-aways is that we can see that there is quite a bit of change throughout UND's quarters of costs for their vehicles and such. She added through our analysis we found that we wouldn't qualify for any extra federal funding. She said that one of the biggest changes was that we were under the impression that UND wanted this to start this in the fall of 2019, but they are now saying that they want to wait until the fall of 2020.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 15th, 2019**

Haugen referred to a slide and explained that the study is focusing in on an hourly rate of \$37.50 as a rate assumed as the cost on a more regular annual basis; and it has swung from \$52.00 to \$26.00 per hour; so that would give us a starting point of \$360,000 for UND to operate their three shuttle services on campus, and then that is what they are working towards, to see how much it would cost CAT to provide the exact same service, but using CAT resources, and then have a comparison as to how close we are with those costs.

Haugen referred to a table and explained that they are focusing just on the Campus Shuttle, but there was an exercise done by our consultant that states that if we did the Airport Shuttle, that might open the door to some additional STIC funding being available to us. He said that the Steering Committee did discuss that, but the way the Airport Shuttle operates it would cause the need for an expansion to regular fixed routes and paratransit service in the city because once CAT takes over it becomes a public service, not a charter service to UND, and so because of that there really isn't much interest anymore to expand the shuttles from just beyond the campus, so we are back to that merger of how much it would cost Cities Area Transit to provide the service that currently is being operated by UND and that is three shuttles on campus only.

Reisinger commented that UND will continue to operate the shuttle as is out to the Airport for their needs. Haugen agreed, adding that he thinks we need to be careful because when we describe UND providing the services it is actually the UND Foundation, so he wants to make sure we understand that.

Rood stated that UND will continue to provide the shuttle service for events they are currently doing, such as sporting events, concerts, etc.; CATs scope would only be for the on-campus shuttles that circulate during regular hours.

Reisinger asked if CAT received many requests for transportation to the airport terminal. Rood responded that they get a few, but not very many. Kouba commented that when we look at needs for our Transit Development plan this is something that has come up, a shuttle out to the airport.

Haugen stated that they hope to have a presentation next month on what the arrangement might be between UND and CAT for this service. He added that wrapped into this is also a tentative purchase of three buses, and so once this study has reached it's likely conclusion that it is feasible for CAT to take over the service, we will have to do some follow-up things and thus will need to amend our Transit Development Plan to show the expansion of these three additional routes to the public, and we have to amend our T.I.P. to show the three coaches being purchased. He stated that we don't have to amend the T.I.P. to show the additional service yet as that would be in our next T.I.P., assuming everything goes through. He said that in June we will probably start the process of incorporating this service into those documents.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON FUNCTIONAL RECLASSIFICATION

Haugen reported that included in our work program this year is review of the functional classification in both North Dakota and Minnesota. He said that we are aware of the need to reclassify some roadways, but we have been holding off until the 2045 Metropolitan

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 15th, 2019**

Transportation Plan was adopted, that was done, so now we are moving ahead to begin the process of doing the reclassification update. He added that this will be the first time that on the North Dakota side, in our area, that we will be utilizing the new Federal Highway Guidelines, so that may cause some changes in how we have done things in the past.

Haugen said that on the Minnesota side we went through this exercise through the whole State of Minnesota in 2014 and 2015, so our anticipation is that few if any changes on the Minnesota side will result in this reclass, and that most of our work will be on the North Dakota side.

Haugen stated that included in the packet is a reminder of where our Federal Urban Aid Adjusted Boundary is in relationship to Corporate Boundaries. He added that in the past this used to be a more determined boundary in functional class, it is not quite as determined anymore under the new guidelines, but none-the-less we do have to show that where we have extended these things on the functional class, it is up-to-date with the new Adjusted Urban Boundary, which it is.

Haugen referred to information in the packet and pointed out that it includes the current Functional Class Map for the North Dakota side and the 2015 City of East Grand Forks Functional Classification Map.

Haugen reported that also included in the packet is, the NDDOT has promulgated some policies on functional classification, and you will see some of the determining decision points we have to make. He said that also included in the packet was a map that the NDDOT provided to us a while back that will point out some of the things that we have to address that are handled differently on the Minnesota side.

Haugen commented that one of the first things you will notice is that they are requesting no extensions of future functional class on the official functional classification map. He said that the future, now, is formally described as being in a S.T.I.P. or T.I.P. document. He referred to a map and cited an example, explaining that if a roadway was showing up in our T.I.P., then we could show it in the functional class map as being eligible for federal aid, but until then the official functional class map can't show those. He added that we are encouraged, and we will be having a separate map for planning the streets for future classifications, but the official functional classification map is only showing the existing plus what is in the T.I.P./S.T.I.P. document.

Haugen reported that the new process means that after each T.I.P./S.T.I.P. we have to do a review to see if there are projects that would cause a need for a change to the functional class because roadways are being extended or upgraded, so in the past we could let functional class sit for a while, now with the program in place it is almost an annual review to see if the functional class is current and up to date. He stated that that is something that Minnesota is consistent with with North Dakota.

Haugen commented that a point where there are significant changes; on the Minnesota side you will see that they allow functional class stubs, they don't end at another higher classified roadway. He referred to the map and cited an example of a stub roadway, and pointed out that as

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 15th, 2019**

you can see by the comments, North Dakota is not going to acknowledge these stub roadways until there is a connection to them; but if we want we can make a discussion point on their policy of why the feds allow it but North Dakota isn't allowing them. He then referred to the map and pointed out where Minnesota is allowing these stub roadways. He pointed out the roadway by New Heights Elementary and explained that the school is a traffic generator, so under the new federal guidelines stubs are allowed using the justification that it ends at a traffic generator, not needing to have an extension or connection to another roadway. He stated that that is one point of discussion that we will have with North Dakota if you want to because there are a several roadways on the North Dakota side that are stubs, and a lot of them don't have a traffic generator attached to the end of them that he is aware of, but maybe there have been some changes that he isn't aware of either.

Grasser asked if, theoretically using 36th up by Simplot as an example, let's say we wanted to apply for federal funds to do maintenance on that road, and it is no longer on the map is that going to be a catch 22 that we can't use it because it is not on the map and yet it has always been put together as a collector street. Haugen responded that that is one of the reasons we will have the discussion, because functional class is tied to federal aid, federal eligibility and a lot of programs. He said that not every program requires a direct connection to a federal aid route, but those that we work with most on our road systems do. Grasser stated that in reality it probably doesn't matter because we don't have near enough money to get in there and do it, but if the program ever became available with money, it would be unfortunate. Haugen responded that unfortunately we don't have anyone from North Dakota Central Office available to discuss this further.

Johnson joined the meeting on the phone.

Haugen commented that Mr. Johnson joined at an opportune time because we are discussing functional class, and he was just pointing out one of the differences between the Minnesota guidance and the North Dakota guidance regarding stubs; that they are allowed on the Minnesota side but the North Dakota guidance is saying no to stubs. Johnson responded that that is correct. Haugen said that a follow up question was if we declassify some of these stubs, then does that affect the federal aid eligibility. Johnson responded that it would; if they come off the system they are no longer federal aid eligible.

Haugen stated that this is one of the things that we may want have further conversation on about why the federal policy allows stubs, the Minnesota policy allows stubs, but North Dakota isn't allowing stubs, and maybe there are some stubs here that we might not need to have discussion on, but others we may want to have that discussion on. Johnson stated that we can have that conversation. He added that he isn't sure what Minnesota's interpretation of the Federal Highway Classification Guidance is.

Haugen said that the other catch-22 is not showing future extensions unless they are in a T.I.P. or S.T.I.P., but in order to get into the T.I.P. or S.T.I.P. a lot of these extensions need to show up in the functional classification map, unless they are always going to be stubs, we may never get an opportunity to put federal aid to the road. Johnson responded that on their side if you were to say

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 15th, 2019**

that you wanted to pave a road that was currently not classified, what they would do would be to determine whether or not that project is going to get funding, and then if it gets funding they would work through the functional classification process. He added that ideally if you think you are going to build a road that is not classified, if it exists today you could classify it because it was eligible prior to this re-classification, but if it doesn't exist today then there is nothing to classify.

Haugen referred to the functional classification map that included NDDOT's comments and pointed out that 40th Avenue now connects to 38th Street so that can be classified, but as 34th Street extends south of 40th Avenue and 47th Avenue extends west of Columbia Road, those would currently be stubs because there isn't a connection between those. Johnson agreed. He added that, again, the way that they have interpreted the guidelines is that if there is a major traffic generator that that dead-ends into, such as the Industrial Park so something like that, it can still be considered for classification. Haugen stated that that is what he showed an example of in Minnesota, specifically a school. Johnson responded that they haven't considered schools, but if you wanted to try and make that argument, they could visit about that internally.

Haugen said that the other comment on the map is up in the Mill Road area. He pointed out that the date on the map is like 2004, but they presented a 2012 map that would have that area included, that was signed by NDDOT and FHWA in 2012. Johnson agreed, but he believes that this is the only functionally classified road that needed to be extended because the boundary changed a little bit, and the comment is still valid; just because that boundary got updated and approved they did not do an automatic extensions of functional classification to that boundary, there still needed to be a change request for the project, so that is the reason the boundary that they have on-line and are using still actively today is still the old boundary. Haugen stated, though, that they did present the map that NDDOT signed that showed the new functional class with this new boundary in 2012. Johnson responded that if there was functional class on their that was not the intent of that being signed, that was a boundary approval not a functional class approval. Haugen stated that there were two maps that were presented, one was the boundary approval and one was the functional update because of boundary approvals, and they also had some other discussions at that time. Johnson responded that he remembers talking about this before and he had said that if you did submit that he does not have record of that submittal and he asked that it be resubmitted, and he hasn't received it yet.

Haugen commented that this was just some general highlights walking into this functional reclassification, and included in the packet was a presentation Federal Highway gave about the revision, so you have all of that information. He said that the one thing that he did not mention yet is that North Dakota is not going into some of the options or guidance that was allowed for types of functional class subcategories. He referred to a slide and cited the example that Minnesota is using other expressways and freeways as a classification of the principal arterial; NDDOT policy guidance document said they won't be able to use that, everything is principal arterials, and then also the Minnesota side is using minor collector in urban areas, North Dakota is not going to make a distinction between major and minor collectors in their urban area.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 15th, 2019**

Haugen reported that in the past our practice has been when a roadway hits the federal adjusted urban aid boundary it automatically had to change functional class; the new policy of the new guidance from Federal Highway for both States is that roadways don't change their function simply because they cross a boundary. He said that this might affect some of our roadways on the periphery on the North Dakota side, it might change the classification because the way they are currently classified is based on the old philosophy of it changed boundary so it changed class.

Haugen stated that we will be sending out copies to the NDDOT of the signed 2012 map to show that back in 2012 we did an updated functional class. He said that they will also be sending out a map to our partners on the North Dakota side and have you write on the map functional class areas that you would like to have examined, re-examined, updated.

Haugen commented that on the Minnesota side we aren't anticipating much so we will probably be doing more of a simple review of are you aware of anything we need to change now.

Haugen stated that we will also discuss where we fit with the percentages, so if we are trying to add something that you are aware of that might be going against the ranges of percentages, but those are just guidance, they aren't absolutes, so we can be above some of them and below others.

Haugen summarized that this was the intent of this agenda item today; to give a general update on the process that we follow; to list some of the discussion items that we will need to have, some of the impacts reclassification might have on some roadways and their eligibility for funding sources.

Kuharenko commented that he has read that future roadways may only be functionally classified if it is within the approved T.I.P./S.T.I.P. document. He asked if that would also extend to, say a City's Six Year Capital Improvement Plan. Johnson responded that that would depend on your local processes. He said that if the City is not willing to put something in the T.I.P. unless it is in the C.I.P. than that would be your local preference, they aren't going to have any preference or control over that relationship. Kuharenko said that that is what he is saying; right now it is calling out that a future roadway may only be functionally classified if it is in the T.I.P./S.T.I.P., his question is if the City is putting it into our own 6-year C.I.P., and we are constructing the road, whether through local funds or special assessments, would we be able to include it in the Roadway Classification Map. Johnson responded that if you put it in the T.I.P. as a locally funded regionally significant project.

Haugen reported that this is the first discussion we have had on this item. He added that we aren't on an absolute deadline to get this done, so if it takes us three or four months. Johnson commented that that might change, a letter might be going out in the next month with a deadline for this.

Johnson stated that if staff needs baseline percentages on what they currently have approved on their existing map he can get it to you. Haugen responded that he can send them whether we need them or not; we'll just have them again.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 15th, 2019**

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2019 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that included in the packet was the monthly progress report.

b. Grand Forks Airport Master Plan

Reisinger stated that he would like to give an update on the Airport's Master Plan they have been working on. He said that some here did participate in focus group meetings,

Reisinger commented that this was kicked off over three years ago, so it has been a long process for them. He explained that when it first started the primary discussion was on how to reconstruct their primary runway, which needs to be done in the next ten-year time-frame; but to do so in a way that they would maintain their air-carrier operations on the field, which is critically important.

Reisinger stated that in the past, when they have done mill and overlay rehab type projects, they are typically done in one construction season, and the last time that was done was in 2001, just prior to 9/11 and the air-carrier operations at that time operated in and out of the Air Force Base, passengers came to the old terminal building to be processed and went on buses to the Air Force Base to get on a flight, but we feel it isn't palpable to do that for an extended time as it will take up to three construction season to be able to facilitate the work required to reconstruct the primary runway; we would basically be putting a "closed" sign on our front door through the construction season, so they had to come up with alternatives to be able to facilitate the operations of the larger aircraft to stay on the field.

Reisinger commented that they did look at reconstruction of our parallel taxi-way, to make that into a temporary runway, but that had limitations because of restrictions with distances to buildings and other such aspects plus the taxi-way as it currently exists is in good condition and they would need to completely reconstruct it because it isn't designed for high speed or for runway use.

Reisinger stated that they also considered constructing a completely new runway, a north-south runway 550 feet to the west of the current primary runway; they could build that and once it was done, close the current runway, that would be another way to help the facility operation during construction.

Reisinger commented that a third alternative was to extend our crosswind runway to make it longer for the commercial operations, and then reconstruct the primary runway and use that extended crosswind as the primary runway during that new construction. He stated that ultimately this one also accomplishes several other things; capacity enhancements, safety enhancements relative to the number of operations that they have.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 15th, 2019**

Reisinger reported that throughout this whole study their number of take-offs and landings have increased from roughly 300,000 to 368,000. He said that last year they set an all-time record for operations; UND enrollment went up, and this makes us the 21st busiest airport in the United States, which a lot of people don't realize, and so we are constantly looking at ways that we can enhance safety with a lot of policies and procedures in place, and with UND and the Traffic Control Tower, extending the crossroad would be a significant capacity enhancement and safety enhancement because the larger aircraft and east/west traffic flow would be able to operate in the same direction during those sorts of wind conditions as they do with north/south wind direction.

Reisinger said he wanted to bring this up today because they have been having successful meetings with the FAA; which, because of the costs involved with these sorts of projects we will need to get approval from the FAA Headquarter as well, and he is happy to report that they held some meetings back in February and indication is that they are considering these projects to be eligible and justifiable; so their goal right now is to move forward with wrapping up their Master Plan process, and one of the things they haven't done yet it to hold a public open house so that has been tentatively scheduled for Thursday, May 30th from 3:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. He said that they will be sending out a press release on that, and certainly everyone here is invited to participate in that, seeking the public comment as part of the Master Plan process.

Reisinger stated that once they receive the comments and consider those things, they will also be moving towards their Airport Authority making the final determination on the preferred alternative. He said that he would say that at this stage the extension of the crossroad and subsequent reconstruction of the primary runway is their preliminary preferred alternative. He added that, along that line, the extension of the crosswind would likely require a partial relocation of County 5, just to the west of the airport, and they have been in conversations with the County throughout this process. He said that that sort of a relocation is eligible for federal funding through the FAA and is part of that work; so he wanted to bring to your attention that that would be at least one piece that would be subject for consideration

Reisinger said that he just wanted to give this brief update on the process, and would certainly be happy to give a more detailed presentation if desired. Haugen responded that we will have further conversation about that, but for now the open house will take place on May 30th. He asked where it will be held. Reisinger responded that it will be in their board room in the Terminal.

c. MnDOT Decarbonization Project

Haugen reported that earlier this morning he sent information on a new project that MnDOT is doing; it is decarbonizing transportation. He stated that the most interest is they are having some regional meetings and our closest opportunity is in Bemidji on June 5th. He said that there are two different timelines; 2:30 to 4:30 or 6:00 to 8:00 at Bemidji State University in the Memorial Union.

Haugen stated that if anyone wants more information on this; they did hold a meeting of some technical stakeholders back in April so there are slides, notes, and other information available to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 15th, 2019**

look at to get some sense of what the purpose of this is. He added that there is a State Next Generation Energy Act, which is a State of Minnesota document that talks about goals on reduction they want to meet and achieve, and their current status is that they aren't progressing to reach this 30% reduction by 2025, so renewed interest on this issue. He commented that if anyone is interested you can contact the coordinator to double up on rides.

Hopkins reported that MnDOT is looking to, in 2023, request three signals on 2-B. He said that there was a meeting held last week where, after this Mn220No Corridor Study, they are looking at adding a signal at 14th and 220 into that project, as well as the ADA crosswalk at 220 and 17th Street. He explained that those are both pending the results of Darren Laesch's discussion on available funding from the City; about a \$600,000 cost share, so depending on what funding they have available, they will see if it will be included or not. He added that they have an ADA review wack on the three signals on 2B, as well as 14th and 17th Streets; so he is wondering if anyone from the MPO would like to join their Central Office ADA Coordinator, who is looking into scheduling this and it is a high priority, in participating.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ROOD, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO ADJOURN THE MAY 22ND, 2019
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:27 P.M.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager