

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2019  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Teri Kouba, MPO Senior Planner, called the July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2019, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:32 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Patrick Hopkins (Proxy For Darren Laesch), MnDOT Planning Engineer; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; Richard Audette, Airport Authority; Jason Peterson, NDDOT-Local District; Nick West, Grand Forks Highway Engineer; and Michael Johnson (via conference phone), NDDOT-Local Government.

Absent: Brad Bail, Steve Emery, Jesse Kadrmas, Ryan Riesinger, Darren Laesch, Dustin Lang, Ryan Brooks, Stephanie Halford, Paul Konickson, Lane Magnuson, Ali Rood, David Kuharenko, Stacey Hanson, Mike Yavarow, Lars Christianson, and Rich Sanders.

Guest(s): Al Grasser, Grand Forks Engineering.

Staff: 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**

Kouba declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 12<sup>TH</sup>, 2019, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE THE JUNE 12TH, 2019, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2019**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FY2019 T.I.P. AMENDMENT**

Kouba reported that Cities Area Transit received an award of \$1,200,000.00 to purchase buses and we need to amend it into our FY2019 T.I.P.

Kouba opened the public hearing.

There was no one present for discussion, and no comments were received by noon today.

Kouba closed the public hearing.

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FY2019 T.I.P. AMENDMENT, SUBJECT TO REVIEW AND APPROVAL FROM THE GRAND FORKS CITY COUNCIL.***

***Voting Aye: Audette, Johnson, Williams, Peterson, Ellis, Gengler, Hopkins, West, and Bergman.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Absent: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FINAL DRAFT OF MN 220 NO. STUDY**

Viafara reported that staff is seeking approval of the Final Draft MN 220 No. Study Report. He stated that this study was completed and a link for the report was provided to you, as well as the presentation, describing all the different phases of the project was also linked to the report.

Viafara referred to the staff report and briefly went over the information contained in it. He pointed out that the proposed alternatives strive to improve the following deficiencies in the corridor:

- 1) Access/Traffic Control Device Considerations
- 2) Access Management
- 3) Traffic Signals
- 4) Pedestrian Improvement Strategies

Viafara stated that the alternatives were outlined as follows:

- 1) Near term improvements (2019-2024)
  - a) Improve Pedestrian Crosswalk at MN 220 N at 17<sup>th</sup> St. NW – Estimated cost \$71,600 – 100% MnDOT funded.
- 2) Mid-term improvements (2025-2034)
  - b) Traffic Signal Replacement and Design/Operation improvements at MN 220 N at 14<sup>th</sup> St. NW – Estimated cost \$519,088 – 50% State/50% City funded.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2019**

- c) Intersection Control & Geometric Improvements at MN 220 N at U.S. 2 – Estimated Cost \$6,021,417.00 – 90% State/10% City (City is responsible for 25% of Signal and Street Improvements on DeMers Ave).
- 3) Long-term improvements (2035-2045+)
  - d) Intersection Control Improvements on MN 220 N at 17<sup>th</sup> St. NW – Estimated Cost \$6,340,700.00 – 80% State/20% City (City is responsible for improvements on local streets approaching the circle).

Viafara said that if this report is approved we would like to advance the report into the possibility to amend the Metropolitan Planning Transportation Plan in order for these projects to be included in the T.I.P., particularly now that we have sources of funding and support for these alternatives.

Hopkins asked when the second improvement was at 220 and 17<sup>th</sup>; you said the first one is a crosswalk enhancing the pedestrian safety and the second one was around \$6 million. Viafara responded that the other one is at 17<sup>th</sup> and it is located in Year 2035 to 2045 so it is in the long-term and includes the intersection for control improvements at that particular intersection of 220 and 17<sup>th</sup>. He added that the associates anticipated 80% from the State, 20% from the City, but there are provisions so it is possible for the improvements on the local streets that are approaching the proposed circle.

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FINAL DRAFT OF MN 220 NORTH STUDY.***

***Voting Aye: Audette, Johnson, Williams, Peterson, Ellis, Gengler, Hopkins, West, and Bergman.***  
***Voting Nay: None.***  
***Absent: None.***

**MATTER OF U.S.2/U.S.81 SKEWED INTERSECTOIN STUDY UPDATE**

Kouba reported that the Steering Committee met at the end of June and went through the alternatives.

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

Kouba commented that all of the alternatives kind of have a basic improvement plan to improve the sidewalks along Mill Road and connect them up better to Washington Street to utilize the traffic control signals and kind of close out the pedestrian bike path on the back of a lot of the businesses, as well as to bring in medians to control traffic flow better.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2019**

Kouba said that another improvement, which is highly scored, and that is one of the very basic improvements is putting in gates and things like that for the actual railroad, as well as looking at the option of managing or closing out some of the redundant access points along Gateway so we don't have as much conflict with people slowing down to enter various businesses. She stated that this also includes using 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue North as a backage road.

Kouba stated that another alternative was to build a new road using the fairground access road with no actual traffic control being put in place at the intersection of that new roadway.

Kouba commented that they are just looking at trying to improve some of the skew of each of them and bringing them to as close to 90-degrees as possible.

Kouba said that they also looked at doing some signal timing as well as installing sensors to alert people when trains are crossing the roadway ahead. She added that they want to make sure these displays are installed in East Grand Forks as well.

Kouba reported that the Mill has installed a lot of new rail, and has installed sensors to alert people know that the train is in the intersection but not be in the best location for making decisions further away from that area where the train could be crossing.

Kouba stated that they also looked at a total realignment of the rail so there would no longer be a Mill Spur being accessed; the train would be coming around further north and connecting to the new rail system.

Kouba commented that there was also some consolidation of intersections looked at, but not all of them worked well nor did anything to reduce crashes.

Kouba stated that there is also the Grade Separation alternative, which is, along with the road realignment alternative, very expensive as they both involve the purchase of property and such so aren't well received, although they are ranked fairly high and did receive some input from the Steering Committee, however even though there isn't a lot of interest in the Grade Separation from the committee, they do want to get input from the public on it and all the alternatives.

Williams referred to Alternative E,F and R; the existing footprint with railroad realignment, and asked what is the specific realignment. Kouba responded that the realignment is from the Glasston Study where they move the unit train landing further north of town and then because of the new train tracks that have been installed by the Mill, the realignment would have to be further north probably closer to the Washington Interchange. Williams stated that she wanted to verify that because the cost is shown as being \$5-\$7 million; is that for realigning the tracks and everything. Kouba responded that they will be getting an updated cost as they were told by the Mill that that cost was significantly low so that will be adjusted. She said that they will be reestablishing these numbers before they take them to the public. She added that they haven't taken any of these alternatives before the public yet because they wanted input from the Steering Committee first.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2019**

Williams asked then, in the ranking, where you have Number 2, is that just the pedestrian improvements. Kouba responded it is. She explained that that is the very first alternative EF. Williams asked if there was any discussion about having a short range and a long range, so it would basically be 1a would be #2 and 1b would be the realignment of the rail, was there anything like that discussed. Kouba responded that they haven't at this point but that would probably be some sort of when improvements could be phased in.

Williams asked if the Glasston Study had a cost in it. Kouba responded that she believes that they ended up starting with those costs and then they just projected out to present dollars.

Williams referred to the pedestrian improvement map and said that she is looking at the southwest corner of 5<sup>th</sup> and Gateway where it is showing the pedestrian trail going across the tracks and asked if there is a pedestrian crossing there now. Bergman responded that most people use it as drive-in to get to the Dairy Queen. Williams said that she doesn't think there is sidewalk along there. Bergman responded that there is sidewalk along there.

Peterson asked if this was the update to the committee meeting that met, where does it go from here. Kouba responded that they need to bring the alternatives to the public, and they are looking at doing that the beginning of August, and then there will be a comment period on the report, and it will also go to the Steering Committee for their input as well. Grasser asked if the potentially impacted properties, from the alternatives, get a specific invite to these public meetings. Kouba responded that they invited everyone along the corridor by sending a postcard telling them about the first public meeting and they will be doing the same thing with the next meeting. She added that there are also a couple of property owners on the Steering Committee as well.

**MATTER OF FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION UPDATE**

Kouba reported that at our last Technical Advisory Committee meeting we looked at our functional class and did reach agreement on some issues such as stubs, and the fact that they are not going to be allowed by NDDOT, and other such things.

Kouba referred to a slide presentation and pointed out that 55<sup>th</sup> is already currently in and at the last meeting it was stated that Cherry Street would end up being in down to 62<sup>nd</sup> within the T.I.P. period. Grasser said that it doesn't have to be in the T.I.P., it just has to be within the T.I.P. period, if it is funded locally. Kouba responded that it should be in the T.I.P. even though it is funded locally.

Kouba commented that they have added those various areas already agreed on into our numbers for 2019 but there are still some areas that are open for discussion. She stated that one of the things, when we started looking at what the State had for numbers, for mileage for our area's categories, there was about a mile difference, and when we started to investigate there was one area that we had functionally classified, but because of the difference between the adjusted federal aid urban boundary, that was not included in the State's numbers. She added that there is also a lot of cross-overs that we had classified that are connecting the frontage roads to the main

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2019**

roadways that they also don't have classified as well, and not just along Gateway but along Washington as well, so that will need to be discussed as part of the frontage road discussion. She said that another part of this is that NDDOT is saying that we need to take out these stub frontage roads because they are not connecting at both ends by functionally classified roads.

Grasser commented that the reason these frontage roads don't connect with anything is because you've got the Interstate cutting them off so he doesn't know if that is really fair compared to an area where you just have a frontage road to nowhere. Kouba pointed out an area that the State asked us to not have functionally classified as well, so it is all the little stubs along the way that don't really connect to anything, and there are a good portion of them on Washington as well that don't necessarily connect to anything.

Grasser asked if this same exercise is being done by the other MPOs in the State. Kouba responded that it is up to each MPO as to when they want to update their functional classification maps, or they need to update any kind of functional classification such as when they install a new connection like 55<sup>th</sup>, then they would need to go through the update process and let the State know that that needs to be functionally classified and have it included on the map.

Grasser said that what he is hearing is that we are implementing policy decisions at the State level to, in this case Grand Forks, and he is just wondering if that shouldn't be a broader discussion with all of the entities at the same time to come to a common agreement or census or a challenge to what the DOT policy decisions are. He added that it seems that the MPOs in North Dakota should at least have discussion and awareness of those policy changes as opposed to each one discovering what the new policies are. Kouba responded that the feds changed a lot of their policies back in 2013, and Minnesota recently went through this process in the 2014/2015 time period, which is the reason why we aren't really looking at East Grand Forks because a lot of those were dealt with then to include especially the minor collector category. She added that North Dakota has given their view of the policy so we are just viewing it as all collectors, and we are no longer looking at stubs and things like that so it is NDDOT's interpretation of how they are going to handle the new rules set by the feds.

Grasser commented that, again, he thinks there should be a broader input to that discussion, that is his thought, and it would be his recommendation that the MPOs and the State discuss it and come to an agreement. He said that he just thinks that we are at point now days where it is harder and harder for a government entity just to impose and say "now, this is how we are going to do it" without any input from affected parties, and it just doesn't quite feel right to him that we haven't had detailed discussion, at least with the MPOs at the State level, that would be a good place to at least have that general discussion. He added that it is a bit of a Catch-22 because on one hand there really aren't the dollars put into it to do anything, but we never know what the future is going to bring, and if you declassify something now you make it ineligible for any kind of future program that we don't know about, and the example that they talk about is the Urban Grants Program, and here there is a discussion about we declassify 3<sup>rd</sup> Street and 4<sup>th</sup> Street, no, why would we do that when we have a specific program targeted to improve those streets, but again to him it is an example of, at the local level, where he would be reluctant to take things out of the program. He stated that there are a few that make sense, but generally speaking most

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2019**

don't. He said that he doesn't mind quite so much changing the classification as he does the declassification.

Williams stated that her concern on the frontage roads is, the title is frontage road, and it is part of the highway system and the reason they were installed is so that we did not have direct access from businesses onto the main highway and facilitate it so if you want to go to any of those businesses that are on the frontage roads you have to, obviously, exit where there is an opening so all those vehicles that are going in front of a business to get to the next business would normally not be on that road, they would just use the driveway, so to take it all away and just make it a local street, so now you have local businesses and properties paying for a local street that is actually facilitating, in part, the State highway traffic, so she would like to get it clear in her mind as to how NDDOT has worked through that one. She cited the example of Washington, between 24<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup>, and explained that both of those frontage roads connect to classified streets. She added that she also believes that north of 17<sup>th</sup>, on the west side, goes from 17<sup>th</sup> and terminates at the State highway so that is why she would like to get the logic of this straight in her mind.

Johnson commented that he might be able to provide some feedback on some of these issues. He explained that on the issue of frontage roads NDDOT is excluding those that are separated, so frontage roads that parallel to highways can be on the functional classification system and be stubs. He said that they are excluding those for that very reason, and the main reason behind that is that they, probably over a year ago now, went through a discussion with Federal Highway. He stated that they had been treating frontage roads in a lot of their rural areas, and some of their urban areas as extensions of the highway system, similar to what you're saying Jane, but they lost that fight with Federal Highway and they basically said that if we want to ever put federal aid on those frontage roads they have to be functionally classified, whether locally or on the State Highway System, so he hopes that answers your question.

Viafara asked if Mr. Johnson could please provide some enlightenment here concerning the issue Mr. Grasser spoke of as to whether the other MPOs are also in the process or are aware of this classification process; whether the other MPOs are also engaged in this classification process and what is the overall aim of the exercise. Johnson responded that Bismarck/Mandan MPO finished their functional classification update sometime ago and Fargo/Moorhead is in the middle of working on theirs right now. He commented that Bismarck/Mandan took their frontage roads off of their system. He stated that he will tell you that sometime down the road that that is probably going to be an issue and they will probably add it back in.

Williams asked if the State was also going to turn over the frontage roads to the locals, because we have maintenance agreements that cover the frontage roads. She said that a couple of years ago they needed to change the parking and they went to Mr. Noehre and he agreed with the changes and they implemented them, but they still needed his approval to do anything because the frontage roads belong to the State, they aren't local streets, so is the State going to officially turn those over to the City. Johnson responded that that conversation hasn't occurred, but it is a really good question. He added that they have always been operating under the premise that they are elements of the highway so if they come along and do a mainline improvement such as a mill

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2019**

and overlay or APR or some kind of pavement improvement they would just do it on the frontage roads as well because they are there, it is part of the system and they were probably built at the same time so they would just do it, but the feds told them that that isn't an option anymore, and if they want to be able to use federal aid on them they would have to actually have a classification, so to that specific question they haven't done that yet, they haven't had that conversation yet.

Grasser said that they just want to be clear, when these things are coming down, what's a local decision and what's the decision that we're not allowed to make because we don't want somebody to come back later and interpret that we made a decision when we really didn't have a decision to make, if that decision kind of has been taken away from them. He added that when you're talking about Bismarck and Fargo, are they all operating under this same rule and criteria that we are talking about now. Johnson responded that they are. Grasser said that essentially what he is talking about is that we are the last ones on the list instead of the first ones on the list.

Kouba said that she talked to Seng at NDDOT and she was saying that they are looking for us to make those changes, and they are considering those stubs, so are people just making that argument and the NDDOT is agreeing and letting those frontage roads be considered part of the main highway system. Johnson responded that they are making that determination based on the guidance they got from Federal Highway; he said that he shouldn't say that, what you are saying is correct, what they are telling the locals is that if you want to be able to use federal aid on it in the future it has to be functionally classified, should it not be classified the improvement would have to be locally funded, so you are correct, they aren't mandating it but they are telling them what the ramifications are if it isn't classified.

West stated that to him this committee, in his opinion, shouldn't take any position on it other than that we would like to see it stay on there, and if the feds say that it has to go then it has to go, and we don't have a choice, but if we take no action it stays on, and if the option sometime in the future to use federal aid comes about, then you can use your federal aid, we have nothing to lose. Johnson responded the benefit to keeping them on the system is we can still operate the way we have in the past, so, for example on Gateway Drive, say we need to do some sort of APR or something on the mainline, in the past they would also look at those frontage roads because they are on the State Highway right-of-way, and they are for the most part concrete, and they would have just done them as part of the project, but with this new direction from Federal Highway they wouldn't be able to do that if they weren't classified, they would just be able to work on the highway, now keeping them classified they would just continue to do what we always did and they would use State Highway Urban Regional funding most likely on those roadways, but he can't guarantee that but it would be his thought, but if you take them off they wouldn't be able to do anything to them. Grasser said that that is where he is at, to take most any road off the system removes the potential for us in the future, and you never know what the future will bring, for example who would have guessed that a governor would come in with a Mainstreet Initiative and an Urban Grants Program five years ago, and now here we are so he is glad that we have the roads classified in the downtown area that we do because they all at least qualify for the program, so again, frontage roads are kind of the same thing, if we declassify them, especially the stubs, we might have an uphill battle to try to get them back on, and he isn't

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2019**

seeing an advantage from a local standpoint at this point in not leaving them on the system, he only sees a downside unless he is missing something, so if it is a choice he doesn't think we should be declassifying anything we don't have to, or most of them, there might be a specific one here or there that could be. Kouba asked, if there are certain ones, and she can point out a couple including the little backage road that leads up to the Visitor Center, which is a State classified roadway, would you keep that on the system. Grasser responded that he would because you never know when they are going to come in with a Convention, Visitor, Tourist initiative that that road would qualify for. He said that that is what he means, you just never know, it is unlikely and he grants that it is very unlikely, but you never know, and what is the downside of leaving it on. Kouba said that she is just wondering how accessible it is currently because she knows that from 42<sup>nd</sup> it is very difficult to access that road and it is very narrow. Williams commented that it does need work, and so does 43<sup>rd</sup>. Grasser stated that they probably won't qualify for federal funding in the real sense and they are going to end up funding then and treating them like a local road, so then you have that dichotomy about how we have to deal with it today but what we are talking about is what is the potential of the unknown future and just leaving that door open. Kouba said that another one she has a question about is the one along North Columbia Road, the frontage road. Bergman asked if that was the one basically from about 4<sup>th</sup> up to almost University, it used to be the old Columbia Road.

Williams said that she would like to go back a bit, because what Mr. Johnson previously said is just now soaking in, so if we leave the frontage roads on the map as classified, they wouldn't qualify for federal regional funding but they would qualify for local urban funding, is that correct. Johnson responded that they would definitely qualify for urban road funds, and then as far as the regional funds, maybe, it would depend on what type of project is coming through there, how it was initiated, how it began, what it all entails, but for sure urban roads funds would be eligible and maybe regional funds, and that is for the State Highway System, now if you have frontage roads on a different City street they would be eligible for only urban roads funds.

Williams asked if a classified street has to be paved. Johnson responded that they get asked that question a lot. He said that he thinks that in terms of the way they would like to see it and the way the new guidance identifies those roadways there should at least be pavement on it, and gravel not being a pavement. Williams asked, then, if you have a street that is partially paved and partially dirt or gravel, but it does connect, is that still considered a stub, if there is a connection. Johnson asked how long before the unpaved portion gets paved. Williams responded that she is thinking specifically of South 42<sup>nd</sup> Street, which is the one where the street was taken away when the Interstate came in so now on the west side it is like a frontage road, but they are starting to have growth in that area and are beginning to pave down in that area, and actually paved a little short piece and are planning on doing more, and at the end of the pavement it continues down to 62<sup>nd</sup> and eventually it will all be paved. Grasser added that they will be paving it down to 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, which would normally be a classified point but there is no road going to the west, but he thinks when somebody looks at a map and looks at their intent on where they are planning on having major controlled access streets, someone not from the area or familiar would not know that there are restrictions on that street, it would look like a local street and in fact they are going to be treating it like a classified street relative to access points and such. He said that they were just talking about that they maybe should set up a second map of

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2019**

what their planned arterial or classified roads might be in the future if they aren't allowed to do it on this map. He stated that there should be some source of information for people to kind of see what the intent is. Johnson responded that he completely agrees, and they have actually informed all of their urban areas and MPOs that they should consider that for this very reason. He added that in terms of the actual federally classified roadways and what we can use federal funds on the State maintains that map, but from a local perspective on the future of where roadways might be and for building code and land code, things that are kind of functionally classified you could absolutely maintain another map that are local future roads. Grasser asked if, from the local side, can they combine that into one map or does it need to be separated. Johnson responded that he would leave that up to you, but in terms of if you ever call to ask him about whether or not you can use federal aid on a road he is going to go to the map on their website. Kouba commented that that is where we put this into the T.I.P., then we can take it to the State and say "okay we want to put this into our T.I.P. and we want to make this a classified and it is connecting, and make that judgement. Johnson agreed that that is correct. Grasser said that having a map showing only one or only the other will look a little disconnected until you can see the two of them match up. Kouba stated that we can make that map for local purposes.

West referred to the map and asked what it means if Columbia Road and Washington and 62<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South have the dashed major collector colors. Kouba responded that they are shown that way mainly for discussion because in the new federal guidance it says that we aren't supposed to be looking at, "okay it is a boundary of urban versus rural" kind of thing, so it being in the MPO area are we looking at them being more urban or look at it how we have in the past because Columbia Road we have it shown in the future as being a principal arterial, but how far out into the future do we continue to keep it as a major rural collector. Grasser asked if we are defining arterial versus collector based on traffic volume or rural road access requirements to maintain. He said that he doesn't know where the County is with that. West responded that they don't differentiate. He explained that they have their County major collectors, and they have County roads, and the only difference is whether they qualify for federal aid or not, access requirements are all the same, no differentiation in different areas, so to him they should be the same classification as the urban area even though they a rural street section, as soon as the City grows they will become principal arterials, so maybe we should plan for that and try an maintain those roads as that, especially in the MPO area. Williams agreed, adding that the big thing is the preservation of right-of-way because if someone comes in with a set of plans for a house or something, and you're saying it is a collector then you wouldn't be able to say it is reserved for right-of-way. West commented that it is easier to preserve right-of-way than get it later, so to him it is logical that it be a principal arterial.

Grasser stated that those are section line roads, long connecting, and have fairly large volumes of traffic, large being relative to rural or large being relative to urban depending upon where you are at. He added that he had no idea of the discussion between major collector and minor arterial, and he has a hard enough time figuring out the difference between a minor arterial and major collector. Kouba responded it is the amount of traffic. West stated that he would even say County Road 8, which is shown with a solid purple line on the map, is now a major collector. He added that it probably will never have the traffic volume of a Washington or Columbia, but it does connect to 62<sup>nd</sup> Avenue as a minor arterial, which long term wouldn't be a bad idea

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2019**

especially of the County Road 6 bridge gets built across the Red River, but that is the discussion in his mind, but he doesn't know if it would change it much because you have the Army Corps of Engineers' hands in it so that would drastically limit any change, which is good. He stated that it is not on their Federal Aid System, but it doesn't mean that in the MPO area it couldn't be classified.

Kouba commented that there was some discussion about Adams Drive and whether or not it should be looked at as a local street or a collector, do we still want it shown as a collector. Grasser responded that he struggles with that as a collector because when they did the platting the last go around they tried to hold it to collector standards but they failed to do so so he thinks we would be better off the way they were treating it unless you want to keep putting collector controls on it, but he doesn't know how we can win that fight. Gengler said that he doesn't see how it can remain described as a collector. Grasser agreed, adding that with the level of access that they have allowed on it, he doesn't think we are being honest showing it as a collector because we aren't treating it that way. Williams added that the probability of Adams continuing anywhere other than just down to 62<sup>nd</sup> is very slim, and this is supposed to be a functional classification map, and Adams functions as a local street, it does not function as any type of through street that someone out of the area would use to get somewhere. Kouba referred to the map and pointed out that we also have 62<sup>nd</sup> being a minor arterial at County 8. Williams agreed that that would take that back to that one, but that would leave in that piece between Belmont and County Road 8, correct. Kouba responded it would.

West referred to that map, 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South in the county and commented that that was also up for discussion. Kouba agreed and explained that they changed it at the Interstate to a minor arterial because that is how it is functioning, but we shouldn't be looking at it the say way, so how is it functionally working now. Williams commented that 32<sup>nd</sup> has been constructed between 48<sup>th</sup> and the Interstate as a principal arterial. West agreed that to him it is more than just a collector arterial, it almost all the way to County 5 and DeMers, and to him in the County DeMers and 32<sup>nd</sup> function the same. Williams said that they go to the railroad, because it is them crossing the railroad there on 55<sup>th</sup>, which is very limited. West said that it is probably more of a minor arterial as it keeps getting busier and busier, and the intersections of County 5 and DeMers and County 5 and 32<sup>nd</sup> are getting to the point where some kind of project should be done, at least turn lanes.

Kouba asked if DeMers, further out in the MPO area is still a major collector. West responded that to him it is a minor arterial, when you have 2,000 plus cars a day on a two-lane roadway, it is a minor arterial. Kouba asked if he meant just to County 5. West responded that he was, that once you get west of County 5 you are out of the MPO area and the traffic drops to very little.

Williams referred to the map and asked about North 36<sup>th</sup>. Kouba said that they took it out because it is kind of a stub right now. Williams stated that that is where her question is because they are constructing streets up in that area and that was her previous question for Mr. Johnson, whether a classified street can be unpaved because it isn't a stub. Kouba asked if 27<sup>th</sup> would eventually be classified like a major collector. Williams responded that she thinks that is the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2019**

internal discussion that we probably need to have because that is the area that they are actually constructing streets in.

West asked, just for curiosity sake, County Road 6 and County Road 5, he sees that part of it is classified on County Road 6 but then it kind of peters off west, even though, isn't that in the MPO area all the way out to County 5 or no. Kouba responded that on this map it wasn't supposed to be classified. She explained that they were discussing 36<sup>th</sup>, and they had it previously classified. West said, then, that anything west of that is just not classified. Kouba responded that that is correct. She added that when they previously did this they were allowed to show future roads, and that was one of the future sections within the urban area that they classified, but because it is a stub and what it is functioning as, so it was proposed to take it off. West agreed, adding, though, that County 5 is just off the grid. Kouba responded that on this map it is off the grid right now. West said that to him you could take that road, and anything north of 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, and they could very easily be a minor arterial, and if you go south down to County 6 the County 6 classification could be a major collector. He added that as far as urban traffic, urban function, you could have 3,500 cars a day right south of the airport and a third will turn and go on DeMers, and a third will turn and go on 32<sup>nd</sup>, and another third will go south. Kouba commented that if she remembers correctly she believes it is a minor arterial from Gateway down to 32<sup>nd</sup>. West agreed that that would make sense, because that one mile from Gateway to DeMers is getting busy for a two lane. Discussion on traffic volumes and possible solutions ensued. Kouba commented that she is pretty sure it is functionally classified as a minor arterial right now.

Williams asked when we would be looking at trying to finalize any of this, more towards the end of December when we do the other stuff. Kouba responded that we have until the end of the year to complete this and she knows that the NDDOT was looking at some other things that they are wanting us to slow down a little bit on, but to have these discussions within our meetings is good. She added that she can make some of these changes and present an updated map and numbers so you can see what that all looks like and how it affects the system as a whole, specifically the whole downtown area, because that is the reason why they had that whole, particularly South 3<sup>rd</sup> Street because at one time there was a discussion about possible closure of sections of it at some point in time for the development of the Water Treatment Plant. Williams said that she thinks that will probably be the time to have the discussion, when we actually get some site plans and development plans in. Grasser added that, ironically, that is probably when we will want to improve that road to add those amenities and have those things that might otherwise associate with the downtown because we want to connect that water plant site development with the more downtown progress.

Kouba stated that one of the reasons we wanted to have this discussion about North 3<sup>rd</sup> Street and North 4<sup>th</sup> Street is because they are very close to North 5<sup>th</sup> Street, and it was mentioned earlier that you don't really want them taken off the functionally classified system, but the question was raised about whether you might be open to lowering the functional classification of those two streets. Williams said that right now they are both minor arterials, so it would then drop down to a major collector, which would match the southern part of the roadway. Grasser stated that he would maybe defer that back to what are the traffic volumes and which category do they fit in.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2019**

He added that to him if one of them had a super high level of access control. Kouba said that it is a downtown too. Grasser said that that is what he is struggling with. Kouba stated that they will probably give us a little bit of leeway with it being the downtown, and we could even leave it as a minor arterial until University and then lower the classification further north too. Grasser said that, again, he isn't a fan of changing things unless he has to, and he isn't seeing a lot of downside to leaving things mostly the way they are, but he would be much less objectionable to changing the classification as opposed to deleting the classification.

Williams stated that she is looking at the percentages here, which classification are we over in our percentages. Kouba responded that we are over on a lot of them, but mostly the principal arterial and the minor arterial percentages, although the principal arterial percentage is not over by much, but the minor arterial percentages are over by almost double. Williams commented that all of the principal arterials are State Highways, with the exception of Columbia. Grasser stated, though, that Columbia is actually a highway of national significance. Williams said that it is kind of tough to take the federal approach, cookie cutter thing, and apply the same standards to a growing community compared to a community in another part of the United States that is basically built out. Kouba stated that they do allow some leeway, obviously because the Interstate is 4% and it is up to 3% according to federal standards. Williams said what are they going to do, take off part of it. She added that she guesses you could take the ramps and change them to something else, is that how they calculate the miles, is it lane miles, or is it just a footprint. Kouba responded that it is just a single line, just a footprint.

Grasser commented that if it ever got to where you had to hit a hard target or something we would probably reclassify some of the minor arterials to collectors, if we had to do that just to make numbers work because we had minor arterials and collectors that if you look at them on any given day you wouldn't know one was really classified differently than the other.

Kouba summarized that what they will do is to take these changes that we talked about today, recalculate all of the numbers, and bring it forward without changing anything in the downtown area yet. Grasser asked if this discussion goes to the Executive Policy Board or does it stay with the Technical Advisory Committee at this point. Kouba responded that she thinks that we are keeping it at the Technical Advisory Committee level at this point simply because there is still a lot of discussion needed and we are going through an iteration process right now, but it will go to the board at a later time.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

a. 2019 Annual Work Program Project Update

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

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2019**

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO ADJOURN THE JULY 10<sup>TH</sup>,  
2019 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:53 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager