

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 14th, 2019
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the August 14th, 2019, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:30 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Nancy Graham (Proxy For Darren Laesch), MnDOT Planning Engineer; Ryan Riesinger, Airport Authority; Jason Peterson, NDDOT-Local District; Nick West, Grand Forks Highway Engineer; Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Engineering; and Michael Johnson (via conference phone), NDDOT-Local Government.

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

Guest(s): Patrick Hopkins, MnDOT.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

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

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BAIL, TO APPROVE THE JULY 10TH, 2019, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FY2020-2023 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that the action being requested today is to hopefully forward a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board that they approve the FY2020-2023 T.I.P. document.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 14th, 2019**

Haugen stated that staff did advertise for a public hearing to be held at this meeting, as well as allowing for any comments or recommendations to be submitted before noon today.

Haugen opened the public hearing. There was no one present for discussion and no comments or recommendations were submitted. Haugen closed the public hearing.

Haugen commented that included in the packet was the public meeting notice as well as the 80+ page document. He said that instead of going through all those pages he tried to highlight what is in this T.I.P. versus the previous T.I.P.

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

Haugen explained that the roll of the MPO is to ensure projects are consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan and that the projects are prioritized within its proposed funding program, and to make sure that we have projects both not just in Grand Forks or East Grand Forks but also within the MPO study area.

Haugen stated that this is a 12-month process, so as soon as we adopt this T.I.P. we will start soliciting for the next T.I.P. He added that an important thing to note is that once the MPO and State agree on a T.I.P. it cannot be changed unless an amendment is approved; and it is only in the S.T.I.P. for reference purposes.

Haugen commented that some unknowns include the fact that the FAST Act expires in September 2020. He stated that we are currently focused on the “State of Good Repair”, the National Highway System, and funding levels. He added that chances are they will probably continue these focuses, but it appears they may change some, such as an emphasis on safety, etc., so all the funding levels that affect the current T.I.P. could be changed so what we do is subject to further action.

Haugen reported that on the North Dakota side we are funding \$85 million dollars and on the Minnesota side \$16 million dollars during the four years, so just over \$100 million dollars in transportation projects being programmed. He went over each category:

Transit Operating

North Dakota side we are assuming that the CAT/UND Merger will take place in the fall of 2020 so the operating dollars for the Grand Forks side shows that increase for cost, but it also shows UND’s revenue as well.

Minnesota side is increasing their federal participation from the current T.I.P.

Transit Capital

North Dakota has had a lot of capital solicitation and awards this past year. They

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 14th, 2019**

were just awarded their 5339 and 5310 programs. All capital funds are coming from essentially these two federal programs.

Minnesota side all capital funds are coming from their annual 5307 or, in one case, they are flexing some federal highway dollars into the transit.

Ellis commented that one thing to make note of on the capital funds on the Minnesota side is that they are doing a four-year solicitation now for capital and facilities, so she submits her vehicle inventory based on what they think their useful life is. She explained that you do the application for four years and then if they approve of what your vehicles and/or requests are they do a yearly contract, but she doesn't have to apply for it every year. She added that one bit of confusion is that they have a vehicle in the T.I.P. under 2022 based on the mileage but they have that same vehicle under 2023 because of the 7 year useful life, but their mileage will exceed what it should be, so when she applies this time she will see when they actually will award it and then we will either have to amend the T.I.P. or leave it as is. Haugen said that he doesn't recall, but one of the projects has flexed those highway dollars. Ellis stated that it is in her ten-year capital plan for Minnesota so it could be flex monies, but she is applying for it through Minnesota, but they can figure that out.

Transportation Alternatives

There is a little difference between how each State operates; North Dakota, for the first time did a two year solicitation, it was a one-time only two year solicitation, and from now on it will be done annually; whereas on the Minnesota side they are only soliciting one year, and it is always the last year of the S.T.I.P. cycle.

On the North Dakota side two candidate projects were awarded funds, and on the Minnesota side there were no projects submitted.

H.S.I.P. Projects

No projects were submitted.

North Dakota Urban Projects

This is the Main Street Initiative. There was one project submitted and one project awarded out of Grand Forks, and it is North 3rd Street Reconstruction between DeMers and University. In 2021 this project has federal funds assigned to it.

Current T.I.P. Years

There are always three years in the current T.I.P. that are included in the new

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 14th, 2019**

T.I.P.; there have been some shifting and adjustments made, they are:

HSIP

- 1) moved from 2019 into 2020 project to install red light running and blackplates.

Haugen reiterated that, as the staff report pointed out, as soon as we adopt this T.I.P. there will likely be an amendment to it. He explained that there are some urban road funds being moved to the regional program, etc., that the paperwork is not worked out yet, so we understand it is coming forward but we have to adopt a T.I.P. and follow-up with an amendment for at least that project.

Urban

- 1) Funding University Avenue now in 2020; will need T.I.P. amendment to transfer funds from University Mill/Overlay to Regional Project; Project too late for this T.I.P.; \$250,000 in federal money in play.

Regional

- 1) There is a project out on U.S.#2 from North 69th street west to GFAFB in both directions that they have gone back and forth a few times on what the scope of work should be and this T.I.P. will now identify it as a concrete overlay where before it was an asphalt overlay so the cost increased considerably, thus there is a change in pricing. Only three miles of the project are within the MPO study area.
- 2) Delay in the U.S.#2 Mill and Overlay project as a result of this cost increase so to make the T.I.P. fiscally constrained we are moving this back to 2023 instead of 2021.

Interstate

- 1) The Interstate Urban Priorities Process is a new process the NDDOT has initiated to help them select project on the interstate in urban areas. The solicitation for projects is a bit different from the other solicitations for the alternatives, the HSIP, the Urban Roads, etc.
- 2) The process did come up with funding for the southeast ramp on Gateway Drive for traffic signal enhancements so there is a better flush off the interstate.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 14th, 2019**

- 3) There was a request to do a NEPA document for 32nd Avenue South Congestion issue, but it hasn't yet been funded.

Haugen reported that on the Minnesota side the current T.I.P. projects include a project that MnDOT added in 2022 to implement some short-term recommendations from the recent Mn220No Study.

Haugen commented that the New T.I.P. Year is 2023:

North Dakota Side

Local

- 1) The Columbia Road Overpass was not programmed, and as we noted the cost was significantly higher, so if that is the project the City wishes to pursue in the future, we will have to do some adjustments to our financial plan.

Regional

- 1) None

Minnesota Side

- 1) There had been discussion about traffic signal replacement for the Downtown – Study is indicating a need for right of way so there is a delay in implementation, it will not happen in 2023.

Haugen stated that we are always looking to see what the next big project might be for one year beyond our T.I.P.

Haugen said that on the North Dakota side there was a subsequent follow-up request to do a NEPA document at 32nd Avenue South for a congestion relief project and reconstruction of South Washington Street.

Haugen commented that on the Minnesota side there is the downtown traffic signals and a possible US2/US220 North intersection improvement.

Haugen reported that there are some illustrative projects. He explained that on the North Dakota side their S.T.I.P. terms these projects “pending”, although federal regulations identifies them as illustrative. He stated that the projects are:

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 14th, 2019**

- 1) Traffic signal rehab projects, one on the Urban Roads network and one on the Regional Roads network.
- 2) A fairly small chip seal project, a \$1,000 project on USBus2 (North 5th Street), but fiscal constraint wouldn't allow it to be on the programmed side so it is still looking for \$100,000.

Haugen referred to a map and explained that it is a map of the projects in relation to our environmental justice areas, and the years they occur. He also referred to a table that is located in the document that shows year by year funding for the major programs.

Haugen referred to the appendices of the T.I.P. document and pointed out that it includes the 2019 Projects and their status. He stated that several of the transit ones are still waiting for some obligations to take place related to the bus barn project, otherwise the remaining projects are either obligated, set to bid, or they are shown in the current T.I.P. as being obligated in 2020.

Haugen commented that last we have the T.I.P. document condensed and shown in MnDOT's preferred ATP style.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FY2020-2023 T.I.P., AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Riesinger, Johnson, Kuharenko, Peterson, Ellis, Halford, Graham, West, and Bail.

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF A.T.A.C. TRAFFIC COUNT ADDENDUM

Haugen reported that this item is for work that A.T.A.C. does to keep our traffic counting program up-to-date on the video detection equipment and traffic signals. He referred to the packet and pointed out that a copy of the addendum that will officially authorize them to get these signals into the program. He stated that there are six of them that are part of this addendum, and they are:

- 1) South Washington and 44th Avenue South
- 2) South Columbia Road and 36th Avenue South
- 3) South Columbia Road and 40th Avenue South
- 4) Gateway Drive and North Washington Street
- 5) Gateway Drive and North 55th Street
- 6) DeMers Avenue and Columbia Road West Ramp

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 14th, 2019**

He commented that we know that some traffic signals may not physically be in place for this year, but this work will cover the time to the completion of the signals installed so that we can get the cameras counting for us as well.

Kuharenko referred to the second page of the addendum and pointed out that #3 states four vision intersections instead of six.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE A.T.A.C. TRAFFIC COUNT ADDENDUM SUBJECT TO THE CORRECTION NOTED.

Voting Aye: Riesinger, Johnson, Kuharenko, Peterson, Ellis, Halford, Graham, West, and Bail.

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: None.

Haugen stated that they are trying to get A.T.A.C. to come here and give a presentation on the status of our traffic counting program. He added that there are some new reports and new websites that are being designed with the current scope of work and part of their presentation will show a big difference between the new video capture versus the previous video captures and how that is helping immensely with the program. He hopes that this will be on the agenda either next month or in October.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON DOWNTOWN PARKING STUDY

Haugen reported that this study is near completion; they did have their final steering committee meeting and did receive concurrence from committee members that they are satisfied with the draft document.

Haugen stated that he will just go over some of the short-term improvements that are being recommended, and some are already being pursued. He pointed out that they are placed into key categories, and added that you can see the two different supports for them, there is the public support percentage that they received from the various public input meetings and then there is the steering committee's support percentage as well.

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

Presentation ensued.

Ellis commented that she agrees with the Steering Committee that the signage and directional information for the parking ramps and such are a little confusing and aren't as clear as they need to be so she does agree that that should be a short-term fix. She said that when you drive into one the first thing you see is all these different permitted spots and you aren't sure if you are

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 14th, 2019**

supposed to go to another floor, or when you are supposed to, or even where they are at, so that is something that should be addressed.

Information only.

MATTER OF FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION MAP UPDATE

Kouba reported that they sent the first map to the NDDOT to get some clarification on what they are looking for with stubs, especially in relation to those on frontage roads. She stated that she felt that the consensus from the Technical Advisory Committee was that they would like to keep those frontage roads as functionally classified roads, so we need to try to get an understanding of, if we chose to continue to keep them functionally classified, what would the reaction be from the NDDOT. She said that they haven't actually received a response, but maybe Mr. Johnson could give us some clarification on his e-mail in regard to possibly keeping them functionally classified.

Johnson responded that what he said in his e-mail was that they are, in most cases, are excluding frontage roads and stub outs; aka meaning if you want to have them on the functionally classified system, and they are stub outs, that should be okay, but they would look at each location. He explained that the reason for that is that in most situations they are going to the highway, and they have been treating them in the past as a roadway that takes traffic to the highway; and recent information from Federal Highway has stated that unless a frontage road is functionally classified you do not use federal funds on it, which we kind of knew, so they are the exception of the stub definition because they are a vital element to main line systems and they are okay with them being on there and the same with the stubs, and he would say that in most cases they obviously look at every single one of them and make sure that they frontage roads.

Kouba said then that our understanding of those frontage roads is that we will keep them classified. Kuharenko commented that he would think that would be correct.

Kouba stated that she also attached a map with the updates that we discussed at our last Technical Advisory Committee, including those county highways. She asked if anyone felt there was anything else that needed to be changed or updated or have further discussion held. She said that she knows that in the downtown area they kind of split it at University, especially those one-way pairs of 3rd and 4th.

Kuharenko commented that we might look at connecting some of these other current stub outs, such as 34th and 47th, and is that when we would have to go through and do an amendment to this, correct. Kouba responded that that is correct. Kuharenko asked what the typical timeframe is, or what is the process for that. Kouba responded that they are talking about when you are struggling to look at building that connection, you are probably going to want to use federal funding for the most part, and as a major connection into the system you are going to want to have it in the T.I.P. and then they can move it forward through that function. Kuharenko asked if they are doing this as a locally funded only project would they still need to put it through the T.I.P. in order to get it done. Kouba responded that that is they understanding. Johnson

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 14th, 2019**

commented that that isn't exactly true; if you are going to build it with local funds you can request to add it to the functional classification at any time; the only tie to the T.I.P. is that they can only add roads that are going to use federal funds to the functional classification system in the T.I.P. years.

Kuharenko asked what the process is to add those new roads that they would be constructing if they are doing them locally funded only into our functionally classified map, what is the process for that and what is the timeframe for that. Johnson responded that it would be very similar to what you are doing right now; you would submit a request to the MPO to add that roadway to the functionally classified system, and they would go through and do the local process to review and approve it at your board and then submit everything to NDDOT for consideration of your new mileage updates and changes.

West commented that he thinks that South Columbia Road, south of 12th Avenue, could also be a major collector, similar to Washington Street.

Haugen said that he is wondering if there is discussion on the minor arterial designation on 4th and 3rd Street, north of DeMers, if there was any thought on at least that first block of Kittsen, and how to classify them south of DeMers. Haugen stated that perhaps after the Downtown Transportation Plan is approved we may want to talk about changing that designation.

Haugen reported that essentially what the Technical Advisory Committee is settling on is; if they are functionally classified they would prefer to not have them unclassified; so some short stub like the one on 1st Avenue would fall under that classification, same with the one on 6th Street, etc. Kuharenko asked if, at one point in time, wasn't that block of 1st Avenue North between 4th and 5th part of the classified road system. Kouba responded that it was, adding that it was declassified when the extension of the school was done.

Haugen commented that we don't need a decision right now. He added that another thing that they have to talk to NDDOT about is exactly what they want shown on the map. He said that they seemed to like to see the Urbanized Federal Aid Boundary only on the Grand Forks Functional Map, so they will follow up on this issue. He stated that they aren't showing it yet, but they know that there will be a map that shows future functional classifications, so that will be our main topic at our next meeting.

Kouba referred to a slide with tables and explained that, while the NDDOT wants to see the Urban Area, we want to show the full MPO area as well, the first set of tables shows both the Urban and the MPO area mileage and percentages of each functional class. She said that they also included two other sets of tables from the FHWA Classification Procedures and Concepts. She explained that last month there were some questions on what kind of defines each of the categories besides just the mileage, and these tables are good references points for those questions.

Haugen stated that one of the big influences for the percentages is actually the growth of the local roads networks, and so they are taking in a larger percentage of the overall classification, so

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 14th, 2019**

it is lowering, just be that natural causation of more local roads being built, so local mileage goes up but typically the functionally classified ones aren't impacted much.

Haugen reported that based on this discussion, this map is still showing each and every one of those as collectors; we just had a little discussion about some of the downtown areas; change on 17; and then next month we will have our map in more of a approval format, plus show the future classification designations. He added that you will be hearing from staff between now and September on this.

Kouba asked Mr. Johnson saying that the MPO was presenting the Urban Area, what about the other areas, the Rural Areas, the County Areas outside of the Urban Area but inside our MPO boundaries. Johnson responded that those would be tied in with our County staff. He explained that in terms of federal aid they only look at TMPs, or if there are any changes that the County wants to make with regard to their CMC route that are inside the MPO planning boundary but outside the Urbanized Area, those would be coordinated to our County side. West commented that all the county roads are CMC routes. Kouba said that a lot of the changes from County Road 5 from Gateway to 32nd Avenue is currently major collector so in order to make a change to it the County would have to make the request to change it to a minor arterial, which is what was discussed last month.

West stated that on the County system they don't have arterials, it is either a CMC (County Major Collector) or it is nothing, as far as the federal system goes. Haugen commented that he thinks that what he was sharing was that there are no changes to our rural classification system. West agreed, adding that whether it is called a minor arterial or county major collector, on the County System it doesn't exist, to his knowledge; it is either in their federal aid route or not, that just the only designation. Johnson commented that that is what most counties do, but what they have seen some other counties do is they actually maintain a county-wide functional classification system that goes from principal arterial minor to collector down to local, for their own purposes and it is just managed by them but then they have a separate local county federal aid route that is used with the DOT for federal aid projects, so that is an option that you have.

Haugen said that both cities have separated out their functional class as an access control map; they have their own separate individual access control map, and Polk County probably has their own as well, so there might be a need to revisit your individual access control map based on these functional class. West commented that most of what they call the gray area is controlled under City zoning already anyway, except for the last mile of County 5.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

- a. 2019 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen pointed out that they did include the monthly update on the work activities.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 14th, 2019**

Kuharenko said that there are four projects on here that are past their original completion dates, do we have to project a completion date for those four projects. Haugen responded that the functional class may or may not be ready in September. Kuharenko asked about the Skewed Intersection Project. Haugen said that he would ask that Ms. Kouba get back to us on the status of that project. Kuhrenko stated that there is also the Downtown Parking Study and the CAT/UND Shuttle Merger projects as well. Haugen responded that the Downtown Parking Study is waiting for direction from City Staff, so until they give us some direction he wouldn't be able to give a completion date but the final report has been drafted to the committees satisfaction. Kuharenko asked who from the City are they waiting on comments from. Haugen responded that they aren't waiting for comments, they are waiting for direction from the Planning Department. Kouba stated that they are probably looking at October for the UND/CAT Shuttle Merger. Haugen added that there is a phone call on Friday to get the required personnel together to work this out.

Information only.

b. Oral Briefing On Future River Crossings

Haugen reported that they did have a joint County Commission meeting last week to get their thoughts on the Merrifield location; tepid would be his description of their response to the presentation. He stated that he thinks there is an acknowledgment that there is perhaps is a need, but there is also an acknowledgement of the needs of the counties as well.

Haugen said that there is a meeting on the Grand Forks side to discuss intra-city bridge locations. He explained that there is a meeting tonight for Wards 3 and 4 at Lewis and Clark, and there may or may not be another meeting for Ward 5 later this month as well. Halford asked if Mr. Haugen would be presenting information at the meeting tonight. Haugen responded that he would.

Haugen commented that the MPO Executive Policy Board did, on 32nd Avenue, table a motion to have it on their August agenda, but it will still show up their August agenda however he doesn't think they will be in a position to finalize something and move it forward, but it will be on their agenda for discussion on the RFP for a Bridge Feasibility Study at that site, so there will be some discussion.

Information only.

c. Oral Briefing On Skewed Intersection Public Meeting

Kouba reported that they held the second public meeting for this study and presented alternatives. She said that there was a pretty good turn-out at the meeting, especially from business owners along the corridor itself. She stated that they are still collecting comments about the alternatives that were presented, from the public, and they did get some good input from the meeting itself, and hopefully will continue to receive more from the public.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 14th, 2019**

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY HALFORD, TO ADJOURN THE AUGUST 14TH, 2019
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:26 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager