

2019 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

January 9, 2019 Minutes

February 13, 2019 Minutes

March 13, 2019 Minutes

April 10, 2019 Minutes

May 15, 2019 Minutes

June 12, 2019 Minutes

July 10, 2019 Minutes

August 14, 2019 Minutes

September 11, 2019 Minutes

October 9, 2019 Minutes

November 13, 2019 Minutes

December 11, 2019 Minutes

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2019
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen Chairman, called the January 9th, 2018, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:34 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; Jesse Kadrmas, NDDOT-Local District; Richard Audette, Airport Authority; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Dale Bergman, Area Cities Transit; Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Consulting - Engineer; and Paul Konickson, MnDOT District 2 Crookston.

Absent: Darren Laesch, Brad Bail, Ryan Reisinger, Dustin Lang, Ryan Brooks, Lane Magnuson, Ali Rood, Mike Johnson, Stacey Hanson, Mike Yavarow, Lars Christianson, and Rich Sanders.

Guest(s) present: Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Al Grasser, Grand Forks Engineering; Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning; Clarence Vetter, East Grand Forks City Council/MPO Executive Board; Michael Huot, Resident; and Troy Schroeder, NWRDC.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTION

Haugen stated that for our guests present today he would ask that everyone please state their name and the organization they represent.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 12TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 12TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2019**

MATTER OF FINAL APPROVAL OF THE 2045 BIKE/PED ELEMENT

Haugen reported that included in the packet was the staff report and a full draft version of the performance measures document. He stated that based on our discussion last month our interest is in performance, and with that he will turn this over to Mr. Viafara for a brief overview.

Viafara commented that in the packets you received a line describing a number of performance evaluations for the common measures and targets for the bicycle and pedestrian plan or elements.

Viafara stated that the idea behind this is to provide a type of government or related agency the opportunity for us to establish baselines that will allow us to start the process that allows us to measure improvements conducive to the betterment or improvement of the overall network.

Viafara pointed out that there are a number of goals, objectives, and standards leading towards that particular direction, therefore we need to measure the steps being taken for us to get there.

Viafara said that there are some performance measures for each one of the US National Transportation Goals; we have assigned ten of them, and tried to tie it through accepting performance targets or by initiating a number of monitoring activities so we can start moving towards that direction.

Viafara commented that the performance measures that you have you got prior to today's meeting, however he would like to bring to your attention that through conversations with the Department of Engineering from Grand Forks and East Grand Forks and Planning from the two cities, some minor changes have been made and those changes he would highlight them indicating that with a few exceptions there aren't any changes on the ones that you have in your packet.

Viafara referred to a slide and stated that the one he would like to discuss first is on Goal #3, which is the need for us to measure accessibility. He said that where it corresponds to East Grand Forks, East Grand Forks originally had indicated that after 10 years 40% of accessibility features would be ADA compliant, because that was what was indicated on the plan that is under consideration at the moment; but it is our understanding that Engineering, Planning and Recreation met together and agreed that rather than 40% they would like it to be 30%, and they have provided the rationale for that.

Viafara stated, though, that for Grand Forks we had originally a number of ramps that were not really determined at the time that he sent the packets, but we have since received news that 44 ramps is an acceptable number of ramps that the City is committed to repair or retrofit in a period of the year.

Viafara said that another thing is that we had established 3 miles either of new or retrofitted sidewalks based on historical review; but East Grand Forks indicated that they were willing and happy to cooperate in achieving at least one mile of either repaired or constructed sidewalks per year in the next period of five years, so that is where the changes are.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2019**

Viafara stated that the remaining changes are really pertaining to East Grand Forks, and based on conversations with them those changes are really related to the fact that there is a lack of staff and issues with resources, but nevertheless they would like to cooperate by reducing some of them; for instance on the same topic the miles of sidewalks, we had originally envisioned 1.5 miles of new sidewalks but they have said that a quarter of a mile per year to 1.25 miles per year in the period of five years is acceptable.

Viafara said that the second thing on the miles proposed for bicycle facilities in the two miles, originally we had 20% or 2 miles built per year of bicycle facilities, but they indicated that in the period of five years 2.5 miles will be doable, or the equivalent of half a mile per year.

Viafara commented that there is one other thing on Access to Jobs; originally we had increased it to 100% in the five years but based on issues with the Land Development factor and things like that East Grand Forks indicated that 91% to 92% is the most appropriate measure for them.

Viafara stated that he will leave these measures with you for discussion and for consideration but it is important for you to remember that we are basically compelled, as an MPO, compelled to request the local governments and agencies to please produce or participate in the operation of those performance targets in order for us to configure the requirements that the MPO has based on the FAST ACT or Fix America Infrastructure legislation.

Bergman referred to Goal #5, Bicycle boarding on buses; and pointed out it states that the percent of transit shelters on fixed routes that are accessible and adjacent to the bike network will increase to 70% in the next five years and said that you will get 7%, you aren't going to get no 70% of the people to put bikes on a bus. Ellis responded that it is just asking us to have the bike racks on the bus. Bergman stated that they have 100% of the bike racks on the bus, which has a target of 100%, but then you go down further and it says the currently 19 of 35 transit shelters are adjacent to the bike network, but there is some of that bike network that doesn't even come close to our shelters, so unless someone is going to put in sidewalks that are specially made to get over to those bus shelters, you aren't going to get that to increase either, they will look at it when they start putting them up but when they get a request from citizens to put them on a certain area they look at that too; how many on and off boardings are we getting at that particular area, but he isn't going to do like they have now, out of the 38 shelters that Grand Forks has we might use 15 of them, and if we start changing that this year because of the route changes, the majority of those shelters are going away because they are nothing but a smoking shelter for someone or someone will dump their leaves or grass in it so they will be looking at knockdowns before they would make a determination and follow this rule that you have in here, it isn't going to happen.

Haugen responded that they aren't establishing a rule that you have to follow, so let's get past that language. Bergman asked if he was saying that they aren't establishing a goal that they have to follow. Haugen responded that they aren't establishing a rule that you have to follow. Bergman asked, then, what they are doing when they are putting it in there. Haugen responded that they are seeing that there are thirty-five shelters; nineteen of them currently are adjacent to the bike network, and as the bike network expands part of what they are trying to implement is to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2019**

try to get more of the shelters, the bikes and shelters adjacent to one another, so they aren't even suggesting the moving of shelters, this is just suggesting that as we expand the bike network that we look towards expanding the bike network for those other remaining shelters and the target would be to have not 100% of the 35 shelters in the five year period, but 75% of the shelters in that five year period. He explained that a lot of the future network is on-road bike routes, which would make this target not onerous, so it isn't about you moving shelters or adding shelters, it is about where bike networks are being established and trying to make a connection between the bike network and the transit shelter network.

Halford asked if there was a similar target in the Transit Plan that we could just mirror. Haugen responded that there is not a similar target that connects the bike network to the shelter locations in the Transit Plan. Bergman asked if they looked to see what their Transit Development Plan had listed for shelters next to the bike network. Haugen responded that we have a target that is saying that there are 35 shelters or 2 shelters. Bergman is asking how does it match up with 2d, aren't these plans all supposed to be following or interconnected. Haugen responded that the TDP doesn't suggest or identify that you are adding shelters or needing shelters, it is saying that you have 35 shelters, and then it talks about the whole State of Good Repair and part of your TAM discussion there are ratings on them, etc.; so that is addressing the facility itself, the transit facility itself; this document is addressing how the bike network can be better connected to where the transit shelters are located, so, again it's not a rule that says you have to implement shelters anywhere, or move shelters; but the target says that as we expand the bike network we are working towards making the bike network connections with your existing shelters better, increasing it from just roughly 60% up to 70% in a five year period.

Ellis asked what classifies as adjacent, because she is just thinking of East Grand Forks and the fact that the number of miles that they have in the Greenway that are bike routes or bike trails, it will be hard for them to get to that 70% because the bus routes aren't near the Greenway so she is thinking that the definition of adjacent would probably be... Haugen commented that she is looking at the wrong data; it isn't the miles of bike network, it is the number of shelters adjacent to the bike network. He explained that the denominator is 35, how many of the 19 of the 35 are we getting towards. Ellis rephrased her question as; a majority of their bike network is in the Greenway so based on the shelters they have she wouldn't consider them necessarily close to the bike network at this time, so what you are asking them to do is to essentially turn a lot of our City into bike network to kind of meet the percentage of what their bike network is in the Greenway, does that make sense. Haugen responded that he doesn't understand the connection to the Greenway. Ellis explained that they have maybe seven miles of bike trail in the Greenway, how many bike facilities do they have that are not on the Greenway but are in City Limits, maybe a mile. Haugen responded that you have 23rd Street, Central Avenue, for two miles. Ellis said, then, that they have nine miles of bike facilities, and seven of those miles are in the Greenway so the percentage there is quite a bit higher in the Greenway than it is on their street network, so it is hard to get to that 70% adjacent to a bus shelter if a lot of it is in the Greenway. Emery said, though, that just 70% of the shelters need to be adjacent to a bike route. Haugen agreed, and explained that as you expand, this plan is about expanding your bike network, and it isn't all going to be expanded in the Greenway; so as you expand your bike network you will have shelters placed around the City, so as you try to expand and make the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2019**

connection between the bike network and your shelters, so he doesn't understand the connection to the Greenway, it isn't a percent of how many total miles are adjacent to a shelter it is how many shelters are adjacent to a bike facility.

Emery commented that to go from 55% to 70% the City of East Grand Forks just has to get bike routes adjacent to six more shelters; because they have to go from 19 of 35 to about 25 of 35. Haugen responded that that is correct, although it is system wide not just East Grand Forks.

Haugen reiterated that this isn't about moving shelters, it isn't a ratio of miles of designated bike facilities, it is the ratio of how many shelters that exist today are adjacent to a bike designated facility, not all of them are so as we try to move towards that connection between bike and bus they are suggesting that target be 70% in five years. He added that going back to the question of how does this connect to the Transportation Development Plan, that is how it connects, we are trying to get that multi-modal connection so that your bikes and buses are on a similar system. He also clarified that the 70% is 70% of 35; and the target of 100% is to maintain the target at 100% of fixed route vehicles having bike racks.

Bergman said that the way he looks at it, any sidewalk in the City is a bike trail, maybe we can use that. He added that he doesn't see a designated sign that says this is for pedestrians only. Haugen commented, though, that not all sidewalks are legal for you to ride your bicycle on. He added that we do have a designated bike network so that is what this is focusing on; we aren't saying that you can't ride your bicycle on any street, but we are promoting a bicycle network and we are promoting increasing the connection between the bike network and transit shelters.

Viafara suggested that if you have time to review Chapter 4 in the proposed plan that has been approved, there is a response brought by a consulting company in Washington to a question similar to this that says that every sidewalk, therefore, is a bike facility; there is an explanation coming from professional engineers explaining that and certainly at the beginning the comments seem to sound unreasonable, but once we go into further analysis of which one is the purpose, which one is the function, which one is the level of service of these facilities then render some sidewalks that aren't really part of this system, and the same happens to some of these, so that is basically how to explain how we came to this particular kind of bike facility determination.

Haugen reiterated that again, the overall goal is better integration of the two modes, and so the target is to try to increase integration by having more bike routes, more bike facilities adjacent to those bus shelters.

Ellis reported that the other one she would like to discuss is to reduce the number of complaints by 50% on snow removal; and if anyone has any idea on how they can reduce the number of people complaining that would be helpful. Viafara responded that Grand Forks uses a system based on complaints so when the complaint comes to the #311 immediately the City sends somebody to check that particular property to see the length of the sidewalks and the snow that needs to be removed, so what we are asking is for them to reduce, by 50%, the length of the sidewalks for snow removal, that is basically what this is doing, and in order to achieve this one has to take a proactive approach.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2019**

Viafara stated that he agrees that it is impossible to reduce the number of complaints, what we are striving to do is to reduce the length of the sidewalks that come through those complaints. Kuharenko said, then, that what you are saying is that the performance target of reduce by 50% the number of complaints received concerning snow removal shouldn't be there. Viafara referred to Goal #9 and responded that in 2018 Grand Forks received 232 complaints through #311. Williams said that their question is how are you going to stop people from complaining, not all of the complaints are founded, sometimes you get out there and there isn't enough to qualify for removal, so the problem is is that you are never going to stop people from complaining about things, but whether it is founded or not, that is another story and that is why they have to check things out; so how do we get people not to call in, that is the question. Ellis agreed, and added that the struggle is is that she thinks everyone is aware that they need to move snow off of their sidewalks, but it is really hard, without fining them, to get them to move the snow and often times it is difficult to enforce the issue. Emery added that East Grand Forks really doesn't monitor complaints either. Ellis stated that they address complaints when they receive them, but they don't have anyone that can go out and look for those that aren't moving snow. She explained the policy/procedure they follow for snow removal and the costs involved.

Ellis commented that she thinks their process is not working so for them to meet this performance target at this time would be very difficult; so that is why she mentioned that right now, based on where they are at, it is difficult to meet that percentage.

Viafara reiterated that there were 232 complaints received by Grand Forks; when we added each one of those complaints in terms of lengths of the sidewalk that needed to be cleared, it comes to about 18,860 feet that were cleared; now what the suggestion is is to reduce the number of that length by 50%. He stated that we don't know how, but one way may be to enforce the ordinance, if there is one, which means that they have to send somebody to inspect and check the complaint location and then probably someone would need to provide notice to the property owner, that is one way, proactively to reduce the number of phone calls or complaints after the fact.

Viafara commented that, ideally, there shouldn't be any snow on sidewalks, particularly because as Cities you are compelled to follow ADA Legislation, that is ideally; but because that isn't the case at least having a system in place will bring to ADA's attention your good faith as a City that something is being done.

Williams asked, if the performance measure is to report on a coordinated program for education and enforcement, how does a target have anything to do with snow removal, it should have something to do with the number of programs, or the number of notices, or how are we informing the public of how we will do this; they are not complimentary. Haugen responded that the one data set they had was this data set of the number of complaints and how they were addressed through the assessments that were levied, and so one of the major topics we hear when we talk about pedestrians is snow removal, so in order to try to establish a target they looked at the one data set they had and that was how much the City had to go hire someone else to move the snow, so the intent is instead of having the City have the onus was through those materials that you mentioned to strive to have less City effort and place more effort back to where the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2019**

expectation is to have it done and that is to the homeowner to remove the snow; so that is the thought process behind setting this target. Haugen stated that if you look at the assessment list you will notice a lot of frequent fliers if you will, and they aren't homeowners, they are builders, so they can give you some thoughts on how to perhaps improve the removal of snow on their properties instead of through this method, but that is what the thought process behind this target is, to reduce this method as the way to get snow removed.

Ellis said, then, that the performance target should say reduce the number of complaints received concerning snow removal by; because there are two different targets there. Haugen responded that the confusion we are seeing here is that there are two separate targets; the first one is not all complaints lead to a City assessment, a lot of complaints lead to the homeowner complying before the hiring of snow removal companies, so we are suggesting two separate targets that are very similar, but are separate.

Grasser commented that he thinks there is a bit, on this and some others, that part of the issue is with the measurements; that they are responding to something that is outside of their control. He gave a brief explanation on what/how things are out of the City's control. He asked if there was some way to put a paragraph or something in here that recognizes some general variability of things that we don't control. He said that he doesn't have the answer to what should be measured exactly, but he thinks that that is why there should be some recognition of financial constraints on a local level, state, and federal; and just reactions to things that are outside our control. Viafara cited an example of how property owners don't remove the snow and how it affects pedestrians; and asked how this can be addressed.

Haugen stated that in response to what Mr. Grasser mentioned, there is already some language in the draft about external factors; these targets are not those that have penalties attached to them. He added that they can certainly beef up that section about how these targets are varied by recession, etc., to acknowledge that they are and that we have some measure outside of staff control. Ellis stated that that would be helpful because increasing the number of people commuting by a certain percentage or increasing the number of people on the greenway, those are hard to meet from an engineering standpoint; they can provide opportunities or better connections, but to actually get people to use it or to commute through biking or walking is kind of out of our control, so that is her concern; she doesn't want these to be set and then have them in the plan and then be something that we are tied to in terms of funding, so as long as it is something that we are striving towards, she has no issue with it.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY ADOPT THE FINAL 2045 BIKE/PED ELEMENT; RECOGNIZING THE FINANCIAL CONSTRAINTS OF FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL FUNDING, AND OTHER CONSTRAINTS THAT WOULD BE OUTSIDE OF OUR CONTROL.

Halford reported that Mr. Viafara was quoted in the Grand Forks Herald that the MPO would still be receiving comments on the Final 2045 Bike/Ped Element through January 23rd. She asked if that was that just to receive them or could that edit the document; or does it still go to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2019**

public hearing for final approvals for council, but outside of that anybody can comment and then the plan could still possibly change, or will the comment just be received. Haugen responded that it could cause a need to edit the document. He explained that until the MPO Board adopts a document it is still available for comment and if a comment comes in at 11:00 on the 23rd, and it is a substantial comment that the board decides has to be implemented and causes a modification of the plan then it would be edited. Halford asked if the document would then go back to the Technical Advisory Committee and the Executive Policy Board to approve the change. Haugen responded that the language states that if it is a significant change then it would need to go back through the process, but if it is determined that it isn't a significant change then it would not. He added that, just as what happened with our last Transit Development Plan, both cities would have to make a determination of their level of significance, so it could possibility have to go through the whole process, or it could just go through the MPO participation process.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Gengler, Audette, Ellis, Bergman, Emery, Kuharenko, and Konickson.

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Bergman, Lang, Brooks, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Bail, Johnson, and Christianson.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FY2019 T.I.P. AMENDMENTS

Haugen referred to the staff report and pointed out that it notes that there are four amendments. He stated that one of them is for an East Grand Forks transit vehicle, one is for Grand Forks and is related to transit as well but not for a vehicle but for other equipment, and then the NDDOT has two that we are amending into the plan.

Haugen said that we did advertise that there would be a public hearing at today's meeting so he would open the public hearing; there was no one present for discussion so he closed the public hearing. He added that there were no written comments received either.

Haugen stated that staff is recommending that the Technical Advisory Committee approve a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board that they approve these T.I.P. amendments as submitted.

Kuharenko asked if the safety project that came through with the regional project request last month; are the chip seals not included here. Haugen responded that we aren't being asked to amend those into the T.I.P., they are being asked to be added to the next T.I.P. as they are candidate projects and haven't been fully vetted through the S.T.I.P./T.I.P. coordinated process yet, but these have been. He added that it was mentioned last month that we would handle these projects this way.

Bergman stated, then, that these are the funds that we were awarded in December, correct. Haugen responded that that is correct.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2019**

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FY2019 T.I.P. AMENDMENTS, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Gengler, Audette, Ellis, Bergman, Emery, Kuharenko, and Konickson.

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Lang, Brooks, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Bail, Johnson, and Christianson.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR NDDOT FTA 5339 SOLICITATION

Haugen reported that, as they have been saying over the last several months, there are a lot of transit dollars going through the cycle. He cited that the NDDOT has announced a new solicitation for another year of appropriation from the 5339 program which we just amended the T.I.P. for. He said that they did advertise for the solicitation of projects for this program, and it was for vehicles only, and the Cities Area Transit has submitted this prioritized list of projects for consideration with the top priority being the purchase of vehicles to serve the possible merger of City Bus and the UND Shuttle Service; and the other three are more of a shop type replacement vehicles not so much in-service vehicles.

Haugen stated that staff is recommending the Technical Advisory Committee approve a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board that they approve the candidate projects for NDDOT FTA 5339 Program as being consistent with the Long Range Transportation Plan and to give them priority ranking as submitted.

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR NDDOT FTA 5339 PROGRAM AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE MPO LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING, AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Gengler, Audette, Ellis, Bergman, Emery, Kuharenko, and Konickson.

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Lang, Brooks, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Bail, Johnson, and Christianson.

Haugen reported that this is related to the T.I.P. cycle. He reiterated that last month they mentioned that the North Dakota Recreational Trails Program was open; but they have had staffing changes so it was not officially opened in December but it is officially open now for candidate projects, so if anyone has any projects for this program, please submit your application for candidate projects.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2019**

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE EAST GRAND FORKS ADA TRANSITION PLAN

Haugen referred to the staff report, included in the packet, and explained that staff was originally seeking consideration of approval of the document, but will ask that it be tabled. He stated that we all, he thinks, understand the legal reasons why ADA is in place and requires transitions plans and why it became a focus on the Minnesota side in particular was this action by Federal Highway, interpreted by Minnesota State Aid, that they would be freezing T.I.P.s if our jurisdiction didn't have an up-to-date transition plan so we worked with East Grand Forks.

Haugen pointed out that also included in the packet is a draft of the document. He stated that the goal was to have this done prior to the approval of our current T.I.P.; we didn't meet that goal however they have accepted the T.I.P. because they saw that we were making reasonable progress for this.

Haugen referred to the draft document and went over it briefly.

Haugen commented that one thing that SRF did not do was to assess the transit facilities, the bus stops/shelters, so this draft is absent of that.

Haugen stated that we also talked a bit about who has jurisdiction over what curb areas' right-of-way; not all of it is the City of East Grand Forks, there are other jurisdictions involved. He cited an example of where we go the data set that is all GIS based, and stated that the City does have access to that information, so if you go look at these funds and identify what was identified as compliant and not compliant at those points, you can see that there is quite a number of them throughout East Grand Forks. He went over this information briefly.

Haugen commented that the financial picture, based on cost components; the plan document only as a total cost of \$1.99 million to bring everything up into compliance asset of the transit. He said that the plan does not break that down into proper jurisdictions so we are asking that SRF do that. He stated that this is the language in the current draft, based on our earlier discussion there might be a change to these values, but as you can see on the implementation schedule it wasn't going to be done in one year, but it does set out a good faith effort to get it done over a span of time.

Haugen reported that we are still under the determination that reasonable progress is being made, so they are not withholding our funding, but Federal Highway is advising us to not finalize this plan until we do have that transit facility information. He added that we would also like to have the cost breakdown identified and then if there is another change in this performance target we would include that in the draft.

Haugen said that another thing that we have to document in the draft is how frequently it will be updated; right now it is kind of silent on that issue so we will have to amend the text to identify, as we do with everything else, five years or if significant change occur, but he isn't sure if Federal Highway will give us a definition of what significant changes are.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2019**

Haugen stated that our action today is, we have a draft but we have some things that are still outstanding in the draft, so we are asking you to table this until we have the cost restriction and the transit assessments included. He added that in talking with Federal Highway Minnesota, they indicated that sooner than later, but with snow conditions if we have by June would that be acceptable, and they agreed that it would.

Haugen commented that we will need to talk about who will be doing this additional work; SRF still has some money left in the budget if we want them to do it. He explained that the reason they didn't do it is because they had information that said that Cities Area Transit staff would be doing it, so that will need to be figured out so it can be done as soon as the snow is gone, April or May, then it can be inserted into the draft and we can finalize the document.

Ellis asked how many shelters there are in East Grand Forks. Bergman responded that there are five. Ellis commented that she knows that four of them are already in compliance because they were just done within the last three years, so we would be looking at one that they already have plans for, so we essentially have the inventory so it won't take them long, and she feels that they can even have it done by the end of February if we want to because they did two on 5th last year; the one by the Library is compliant, and the one on the northend by the College was just done two years ago, so to only one she can think that needs to be considered is the one by the Apartment complex and they already have plans and specs for that one, so she would think that they would all be compliant by August of next year, but they will verify that if needed.

Ellis asked what was needed, in terms of inventory. Bergman asked if there is a document that they can follow for this. Haugen responded that there is and he will provide it to them. He added that this won't be as extensive as the data sets they looked at for the sidewalks and curb ramps, so essentially you will be looking at slope, shelter opening width, etc.

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE TABLING THE EAST GRAND FORKS ADA TRANSITION PLAN UNTIL THE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION CAN BE INCLUDED.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Gengler, Audette, Ellis, Bergman, Emery, Kuharenko, and Konickson.

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Lang, Brooks, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Bail, Johnson, and Christianson.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE RFQ FOR TRANSIT ABSORPTION OF UND SHUTTLE

Haugen reported that this agenda item is requesting quotes to assist us in merging the Cities Area Transit and the UND Shuttle Program.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2019**

Haugen stated that we are going with a quote process rather than proposals as the dollar value is below the threshold required and we are trying to get a quick turn-around as our hope is that if things work out financially, if the previously prioritized transit vehicles are awarded, that by the fall semester the Cities Area Transit will be operating the current UND Shuttle routes, so we are trying to get this request for quotes processed through quicker than it would take us for proposals.

Haugen said that the scope of work does have some holds still on the dates, and the need to work with the NDDOT to finalize what those dates are between now and the full process, which is the proposal process, so they will hopefully have them filled in by the Executive Policy Board meeting in two weeks. He added that they did have the draft scope of work reviewed by transit staff and UND staff prior to this presentation.

Haugen commented that this is principally a financial review of how to merge the two systems; the current route structure of the UND Shuttle would be a route structure that CAT would consider implementing so that is again a financial piece of utilizing the current prorated cost model that CAT has because of its connection between Grand Forks and East Grand Forks operations, so that is who captures it.

Haugen stated that there have also been talk about future replacement as we know that vehicles don't last forever so we will try to negotiate an agreement as to how those future replacements are cost shared.

Haugen said that staff is seeking a recommendation to approve the release of this Request for Quotes to the MPO Executive Policy Board. He added that the budget is \$40,000.

Kuharenko asked if this is included in the Unified Planning Work Program. Haugen responded that it is.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE RFQ FOR TRANSIT ABSORPTION OF UND SHUTTLE SERVICE.

Audette commented that on the route structure it references the Airport Shuttle; the Airport Shuttle right now is only between UND Campus facilities and UND facilities at the Airport, it doesn't technically serve the Airport in general. Bergman responded that they will do a study to see if there is a feasibility stop near the terminal and make it a dual purpose function, and then the question will be when, that is something they will look at.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Gengler, Audette, Ellis, Bergman, Emery, Kuharenko, and Konickson.

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Lang, Brooks, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Bail, Johnson, and Christianson.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2019**

OTHER BUSINESS

- a. 2019 Annual Work Program Project Update

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

- b. Connected Automated Vehicle Workshop in East Grand Forks

Haugen reported that you have all received an invite to the MNDOT Connected Automated Vehicle Workshop; please register if you can attend. He believes it is scheduled for January 31st in East Grand Forks City Hall.

- c. Open Houses For Regional Transit Coordination Council

Ellis reported that there are three open houses for Regional Transit Coordination Council; January 17th, January 24th, and January 31st in Crookston, Ada, and Karlstad. She explained that they will essentially be talking about how we can be better coordinated between different cities with different types of bus service, to make sure that we are getting a person who may be in Roseau to Thief River or East Grand Forks; how we can accommodate those people. She said that this is just the beginning of how we can accomplish that type of service.

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO ADJOURN THE DECEMBER 12TH,
2018, TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:35 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2019
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen Chairman, called the February 13th, 2019, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:44 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning; Jesse Kadrmas, NDDOT-Local District; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Consulting - Engineer; Darren Laesch, MnDOT-District 2; Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Local Government (Via Phone).

Absent: Paul Konickson, Brad Bail, Ryan Reisinger, Richard Audette, David Kuharenko, Dustin Lang, Ryan Brooks, Brad Gengler, Lane Magnuson, Ali Rood, Dale Bergman, Stacey Hanson, Mike Yavarow, Lars Christianson, and Rich Sanders.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 9TH, 2019, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY HALFORD, TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 9TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF ANNUAL SAFETY PERFORMANCE TARGETS

Viafara gave a brief introduction, explaining that MPOs are required by the Federal Highway Administration to adopt these performance measures and the targets in the areas of safety, transit, asset management, system performance, bridge conditions and pavement conditions. He stated that in our case every year the NDDOT, MnDOT and the MPO establish the performance targets for safety, and they are based on the examination of the following factors:

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2019**

1. Number of Fatalities
2. Rate of Fatalities
3. Number of Serious Injuries
4. Rate of Serious Injuries
5. Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Non-motorized Serious Injuries

Viafara referred to the staff report and went over the proposed safety targets briefly, explaining how they arrived at the target shown.

Halford asked, with the whole campaign for “Towards Zero Deaths”, aren’t we kind of obligated to have our goal be zero and not two or fewer. Haugen responded that that is actually a long term target, and this is an annual target, and as you can see the State of North Dakota and the State of Minnesota are not targeting zero because it is an annual target, but their long term vision is zero, and that is our long term vision as well.

Haugen commented that another thing that Mr. Viafara focused on was 2016 and 2017 data. He explained that if you will recall, last year when we did the annual targets for safety, MnDOT did not have 2016 data available to us so we had to use 2015 data which was the year that North Dakota and Minnesota last synced together; now we have 2016 and 2017 for both States so we are up-to-date now with our targets, so these numbers reflect those two years of additional five-year rolling numbers.

Viafara added that depending also they carefully based on the analyses because the analysis of five years rolling average, that would be the possibility mathematically speaking of having some numbers of fatal episodes, but then when they are averaged in the five-year rolling period, because of the way how the average is taken, may be reduced; so are we spending to zero, that is the idea. He referred to the staff report and pointed out that it shows the numbers supporting the results from the five-year rolling averages and also the rates, and stated that these are the numbers that you need to review in case you have any concern concerning the table.

Haugen commented that the last thing he would like to note is that for the first time both States have introduced a decimal point with a number behind it. He said that last year when we discussed this we did not do that because we felt we can’t have half a person, so we rolled it up, and so that is what we did with the four or fewer, we kept whole numbers; but it is up to you if you want to go with the decimal point number, but as it is this is what staff is recommending the MPO adopts as its 2019 Safety Targets.

Williams referred to page four of the staff report and asked what the letter “A” stands for in the tables. Viafara responded that it stands for serious injuries.

Kadrmias commented that all of the safety factors show or fewer or lower so should the #2 safety factor show that as well. Haugen responded that it certainly could.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2019**

MOVED BY KADRMAS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY ADOPT THE ANNUAL SAFETY IMPROVEMENT FACTORS SUBJECT TO THE AMENDMENT OF ADDING THE TERM “LOWER” BEHIND THE RATE OF FATALITIES FACTOR #2.

Laesch asked how they came up with the goal rate, is it a 10% increase, or is this a rate that is recommended. Haugen responded that it is a calculation based on our vehicle miles traveled, so just as the fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled, it is a calculation of that rate; so we've had so many fatalities in different years so the rate is a little bit different, but we have combined them all to the most recent five-year rolling average, that is the calculation that we've come up with. Laesch asked if our goal is the five-year average rate. Haugen responded that our goal is a reflection of the five-year rolling average, that is the federal requirement. Williams commented, then, that we are going to have a problem in 2018 because we had several fatalities last year. Haugen agreed that there will be a movement. He said that that is the only way he can answer Mr. Laesch's question, that it is a calculation straight out of the federal definition of what this rate of fatalities is. Laesch asked if that is what the .673 is and then the .59 is what we've come up with. Haugen responded that that isn't correct. He explained that that was last year's and this is an annual target so last year's five-year rolling was a little higher than this year's five-year rolling, so every year it is going to be a different calculation based on the last five years of data.

Laesch stated that we aren't really setting a goal for lowering, we are setting a goal to maintain what happened in the past. Haugen responded that our ultimate goal is towards zero deaths, so our rate would be zero, but our target for the annual target is less than it was last year so our goal is to continue that trend toward zero.

Laesch asked what happens if we don't meet any of these. Haugen responded that for the MPO there isn't a penalty clause, but at the State level there are penalties imposed. Halford asked what those penalties are and if they would trickle back toward us at all. Haugen responded that the penalty if the State does not meet; four out of five have to be met and then there is also another part of the matrix that is not just an annual target for what the baseline data is, so you have a lot of opportunity to meet the targets, but to answer the question on what the penalty is, it is that you have to spend all of your obligation for your Safety Program. He explained that States have the flexibility to spend 100% of their obligation in surface transportation, which means that they may only spend up to 80% of their safety dollars to meet their overall cap of 90%, so they would just have to spend 100% of their safety and use all of their other flexibility in the other programs, safety just gets eliminated as being a flexible program to spend money out of if they don't meet the targets.

Williams asked if they use any of our target goals in their calculations. Haugen responded that they don't. He added that their data is the statewide data, and our data is just our study area data. Williams stated that she is still kind of stuck on the two or fewer on the fatalities because she knows they aren't going to meet that so she would like to just keep it as it is with three or fewer. She explained that the problem is that mathematically that is a third, so if we keep it at three for

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2019**

three or four years and then reduce it than mathematically that works out better than a third all at once.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO AMEND THE MOTION TO KEEP THE FATALITIES TARGET AT THREE OR FEWER.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Halford, Ellis, Emery, Williams, Laesch, and Johnson.

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Bergman, Lang, Brooks, Gengler, Hanson, Kuharenko, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Bail, Riesinger, Audette, Konickson, West, and Christianson.

ORIGINAL MOTION, AS AMENDED: MOVED BY KADRMAS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY ADOPT THE ANNUAL SAFETY IMPROVEMENT FACTORS SUBJECT TO AN AMENDMENT TO ADD THE TERM “LOWER” BEHIND THE RATE OF FATALITIES FACTOR #2 AND TO KEEP THE FATALITIES TARGET AT THREE OR FEWER.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Halford, Ellis, Emery, Williams, Laesch, and Johnson.

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Bergman, Lang, Brooks, Gengler, Hanson, Kuharenko, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Bail, Riesinger, Audette, Konickson, West, and Christianson.

MATTER OF DRAFT ITS REGIONAL ARCHITECTURE UPDATE

Viafara reported that staff is seeking approval to engage A.T.A.C. in advancing the ITS Regional Architecture for the Year 2019.

Viafara explained that this is a program that has been updated every five years, and the last time it was updated was in the Year 2014 and the whole idea is to develop the ITS Regional System to assist in the implementation of the number of initiatives and strategies that are included in the 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

Viafara stated that it is important to note that Emergency Management activities constitute a vital component of the ITS Architecture.

Viafara commented that in our case we have two boundaries; Minnesota and North Dakota, and each one of these States has its corresponding ITS Architecture, so the idea is to try to integrate our region within those two systems.

Viafara stated that the following are the objectives of the update:

1. Address changes in regional needs

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2019**

2. Address changes in stakeholders
3. Address changes in the scope of services considered, deployment of ITS projects in the region, and
4. Address changes in the National ITS Architecture.

Viafara commented that because it is important to have the stakeholders participation, a number of agencies are listed here as potentially being the sources of the stakeholders. He said that they are there because in many cases part of the regional architecture will address some of the needs, objectives, or initiatives that are also included in corresponding plans and in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

Halford said she had a question on this. She said that on the list of stakeholders in the staff report compared to the Advisory Group listed in the scope of work is a lot shorter. She asked if some of those stakeholders should be more of an advisory group, or what is the difference between the two and/or their roles. Haugen responded that the Advisory Group is monitoring more of the progress of the work and the Stakeholders are all the people that would be engaged at some point in time. He added that they won't engage all of the stakeholders all the time, however they would like to have more of an executive group to help guide the process.

Viafara stated that the scope of work documents were also included and staff is requesting consideration of approval of this activity.

Laesch asked for a definition of what ITS Architecture means. Haugen responded that because there are so many different components that it affects differently, the essence of it is that back twenty some years ago when this was emerging technologies were perhaps not interconnected or interoperable so the process behind ITS Regional Architecture is to have a more arching architecture so that East Grand Forks and Grand Forks communication could be more interoperable. He added that as things have evolved it has shifted away from some things and software has enabled ease of the interoperable so it has expanded into other things as they have emerged. He said that with this update one of the major things that we will be looking at is the CAV component, automated vehicles and automated equipment component that right now is an emerging architecture so this update will take the National Architecture, which is a real high level, and State Architecture, which brings it down a couple of levels, and then to our Regional Architecture level where we will identify some more detailed components that we might be implementing and how that interplays and how things are interoperable.

Williams asked if either of the States have theirs done yet. Haugen responded that the State of Minnesota just adopted their Statewide ITS Architecture; the NDDOT, because of staffing issues, is in the midst of updating their ITS Architecture. Johnson agreed that to his knowledge it is not complete. Williams said, then, that at this point, and that may be discussion for the project advisory group, but it may be premature for us to identify stuff because we don't want to create a conflict with what the States are, because her understanding is that A.T.A.C. is doing the State one, and we are kind of carving our part out of that, so would that be discussion for the Project Advisory Committee or is that something in the tasks here. Haugen responded that it is a Catch-22 because the State has drafts available, and the same person that is doing the State's will

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2019**

be doing ours. He said that it is more of a staffing level at the NDDOT is where the delays are occurring, so perhaps now that the MPOs are rolling up their Regional Architecture Updates the State will have to spend a little time and resource to get theirs up-to-date. Williams asked if they even have a CAV in here anywhere, as far as a deliverable or a task. Haugen responded that it isn't specifically listed but it is part of the update; the software package.

Williams stated that she thinks she can solve this by just saying that wherever that is included, if we just put the term "if applicable", as she doesn't want us to back ourselves into a corner, and then try to pre-empt the State, because she is sure there will be more discussion on this as far as that goes, and she doesn't want to create a problem. She added that we may not have that component right now, it may be that in two years we come back and amend our plan, or when it is done again in five years. Haugen stated that there will be a component to it, how expansive that component is is the question.

Laesch asked if we could change the Advisory Group to be the MnDOT District Traffic Engineer instead of the District Engineer. Haugen responded that that would not be a problem.

Williams asked if she is correct that you said that the Project Advisory Group would be reviewing every task and will have oversight on each one of those tasks. Haugen responded that they will be meeting as needed to guide us through this process so he isn't sure that "every" task is the appropriate wording, but at key points in the decision making yes. Williams said that she thinks she would like to see that included though, and then in some cases it might just be okay, and it could just be done by e-mail, but she would like to make sure that everybody is aware of what is going on with every task. Halford suggested that maybe for each of the task have the Project Advisory Group review and/or approve. Williams agreed.

Williams asked when this was going to be done. Haugen responded it is scheduled to be completed by December. Williams said, then, that you could almost bring these tasks to the Technical Advisory Committee meetings and to the Executive Policy Board Meetings as we go along for their review and input. Haugen agreed, adding that there are deliverables at different points. Williams said, though, that you might have two tasks together in one month, so she would like to include that also.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY LAESCH, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE AUTHORIZING THE MPO CHAIRMAN AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR EXECUTE AN AGREEMENT WITH A.T.A.C. TO PERFORM AN UPDATE TO THE MPO REGIONAL ITS ARCHITECTURE PLAN SUBJECT TO REVIEW OF ALL TASKS BY THE PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP, THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD; AND THAT THE CAV COMPONENT BE COORDINATED WITH THE NDDOT ITS ARCHITECTURE PLAN.

***Voting Aye: Kadrmaz, Halford, Ellis, Emery, Williams, Laesch, and Johnson.
Voting Nay: None.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2019**

Absent: Bergman, Lang, Brooks, Gengler, Hanson, Kuharenko, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Bail, Riesinger, Audette, Konickson, West, and Christianson.

MATTER OF US2/US81 INTERSECTION STUDY UPDATE

Kouba reported that the Steering Committee for this project met on Monday. She stated that one of the tasks is to evaluate the existing conditions and throw out some of the future conditions based on our traffic demand model and KLJ has put together a detailed report on the future conditions. She said that she did include a summary of that report in the packet and the full document is available on the MPO website.

Kouba commented that they did provide quite a bit of detail of what kind of traffic is happening, what happens when the trains go through, what happens during peak period traffic, etc. She stated that there are possibilities for crashes, especially when traffic controls aren't necessarily warranted so they evaluated each intersection. She added that they also looked at truck traffic and did get some great input from the Dakota Mill, who is part of the Steering Committee, as well as from the School and other businesses along the corridor.

Kouba stated that they did find some bike and ped issues, mostly with the low availability of land for right-of-way which makes it difficult for people to go through there so they will be looking into those issues.

Kouba reported that the main issue for transit is getting across the train tracks to be able to maintain their route schedules.

Kouba said that the Steering Committee went through an exercise to help them get into a brainstorming mindset to discuss what kinds of things people feel would help improve the intersection, what are their interest is in the intersection, particularly since they invited some of the property owners along those corridors.

Kouba commented that there is a webpage for this on the MPO website and she will be adding additional information from the Steering Committee meeting on it.

Kadrmass referred to the list of Steering Committee members and said that he does not represent NDDOT District #2; and asked that it be changed to either District #6 or Grand Forks District.

MATTER OF DRAFT 2019 BIKE MAP

Viafara said that you may have received a report that is basically telling you three things:

1. The MPO is embarking into updating the 2019 Bikeway Map
2. The map, as you can see it, has been drafted to include these objectives – Economic Vitality, Accessibility and Mobility, Environmental/Energy/Quality of Life, Integration and Connectivity, and Tourism.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2019**

3. Posting recreation as a way of enjoyment.

Viafara stated that what staff is asking now is for you to please provide any comments you may have from your department or agency point of view telling your opinion to help with the betterment of improvements of the cover and map.

Viafara commented that if you look carefully at the back of the map there are some panels, and those panels bring some level of information so a survey that we are expected to close on February the 26th, and the link has been given to you, it is available so that you can bring your comments to our attention by answering that survey, telling us how much you like that information or if you want the information to be reviewed or revamped you can tell us exactly what you want. He added that from the point of view of the Cities of East Grand Forks and Grand Forks, if you happen to notice a segment that is missing or that needs to be added into that map please have a careful review and let us know so then the map is fully updated.

Viafara stated that he is expecting to close the survey on February the 26th because the complete map is expected to be launched on March the 22nd or 23rd at the Home Improvement Show in Grand Forks. He commented that we are currently on track to meet that deadline.

Kadrmas referred to the map and asked to zoom in on the Kennedy Bridge area. He stated that the trail there should loop back and connect with the greenway towards the river.

Williams said that in addition to some comments that you should have received from Mr. Kuharenko; along 47th Avenue South they completed a segment on the southside of 47th between 20th and Columbia last year. She added that, just an FYI, on 62nd Avenue South they are currently in the planning and design stage to extend the existing multi-use path on the northside of 62nd from its current terminus over to Washington and then north on Washington to connect to the other existing path. She said that it isn't there now but it will be put in this summer. Ellis commented that since it isn't done now it probably shouldn't be put on the map yet. She added that they are going to be putting up some signage for some bike routes so next year they will let the MPO know where they are, but not for this map.

Williams stated that there is one other correction up on North 3rd Street, just south of Gateway, where it is shown as jogging, it just goes along 3rd now, that jogged section is gone now. She added that the other piece just to the north that is shown as going through, they never had an easement for that so that was not ever a consideration, so it is just a straight line along 3rd. Haugen asked what color it should be on the map. Williams responded that it should be red.

Halford commented that during the Bike and Ped update there was discussion about doing an app for larger maps than what were done in the past, and maybe updating the map every two or three years, is that still part of the discussion or not this time around. Viafara responded that there is one electronic version of the bike map posted on the Grand Forks website. Halford said that she knows about that but there had been discussion about having an app or larger existing maps, paper maps, making them bigger than what we have now and then maybe updating the bike map every two or three years instead of every year; those are just a few things that were talked about

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2019**

during the update and she is just wondering if that was still being considered. Viafara responded that there were some financial implications so Mr. Haugen would probably be the one to explain. Haugen commented that a year ago discussion was held on this issue and the decision was to continue with an annual update and a similar size map as we currently have. He said that since then, with the help of Grand Forks, we added an interactive web application of it, but these can be blown up and printed to whatever size is desired. Viafara added that they were printed for the greenway kiosks. Halford agreed but said that she is referring to discussion that they may enlarge the folded maps and having fewer maps because they would cost more, and she was just wondering if that was something that was still being considered or if this year you are just doing the existing size maps. Haugen responded that they are doing the same size because that is what they understood the decision was a year ago.

Halford reported that the City of Grand Forks' logo is changing. She said that this was just announced at today's State of the City. She added that in addition, the definitions and pictures that were used as examples of bike lanes, bike routes, and sharrows; she is curious where you got those definitions. She stated that some of those examples, such as you used 42nd for a bike route example, that probably isn't the best example. Viafara responded that that was what was used in the past. Halford said that the definitions; one that really stood out was the definition of sharrow in that she thought that it was kind of an odd definition, so she is curious where they got these definitions. Viafara responded that when you review them please make sure that you send us your comments and changes. Williams suggested that she thinks if you just use what FHWA has, and MUTCD, it specifically has five things in there that a sharrow does; Chapter 9c-9.

Haugen said to please feel free to provide more comments as you review the map, and added that staff is asking that you provide them by the end of February so that we can get the map to the printer and get them distributed by the end of March.

MATTER OF 2019 FLOOD BRIDGE MANAGEMENT PLAN

Haugen reported that every year about this time we discuss the possibility of flood events. He said that when this staff report was produced we didn't have quite as much snow as we currently have, however they are still forecasting little risk for a flood, so this graphic has not changed much.

Haugen stated that in any event the main point of this agenda item is to review the contact list and phone numbers and let us know if any corrections are required to ensure that if there is a flood fight we have one sheet that people can go to to know who to call, so please review the accuracy of the list and let us know as soon as possible if anything needs to be changed.

Williams commented that she knows she brought this up last year, and is going to bring it up again on this one; in the background part of the staff report the information included is getting close to 20-years old and she thinks it should be reworked and updated in some way or another. She added that the study that A.T.A.C. did is obsolete at this point because so many changes and improvements have been made and our signal system isn't even close to being the same as it was before, so maybe this can be reworked for next year.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2019**

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2019 Annual Work Program Project Update

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

Halford stated that she has a couple of questions on this report. She asked if these are all the projects for the year or are there some that aren't listed. Haugen responded that there are some that aren't listed because we haven't started working on them yet. Halford asked if that is something that we can get listed, upcoming ones, because it kind of goes into more of the overall question she has on this in that there is a column for completion date, and in the past those dates have changed as projects have been pushed back, so she is wondering if there could maybe be another column where the original completion date is listed in addition to the new completion date and then when it does change it comes back to the Technical Advisory Committee as an update that it has either been pushed back or it is going to take a little bit longer than planned so everyone is aware of it. She asked if this needs to be a motion or if it can just be a request. Haugen responded that a request is sufficient.

Haugen said that if he understands this correctly you want all of the things that are in the work program identified whether or not there is any progress on them. Halford responded that this is correct. Williams added that maybe in the task description you could give everyone an idea of when a project is proposed to begin, like a July kickoff or something, as it helps them to be able to plan their time a little bit better.

b. Possible CAT Route Change

Haugen reported that CAT has some possible route changes and a link to that report was given. He asked if there were any meetings scheduled for this yet. Kouba responded that no meetings have been scheduled as of yet as they are still working on what kind of changes they are looking at doing in-house before they bring it forward for public input. Ellis added that they are looking at possibly some time in March to schedule some meetings.

Discussion on ridership numbers; and route changes, issues and concerns ensued.

Williams said that she heard that there was an app for tracking a bus. Kouba stated that the Route Match is off-line and they have launched a new app and it is available through Google Play and Apple Store, but it is fairly recent that the new app has been released. Williams asked what the name is. Kouba responded that it is called CAT Prowler.

Ellis commented that there is no reason why it should take an hour and a half for someone to get from their home to City Hall so they should contact their Mobility Manager and she can determine a more direct route.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2019**

Viafara asked how many people can dial a ride; is there a limit a day or a month or something. Kouba responded that dial-a-ride is more paratransit or senior rider so it has its limitation of whether a person can use it or not and then senior rider has an age requirement before it can be used. Ellis added that there is no limit as to how many rides you can have a day. Viafara asked if the number of people that can use it is limited. Ellis responded that it really is somewhat defined by the number of vehicles available, the number of drivers available, and what trips are called in because if a trip is called from the north end of Grand Forks and they want to go to Altru Clinic they are obviously going to try to pick up some people along the way but they are very limited on how many people can fit into a van. Kouba added that she thinks where the limitation comes in is who can use the paratransit service, not just anyone can use it or senior rider. Ellis said, though, that as far as rides per day if we notice an uptick in more people qualifying and wanting to use it more, there might be some limitations on availability.

Viafara stated that he was asking if this might be something that Ms. Williams, or others in the same situation of having an hour and a half trip, might want to consider using. Ellis responded that they would have to qualify and then it is \$3.00 per ride so it would cost her \$3.00 to get downtown and then \$3.00 and to get home and she doesn't think most people would want to do that every day when they can get bus ticket for much less.

c. Mn220 North Meeting – February 19th, 2019

Haugen reported that February 19th in the afternoon is the next Steering Committee meeting for the Mn220 North Study.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY HALFORD, TO ADJOURN THE FEBRUARY 13TH, 2019, TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:35 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 13th, 2019
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen Chairman, called the March 13th, 2019, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:36 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

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

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

Guest(s): Jim Mertz, Bolton And Menk and Paul McCullough, Cities Area Transit.

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 not present.

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

As there was not a quorum present, action could not be taken on the February 13th, 2019 minutes.

MATTER OF 2019 BIKE MAP UPDATE

Viafara reported that included in the packet was the staff report and a copy of the Draft 2019 Bike Map. He commented that the design, printing and distribution of the 2019 Bike Map is one of the objectives of the 2045 Bicycle and Pedestrian Element we recently adopted. He added that it is supported by a number of goals, objectives and standards; as discussed in the staff report.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2019**

Viafara pointed out that there are number of panels are also included as part of the map. He said that the purpose of these panels is to improve all the information and safety for the bikeway users. He referred to the panels and went over them briefly.

Viafara then went over some of the updated information on the map; explaining that the purpose is to showcase all of the new facilities that Engineering has been building. He stated that they did miss one small segment, but added that in reality five new segments were included on the map. He pointed out where all of these new segments were located.

Viafara stated that this map is expected to be available by March 22nd for distribution at the Grand Forks Home Show.

Information only.

MATTER OF PROPOSED CAT ROUTE CHANGES

Kouba reported that after CAT introduced the new routes in July of 2018, they have been working on getting them up and running. She stated that they have been getting feedback from both riders and drivers on how they feel the new routes are working, and a report was released at the end of January 2019.

Kouba referred to the staff report and commented that some of the bigger changes were to move some of the on-time performance from one route to another, and so it kind of snowballed into being able to meet up and meet transfers in a timely fashion, and things of that nature. She added that there were requests for areas not being served to be served, so they put together some new ideas and are bringing forward some new routes. She said that they did evaluate how well those routes that were implemented were doing; especially with the new peak periods that were being provided; and they found out that they weren't doing quite as well as they thought they would. She went over some of the route changes briefly.

Kouba stated that this is a budget neutral change, and meetings are scheduled for March 19 in the Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers and then on March 21st in the East Grand Forks City Hall in the Training Conference Room.

Kouba said that they are taking comments until March 29; and are looking at an implementation date of June 3rd.

Information only.

MATTER OF MN 220 NORTH STUDY UPDATE

Viafara reported that on February 19th they held the third Steering Committee meeting. He said that it entailed a presentation and a discussion by the committee of proposed alternatives as outlined in Tech Memo #4, which is available on the MPO website. He gave a brief synopsis of the discussion that was held at the Steering Committee meeting.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2019**

Viafara referred to the staff report and pointed out that it shows that the four primary objectives of the study are: 1) improve access control; 2) improve safety; 3) improve mobility/capacity; and 4) improve pedestrian crossings on Mn220 North.

Viafara said that with this in mind, a number of objectives were proposed. He went over them briefly: 1) access/traffic control device considerations, such as traffic signals, whether to build a round-a-bout or whether to bring access management and geometric analysis to improve the corridor; 2) access management, basically the idea is to prohibit some through crossings at some of the intersections, or to restrict some left turning movements; and the overall idea is to improve safety on the corridor; 3) traffic signals, there are a number of treatments on this because there is a need to upgrade some of them to today's standards, or there is a need to install a new signal systems, and also there is a need to have some intersections have some level of stop control elements; 4) traffic improvements that deal with the possibility to improve access, disability, exposure of pedestrians when they are crossing, and wellness in terms of safety.

Viafara referred to Tech Memo #4 and commented that if you look at this memo you will see that for each intersection an alternative development was performed and they are listed here by intersection. He added that this information gives us the pros and cons for each intersection, and the overall benefits, including cost/benefits.

Haugen commented that one of the significant things that is coming out of this study is that in prior plans the City and the MPO have had discussions of carrying the four lane or five lane section up to 23rd. He stated that we have unique lane drop in the right turn lane and the transition that add some confusion and where the right turn lanes ends and where the second lane starts we had some confusion. He added that as part of the study we are finding out, from a capacity point of view that really the four lanes, even south at 20th, are not needed, from a capacity to traffic flow point of view, so we would be looking at ways to maybe do a road diet from 17th Street North along the corridor, which makes it easier to implement some of the round-a-bout concepts, instead of reducing the two-by ones or two through lane roundabouts, with one for the cross street, making them simple one lane round-a-bout at 17th.

Information only.

MATTER OF GRAND FORKS DOWNTOWN PARKING STUDY UPDATE

Haugen reported that previously we shared what the analysis of the existing parking situation downtown is. This is looking at two different things. He said that the first thing is looking at the fact that there are a lot of development/redevelopment proposals or concepts, some are active in construction, some are active in design, some are concepts in people's minds, so one of things that we asked the consultants to do was to look at our parking supply and see how much more we need, or if we have enough, or do we need to add parking.

Haugen commented that one of the concepts that we are working with the committee on is shifting from having one stall committed to one car for twenty-four hours a day; we would instead, for certain uses, use that parking stall at different times of the day, and so instead of now

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2019**

finding out from occupancy that we have roughly 50% vacant spaces that we look at the parking using more of a time of day scenario, whereby some of the stalls would be used overnight but not during the day, and some would be used during the day and not overnight, so a time of day profile is being introduced, and from that they looked at these six different development proposals; the first five are ones that are either actively being done or have been conceptualized in drawings and presented.

Haugen commented that they have also included a pretty significant “what if” scenario; and that is on the Century Link building block, so they made a major development, suggested in there just to do a “what if” scenario of the parking that would be added.

Haugen stated that for these developments in which the concepts are a little bit more defined; they show on-site parking as part of their development, so they included that on-site parking, but for some of the other developments they are assuming that parking is being provided by the municipal system, or is paying into the assessment instead of provided their own parking.

Haugen said that the other scenarios they are looking at is whether increased biking/walking has a big impact on the parking demand; does the introduction of automated vehicle or connected vehicles have a big impact on the parking demand; so in short they are looking at that we have enough parking downtown, and they are using the Downtown Action Plan concepts of the ten year type time frame to come up with these ten year scenario impacts, and they are finding that there is sufficient parking available even with the developments that are proposed and with the high density development that there is still plenty of parking available. He added that they are finding that some of these alternative transportation modes and autonomous vehicles will have some impact, but it isn't a very significant impact; the parking demand is lessened a little bit, but not a lot, but in the end there is still plenty of parking spaces available.

Haugen reported that the next thing they will be looking at is what alternatives, or what changes to how parking is currently being managed; and the ordinance, besides the way we change how the ordinance reads with the time of day parking, there seems to be a consensus that a marketing campaign needs to be developed and worked on to get past the perception that there is limited parking, so they are working on some suggestions for that.

Haugen commented that some questions they are asking, because utilization shows there is a lot of parking available, currently there is no ability or desire to tell any individual development/redevelopment that they should not be providing so much parking; so in instances we have uses that have been built that go beyond what the assessment would have required them to do and therefore we are just adding more available parking to a parking supply that has a lot of occupancy that is not being utilized.

Haugen stated that there has also been discussions on what is the best use of space downtown, is it parking lots or is it development.

Haugen commented that since we aren't seeing a lot of real significant impact on the parking side of things; some of these other improvements are mostly geared towards a lot of the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2019**

Downtown Action Plan concepts, just to help make the parking study be in-sync with them; alleyways, lighting, and so on. He added that event management includes trying to work with some of the available transit services, or add some of the transit services to help out.

Haugen said that they are seeing that people know that there is a lack of enforcement of parking downtown, they are willing to take the risk of getting a ticket that they typically won't get, so we are working and trying to increase the enforcement and are looking into the possibility of a graduated parking fine, but part of the problem with that is that is very inexpensive to get a parking ticket, but it would cost you more if you get two tickets, even more if you get three, and so on. He added that there has also been discussion on instead of enforcing the whole area, just focusing enforcement on just the real hot spots, and making sure they get enforced on a more regular basis. He said that right now the enforcement is low on the priority list. Halford asked who sets the amount a ticket can be, is it the State or is it the City. Haugen responded that they are working on getting that clarified. He added that the City of Fargo currently has a graduated parking structure; and the court case that struck down speeding tickets caused a lot of cities to change their fine system, Fargo did not change their parking fine system. Kuharenko asked about the amount of violations that we have been getting; he saw in the existing conditions report that it looks like on average 24.1%, so are the majority of those on-street or are those in parking structures. Haugen responded that it is mostly on-street.

Grasser asked if Mr. Haugen could explain the Century Link concept, he isn't familiar with what that would be. Haugen responded that it is Lot #3. He explained that it is building a five-story sidewalk to sidewalk full development with mixed use, so it is not something that anybody has sent to us or the consultants; it is just an idea of what we could put in the spot; it is us saying "what if we had a real big project come in, how does it impact our parking" There is in the Downtown Action Plan some buzz about that Century Building and whether it has a use anymore or not. Grasser said, then, that it would be a fairly high traffic generator then. Haugen responded that it would. Kuharenko stated that even though it is a very high intensity development they are still showing a level of service B. Haugen explained that that is a parking level of service, not a traffic level of service.

Haugen stated that the idea behind this is that even with the known developments we saw that there was a lot of parking availability from the occupancy rate study they did; so how much could we build and still have enough parking before we have to start worrying about parking.

Kuharenko referred to the slides and pointed out that the ten-year scenario impact slide shows that that block has a level of service B; but on the following one with walking, biking and transit trips increasing by 2% each year, it shows a level of service C for parking for that same block; that doesn't make sense to him. Haugen responded that he knows there is a reason for that, but he can't remember exactly what it is, so he will look that up and get back to him.

Haugen reported that because of the infrastructure investment, on the County Ramp in particular there are some maintenance issues that need to be addressed to make it a better ramp option for people. He added that they are also looking at how to change the management, allowing some of the ramp spaces; like the Central Ramp is virtually restricted to permitted parking only during

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2019**

most of the work day, and yet half of the spaces are empty; so try to get more use out of it by adding some clarification that some stalls are free like the County and Corporate ramps do.

Haugen said that they are trying to work with the Downtown Development Association on event management. He explained that, as an example, when the Alerus Center has major events there is an event plan that is used to help people get to and from an event; so it would be helpful to have an event plan in place for downtown events to inform people which routes to take, what available parking should be first sought, etc. He reported that in terms of the marketing side of things, on the study itself the documents that are available on the website; there are other things about the autonomous vehicles, transit, and other things, but since they didn't have a huge impact in the short-term, they aren't even allocated as something that should be done in the short-term.

Haugen stated that an open house is scheduled for March 21st at the Empire Art Theater downtown from 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. He added that the Downtown Development Association is offering a taco bar at the same time, so if nothing else come and have some tacos.

Information only.

MATTER OF PROGRESS ON 2020-2023 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that the Minnesota side is basically out; he isn't sure if the NWATP has formally published it yet, but the ATP did meet this month and finalized the Draft ATIP on the Minnesota side.

Haugen commented that some things to note on the Minnesota funding side; they saw a huge year of expenditure change occur, and that impacted the State projects, so the City Subtargets, County Subtargets, etc., weren't impacted this go-around, but as you can see they had a 17% where normally we are talking 4 or 5 percent, so that trickled throughout the rest of their outer-year projects.

Haugen stated that we also saw that they were over-programming or were over-aggressive in their programming, so they are scaling back, so there has been less revenue coming in to our ATP areas, so the basic message here is that so far it hasn't impacted the local agencies, nor has it really affected any of the projects programmed or scheduled or our MPO area.

Haugen reported that on the North Dakota side, so far North Dakota has only announced one award; that was for the Urban Grant or Main Street, and that is the reconstruction of North 3rd Street. He said that the rest of the programs are still under development.

Haugen stated that North Dakota DOT and the MPO just announced the next round of the 5339 solicitation. He said that applications are due to the MPO on April 1st, a really short turn-around time.

Haugen commented that not listed on here, but what should have been, is that you will be getting from him the Annual Listing of Obligation and a progress report request to fill out for the 2018

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2019**

Annual Listing of Obligations and a progress report for the 2019 current construction season projects.

Grasser asked if any other Urban Grant projects were awarded. Haugen responded that they did. He added that he doesn't know all of them but he does know that Bismarck received one. Grasser asked what the nature was of the ones that were awarded, were they reconstruction type activities and what did they involve. Haugen responded that he doesn't know, and asked if Mr. Johnson knew what projects were awarded and what they involved. Johnson responded that the ones that were notified were Grand Forks, Bismarck, and Williston. He added that they were still gathering some additional information for the committee on that potential awarding of another project.

Grasser asked what type of projects got awarded. Johnson responded that Bismarck was awarded funding for a concrete pavement repair, gutter repairs, sidewalk repairs, pavement marking, ornamental pedestrian lighting, street tree event taping and signage; Williston was awarded funding for installation of street trees, pedestrian lighting and plantings.

Discussion on application deadline issues/solutions ensued. Bergman questioned the deadline for the FTA 5339 as being much too tight. Haugen responded it came from NDDOT without much MPO input yet did state that he would send a reply requesting a later deadline. Haugen mentioned he would see if the other two MPOs would concur extending the deadline.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2019 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that the monthly progress report is included for your review. He pointed out that Mr. Viafara has added some new things that we haven't started work on yet, but he has identified what they are. Halford asked if that is what is left or are there still other things that possibly could be coming about. Haugen responded that these are pretty much everything that is identified in the work program.

Halford thanked Mr. Viafara for doing that, and asked if he could also act a column for the original completion date as well as the new completion date.

b. Acceptance Of 2045 MTP

Haugen reported that the 2045 MTP has been accepted, and we now have started the clock for the January 2024 update. He added that, as we discussed, we hope there is more revenue that will allow is to amend the MTP well before 2024.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2019**

c. Draft ND Moves Plan Out For Review

Haugen reported that the Draft ND Moves plan is out for review on the NDDOT website. He explained that ND Moves is the plan for public transportation and bike/ped.

d. CAT/UND Merger Study Contract With SRF

Haugen reported that SRF was selected to work with the MPO on the CAT/UND Merger Study, so they are now under contract.

ADJOURNMENT

***HAUGEN CLOSED THE MARCH 13TH, 2019 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING AT 2:21 P.M.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

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

CALL TO ORDER

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

CALL OF ROLL

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

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

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

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

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

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

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

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

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF ITS REGIONAL ARCHITECTURE PRESENTATION

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

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

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

Viafara stated that the key objectives for this update are:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DISCUSSION:

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

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

Information only.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Voting Nay: None.

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

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

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION PLAN RFP

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Voting Nay: None.

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

MATTER OF LISTING OF OBLIGATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Information only.

MATTER OF JOINT CITY COUNCIL BRIDGE MEETING

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

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

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

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

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

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2019 Annual Work Program Project Update

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

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

Information only.

b. Skewed Intersection Open House April 11th

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

Information only.

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

c. Mn220No Open House April 16th

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

Information only.

d. NDDOT/MNDOT POSITION CHANGES

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

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

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

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

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**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

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 12th, 2019
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen Chairman, called the June 12th, 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; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Nancy Graham (Proxy For Darren Laesch), MnDOT Planning Director; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; Richard Audette, Airport Authority; Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Jason Peterson, NDDOT-Local District; and Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Local Government.

Absent: Brad Bail, Jesse Kadrmas, Nancy Ellis, Ryan Riesinger, Darren Laesch, Dustin Lang, Ryan Brooks, Lane Magnuson, Ali Rood, Jane Williams, Stacey Hanson, Mike Yavarow, Lars Christianson, and Rich Sanders.

Guest(s): Patrick Hopkins, MnDOT Planning Engineer; Michael Huot, East Grand Forks/Grand Forks Property Owner; Bobbi Retzlaff, MnDOT; and Sandy Zimmer, FHWA-Bismarck.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

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

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 12th, 2019**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MAY 15TH, 2019, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL
ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY EMERY, TO APPROVE THE MAY 15TH, 2019,
MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF FINAL EGF ROW ADA TRANSITION PLAN

Haugen reported that Teri Kouba is the manager on this item and will walk us through it.

Kouba stated that we did the bulk of this document at the end of 2018, but when we took it before our Federal Partners there was some things they wanted added; specifically the evaluation of the transit facilities in East Grand Forks, but as it was winter we had to postpone doing it until May.

Kouba said that the East Grand Forks City Engineer went out and performed the evaluation of the transit shelters; so we went through the body of the document and replaced and/or added the necessary information that was obtained. She referred to the document and went over the changes/additions briefly, adding that as soon as a copy of the full accounting of this information is received it will be included in Attachment A, which has all of the facilities listed, and it will be part of the final document.

Bergman commented that the shelter prices listed are the minimum cost now, the lower end of them, because they can run \$10,000 to \$15,000. Kouba responded that the shelters are already there, we are just looking at doing concrete improvements and adding the truncated domes and things like that to them. Emery added that that is correct and explained that this is just including the necessary sidewalk improvements, shelter improvement type things, it doesn't include new shelters.

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY EMERY, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A
RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY
APPROVE THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE EAST GRAND FORKS ADA TRANSITION
PLAN FOR PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY, SUBJECT TO REVIEW AND APPROVAL FROM
THE EAST GRAND FORKS CITY COUNCIL.***

***Voting Aye: Audette, Johnson, Kuharneko, Peterson, Emery, Gengler, Graham, and
Bergman.***

Voting Nay: None.

***Absent: Lang, Ellis, Bail, Brooks, Riesinger, Laesch, Konickson, Williams,
Hanson, Rood, West, Magnuson, Sanders, and Christianson.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 12th, 2019**

MATTER OF UPDATE ON CAT/UND SHUTTLE MERGER STUDY

Kouba reported that just to reiterate, UND approached Cities Area Transit (CAT) to possibly take over their campus shuttle service, which is provided by the University itself. She added that UND is the only North Dakota University that provides this type of service.

Kouba commented that there are some cost variances involved with this service, which causes a lot of volatility and unknown costs to the University, which is why they approached CAT.

Kouba stated that we did a cost allocation to see what East Grand Forks pays for, and using that as a base we modified it a bit for UND and got some 5-year costs; basically a base cost, and then did a 5-year projection.

Kouba said that the next steps will be to look at where UND is at with those 5-year costs, as well as the City sitting down with UND and discussing those costs as well.

Haugen commented that this is an update only, there is no action requested. He added that last month you were given the UND costs, this month you are being given CAT's cost to provide the exact same shuttles, times and routes.

Haugen referred to the agreement and pointed out that with the allocation model, there is this first year agreed to by staff to carry some of the peak vehicle cost allocation. He explained that the \$44,000 is a cost that was identified to bring in the UND routes to these cost line items, and that is where we get a cost comparison of \$361,800. He stated that it makes the cost comparable for Cities Area Transit to provide the service as UND is currently providing it based on their average annual cost per hour of fleet buses.

Haugen reiterated that as Ms. Kouba said, the next step is for each agency to take it through their governing bodies to concur with the cost sharing, and work out agreements, then we will finalize this study. He said that our contract is based on a fall limitation, but now we are waiting a year so it appears we have time to finalize the report and extend the contract a couple of months. Bergman added that they wouldn't be doing anything until August 1, 2020. He said that the issues is trying to get the University back to the table to iron out what they want to do, that seems to be the hardest part with this.

Haugen commented that we have shown in the study that CAT can provide the service at our cost, what their typical costs are on an annual basis CAT can have cost assumptions for it that are easily predictable versus the current situation where they fluctuate dramatically, so it seems like it could be a win/win to have the merger take place, but we do need to have this information reviewed by the key people and concurrence with what is being provided.

Bergman reported that on the other side of this is that there are zeros cost to either the City of Grand Forks or East Grand Forks, because the University is paying the local match portion of this.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 12th, 2019**

**MATTER OF POSSIBLE WORK PROGRAM AMENDMENT FOR 32ND AVENUE
BRIDGE FEASIBILITY STUDY**

Haugen reported that this item is at the request of the MPO Board. He explained that after their last meeting they were interested in making progress on both future river crossings.

Haugen stated that there was discussion as to how we could proceed forward with the 32nd Avenue location, and one of the options they asked staff to put together was an amendment to the work program to do a study similar to what was done on the Merrifield location; the Merrifield Feasibility Bridge Report that was done; so staff looked at that study, found that the cost of the study was \$60,000 back then, so we adjusted for inflation for this study and set the cost at \$110,000 for the consultant budget.

Haugen referred to the staff report and commented that also you will see there are four projects listed that are currently in our 2020 Work Program that staff feel could be moved to accommodate this study. He said that he did talk to most of the technical people individually on them. He went over the four projects briefly, explaining why it is felt they can be delayed.

Haugen commented that before he gets into the scope of work for the 32nd Avenue Bridge, he would like to talk about the Merrifield Bridge project. He stated that they have been trying to get the two counties to schedule a joint meeting. He said that there was, at one time a date of June 18th was discussed to hold a meeting, but that date has since fallen through; so they are still hoping that both counties will get together and start discussing how to proceed forward with the Merrifield project.

Haugen stated that the scope of work for feasibility study comes straight out of the RFP that was written for the Merrifield study, however with Merrifield we also had the issue of Cole Creek, and with 32nd we wouldn't have that drainage issue tied so closely to the river crossing, but a lot of the rest of the work would be very similar in the scope. He said that with that he is also asking for our State and Federal Partners to make sure that these items they did back then are still eligible for us to do this time around.

Haugen reported that the intent is to take the maps and graphics that we currently have, which are very broad, and bring some level of refinement to them; it does not create a shovel ready project, but it does take it one additional step to help whittle down the alignment and to answer some questions to get us a more detailed traffic operations forecast at key intersections. He added that they would look at the impact it would have on the flood protection system, and what is permitted.

Bergman asked if this study is going against what the City Council had decided at their meeting, is this something that the City Council doesn't know about. Haugen responded that they do know about it. Bergman commented that he is surprised after the last ??? that they are going to be asking you to do a feasibility study. Haugen responded that he would say that there is probably on the North Dakota side, not a unanimous decision, just as the plan adoption was not unanimous, but the City Council reps on the MPO Board are part of this request, so from there, it

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 12th, 2019**

is still at a discussion point within the MPO. He said that you will notice that there isn't a request to recommend an amendment in the staff report, it just identifies that there is a future possible amendment coming. He added that the MPO Board was interested in what staff thought it would take to do this, and what projects would be delayed to do it.

Bergman reiterated, though, that this is not going to give a shovel ready project. Haugen responded that that is correct. Bergman said that it is just a review. Haugen responded that it is not just a review, it takes it to another level just as the Merrifield Bridge Feasibility Study took that location to another level, it will be more refined than just a line on a map, and if you look at the Merrifield report you will see that we looked at several different possible alignments, we looked at flood impact differently with those alignments; that involved Cole Creek, so we had to deal with that issue, but Merrifield didn't have to deal with a lot of the urban setting requirements that this one will have to deal with.

Bergman said that he knows that this is a hot button issue out there, and all we do is stir up the pot again, but if that is really what they want to have. Haugen stated that he would encourage you to read the MPO Board Minutes for May when they are available, and they will be available at the end of the week. He explained that if you read the minutes he thinks you will see that one of their attempts is to not have this sit for five years and have the same or similar discussion as was this past 18 month period, that this would have a little more informing information on the feasibility of this actual location. He stated that one result might be that we find that there is a fatal flaw and this location can be dropped, but until you go to the next level we don't know, so it is still an unknown and this will begin to answer the question. He added that some question a little bit more, but not all question, to a design, shovel ready project evaluation.

Haugen stated that the key things would be to review this scope of work to see if it is appropriate, with those few exceptions, and if there are some things that are omitted that you would like to, perhaps, see emphasized; that would be it. He added that it would also be good if you would give an honest opinion as to our cost estimate for the consultant costs.

Bergman asked if, when this is completed, and it goes to the MPO Board, it will still have to go through the City Council for their approval, correct. Haugen responded that it would still have to go through both respective City Councils.

Emery said, then, that at this point you are just asking us to review the scope of work and let you know if we have any comments and then it will come back to another TAC meeting for further review and discussion. Haugen responded that it will go before the MPO Board next week, and unless we get comments between now and Friday this is what will be presented to the Board; and we still have some review taking place by our partners, and we aren't asking the Board to take any formal action, so his sense is that if they still want to move forward after next week then in July we would produce one that is more specific to 32nd Avenue, and RFP document, and we would also have to produce, then, the formal Amendment to the Work Program and that format, so there would be two agenda items; one would be the work program amendment first and the second would be the Draft RFP specific to 32nd Avenue.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 12th, 2019**

Haugen commented that they did also discuss going to project shovel ready, but they felt it was too costly. He added that if they can get a similar report as the feasibility report for Merrifield, which seems to have advanced Merrifield further along, it might advance or find a fatal flaw for 32nd that would indicate why it shouldn't advance; but, again, the intent is to not let it just sit idly for the next five year cycle.

DISCUSSION

Michael Huot asked if anyone was at the East Grand Forks Council meeting last night. Emery responded that he did attend the meeting. Huot asked for clarification on the discussion about getting bond money for shovel ready projects, and that Friday was the last day for them to apply for those funds. Emery responded that that was through the Build Transportation Grant Program. Huot said that that is money they are going to use to get 32nd somewhat shovel ready. Emery responded that that is a program that could potentially provide money for construction plus any engineering or planning type of stuff. Huot said, again, though that the deadline is Friday and they want information a year in advance, so probably two years. Emery responded that he thinks the deadline for that program is sometime in July. Huot stated that the gal mentioned June 15th. Emery responded that that date is for some bonding money. Huot said that that is what he was referring to.

Huot commented that the thing that was discussed yesterday was the council president was talking about the money being spent for shovel ready; is it going to be wasted, is it not going to be wasted, can we use it, how long does it last, and so forth. He said that they didn't bring up the Merrifield Feasibility Study, but one thing that was very clear in that discussion was, just because it is on the MPO plan doesn't mean that 32nd is actually the location of the bridge, and really what the president wanted to say is that we have to have further discussion to decide what site we want before we spend a lot of money and time deciding what we are going to do; so one of the things he said is why don't we get more meetings together.

Huot stated that he has homes in both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, he has no idea why he would advocate 32nd or not advocate 32nd; he has no idea why he would advocate Merrifield or not advocate Merrifield, there doesn't seem to be a clear discussion that he can use to make his decision; so he goes to these meetings and everyone is just talking, but the real moose on the table is getting all the folks together and actually make a decision, it is a hot button but nobody is talking the same language.

Huot commented that the Mayor of East Grand Forks says it is a neighborhood bridge, he wants a neighborhood bridge; well it goes right smack into a section of dirt, that isn't a neighborhood, so he is just wants honesty as far as where this bridge goes, and he hasn't heard any of those discussions; when it is on the radio you get one side or you go to Grand Forks and you get something else so how do we get two communities together and have a discussion and actually add some things to the list, and/or eliminate some things so we can get some cohesion and get this thing moving because nobody wants to go through this again in three years, right, it's not only separating Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, but it is separating 32nd, Elks Drive, 17th, all those locations. He added that even if you put a bridge at 32nd, but you don't put this

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 12th, 2019**

roundabout, it isn't going to help the traffic anyway, and the roundabout we're talking about isn't really a roundabout it is just a sign that says it is a roundabout because you can't build a roundabout because we've got a neighborhood right through it, and that doesn't make sense to him.

Huot stated that he likes coming to these meetings and see all the work you are putting into them, but it doesn't go anywhere, and then you try to present that at a council meeting and ask them to try to make a decision at the last final hour, that isn't fair to anyone. He added that he is really trying; he goes back to his community and tells them this is what we talked about, this is where we are at, and we're no different than we were last time it came up.

Huot said that he really wants to see something done; if it is 32nd then by-god it is 32nd, but there better be some strong evidence why that is the place instead of just someone winning and someone losing, it better be a community win or we will have issues.

Emery commented that the way he understands this is that has to be the intent of this feasibility study, to take a better look at 32nd and see what is feasible and what isn't. He said that for ump-teen years there has been discussions about five or six different locations, but we can't seem to get past that, so it seems like the Executive Board is at least wanting to take it to the next level and keep the ball rolling to gain some momentum; and maybe through the process we will find out that this isn't the location, but at least they are doing something.

Huot asked, even last night, was there a clear decision where the bridge should go. He added that the meeting last night was ??? where the bridge should go. Emery responded that he doesn't personally think that the City of East Grand Forks knows where the bridge is going to go. He added that he thinks they have some representation on the Executive Board, but if you ask the full council where the bridge is going to go you wouldn't get seven unanimous opinions.

Huot commented that this is just his observation, he is really trying to sink his teeth into something, and at least grab on something that he can advocate more and he can't do either one. Emery stated that he was at the Joint meeting a few months ago, and they talked about 32nd, but when he walked away from that meeting it was very political; with 90% of the people not wanting it and 10% of the people that did.

Haugen said that all he can say is that if you asked what is in the plan of all three entities, all three would say a bridge at Merrifield and a bridge at 32nd. He added that the MPO Board is trying to move on both ends, they are trying to facilitate a joint meeting between the two counties to continue moving Merrifield forward. He said that Merrifield is more advanced and even then there is likely some persuasion that needs to be done at the county level to have any movement of that project, but at the same time he has already stated that they want to try to do something with the 32nd location to either move it forward or to find that fatal flaw and go back to the drawing board.

Haugen reiterated that they are asking the Technical Advisory Committee to review the scope of work; the eligibility of some of those items, and give us feedback. He added that you will get

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 12th, 2019**

another chance before we do any formal changes to anything, and we will also have a meeting a week from today where we will have more discussion, and either a continue moving this forward direction, or a slight change in direction, or a stop and rethink direction.

Haugen stated that this is what the MPO Board asked us to provide them with. He added that the sooner you get us your comments the better off we would be.

MATTER OF DISCUSSION ON FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION UPDATE

Haugen reported that last month we talked more generically about the process, the Federal Highway Guidelines, and so on. He said that they also distributed last month after our meeting, on both sides of the river, but as was stated since we had just completed something major on the Minnesota side we are anticipating that most of our work will be on the North Dakota side, however we still gave our Minnesota friends the opportunity to comment. He said that as he noted in the staff report, our Minnesota friends didn't see much of anything that needs to be changed, so, again, our future discussions will be on the North Dakota side.

Haugen commented that there were some e-mail exchanges; to highlight some things, but for the most part we didn't get a lot of great comments so we compared this map that further discusses some area, so in addition to the stubs that were highlighted by the NDDOT last time, we are also including some other areas where we need to have some discussion; we actually did have some discussion at one point about the possibility of changing the functional class in those areas, but further discussion is necessary. He added that as we discussed last month there is the federal funding tie-in with the decision of future extensions only showing up if there are in the T.I.P./S.T.I.P. process.

Haugen referred to the map and went over some areas that need to be discussed. Discussion ensued.

Haugen stated that what they are asking is; particularly where we have County Major Collectors coming to a City Limit Line, which we classify as Principal Arterials, part of the discussion is that we are no longer supposed to follow political boundaries, or necessary geographical boundaries but functionality of the roadway, and so he is wondering how the extensions of a County Collector should be done. Kouba commented that that is the area where they switch from a Principal Arterial to a County Major Collector. Haugen said that in the past it has been purely just because it crossed that imaginary boundary. Kouba pointed out that we then go from a Principal Arterial to the Minor on the other side of the Interstate and then we immediately go to the County Major Collector.

Haugen referred to the map and pointed out another area they highlighted and explained that we now know that 55th extends to Washington, so that should be changed. Kouba said that the question is will the rest of Cherry be counted down to 62nd within the T.I.P./S.T.I.P. period. Kuharenko responded that he would think that Cherry Street will be extended to 62nd within the next couple of years. Kouba stated, then, that it would be feasible to make it officially part of the network.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 12th, 2019**

Haugen commented that we also have frontage roads highlighted. He said that it is his understanding that at the time that these were classified was to make them eligible for federal aid, not so much based on function as collectors, perhaps, but now we are now using a new guidance process. He stated that the last time he recalls us discussion frontage roads and federal aid was when we doing our fiscally constrained financial plan, and we were having all these frontage roads pop-up as very needy federal aid routes, that had a lot of dollars attached to them. He said he thinks the guidance came from North Dakota Federal Highway and NDDOT back in the day to put them on the class system; he asked if there was any guidance today. Johnson responded that if you want to be able to use any federal aid dollars at all at any point in time, whether it is a NDDOT or City project they have to be classified. Johnson concurred, adding that at one point in time we had to have them classified, then they moved away from that and were treating them as an element of the highway corridor, almost like a lighting system or shared use path, so if you are doing a mainline project we would put federal aid on the frontage roads, but through coordination with Federal Highway that was not the right way to be doing things so they now have come back full circle. He said that for any federal aid to be used on them the need to be classified, but it does eat away at the mileage limit for collectors.

Kuharenko asked if the current mileage numbers broken down. Haugen responded that they do. He explained that they have a North Dakota tally and a local tally. He added that he thinks we are in agreement with the same base year; and then our 2019 numbers are, we have what we think might be the point of making functional class, so we don't know if you know what they might be. He said that he doesn't know if we kept the frontage road functionally classified. Kouba responded that they are currently included in the tally; she was having the intern work on highlighting how much mileage the mileage would be reduced if we did take off the frontage roads and/or some of the other areas. Kuharenko asked if it would be possible for them to send that information so they have a better understanding as to where we are at currently, that way they might be able to better figure out where we need to trim in order to fit those guidelines.

Gengler asked if the individual allocations are set in stone, so to speak, in terms of are they based on size of the city relative to lane miles. Johnson responded that they are a percentage range. He cited examples of the percentages; for the Interstate system its like 3%-9%, and that applies here or to Minneapolis, so they would most likely be over with their mileage; for minor arterials it's like 7%-14%, collectors, etc. He stated, though, that on the North Dakota side the collectors are a little different because they asked that you not to do two collector systems, it is just one system, so for the guidance table you unofficially add the two collector systems together so it is like 6%-32%, and then the locals are like 65%-80%. Haugen pulled up a table with the correct percentages for review.

Haugen referred to the map and pointed out that they also highlighted, particularly in the downtown area, where we have every roadway classified; so getting back to the new guidance would we have such close spacing taking place with these roadways. Kuharenko asked if that causes us issues with a currently programmed project. He said that we have the Urban Grant program for North 3rd Street from DeMers to University, would declassifying that to cause that project issues. Johnson responded that it would. Haugen said, though, that he thinks that an argument could be made that the Urban Grant Program originally wasn't set to be holding up

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 12th, 2019**

federal aid roads; and the discussion he heard was that they want to be as broad as possible with the projects and the funding, and we do know that some STP dollars can be spent on non-federal aid routes. Kouba commented that the northern roadways are all minor arterials, and not collectors, so it could be just a difference of downgrading them. Johnson responded that it that wouldn't work.

Haugen stated that absent of getting much feedback we developed this map for further discussion, so if you want to have further discussion we can do that. He said that the only last piece, that Mr. Johnson made reference to, was a letter and a timeline as to when this needs to be completed. He explained that currently we are just working off our old programs timeline for this, which is the end of the year. Johnson responded that the general thought in his head if the letter goes out is that they would want it done by the end of the year, so you are probably on track without knowing you're on track.

Haugen commented that at some point in this process, until the end of the year, we will have to give better identification of future extensions and how they get into the T.I.P./S.T.I.P. so that they can be functionally classified. He said that he thinks the first effort will be to identify those changes, and the relatively few projects in the current T.I.P./S.T.I.P. and base a functional class map off of that; and as mentioned there is a possibility that this will require annual maintenance, depending on the T.I.P./S.T.I.P. projects, so we will have to come up with an agreed to process procedure on making changes of future extensions, when to make those changes.

Johnson said that one comment he has, if he understands the earlier discussion, is where to break county roads as compared to the urban roads, it should be an urbanized boundary. Haugen asked if it was the Adjusted Federal Urban Aid Boundary. Johnson responded that is correct.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2019 Annual Work Program Project Update

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

b. Mn220No Meetings – June 25th

Haugen reported that there is a Mn220No Corridor Study meeting scheduled for June 25th here in the Training Room from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. and you are invited to attend.

c. Selection Of KLJ For Downtown Transportation Study

Haugen reported that as you are aware we recently released the RFP for the Downtown Transportation Study. He stated that they received four proposals and the interviewed all four; the Selection Committee is recommending we hire KLJ to do the study so we are now in negotiations with them and hope to have it wrapped up to present the contract to the MPO Executive Policy Board at their meeting next Wednesday, after which we will then submit it to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 12th, 2019**

our State Partners for review and concurrence on our selection process so July is our anticipated begin date for the study for both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks.

d. Continued Discussion on EGF ROW ADA Transition Plan

Peterson asked if a similar document to the EGF ROW ADA Transition Plan exists for Grand Forks. Kouba responded that it is only for East Grand Forks and is something that MnDOT requested the City of East Grand Forks do.

Haugen commented that there is a North Dakota DOT ADA ROW Transition Plan as well as some State Highways on the North Dakota side.

Peterson said that he was wondering specifically about Grand Forks. Haugen commented that he is sure the City of Grand Forks has an ADA Transition Plan; but whether they have the right of way identified to the same extent that this document does he doesn't know.

Johnson commented that his guess is that if they don't they will be required to have one soon, when your DOJ audit comes back, that will be a finding his guess is as they just had that audit last year and are waiting on the results.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO ADJOURN THE JUNE 12TH, 2019 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:26 P.M.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

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

CALL TO ORDER

Teri Kouba, MPO Senior Planner, called the July 10th, 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 12TH, 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 10th, 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 17th 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 14th St. NW – Estimated cost \$519,088 – 50% State/50% City funded.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 10th, 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 17th 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 17th; 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 17th 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 17th. 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 10th, 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 13th 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 10th, 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 5th 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 55th is already currently in and at the last meeting it was stated that Cherry Street would end up being in down to 62nd 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 10th, 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 55th, 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 3rd Street and 4th 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 10th, 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 24th and 28th, and explained that both of those frontage roads connect to classified streets. She added that she also believes that north of 17th, on the west side, goes from 17th 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 10th, 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 10th, 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 42nd it is very difficult to access that road and it is very narrow. Williams commented that it does need work, and so does 43rd. 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 4th 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 42nd 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 62nd and eventually it will all be paved. Grasser added that they will be paving it down to 40th 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 10th, 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 62nd 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 62nd Avenue as a minor arterial, which long term wouldn't be a bad idea

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 10th, 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 62nd 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 62nd 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, 32nd 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 32nd has been constructed between 48th 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 32nd function the same. Williams said that they go to the railroad, because it is them crossing the railroad there on 55th, 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 32nd 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 36th. 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 27th would eventually be classified like a major collector. Williams responded that she thinks that is the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 10th, 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 36th, 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 32nd 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 32nd, and another third will go south. Kouba commented that if she remembers correctly she believes it is a minor arterial from Gateway down to 32nd. 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 3rd 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 3rd Street and North 4th Street is because they are very close to North 5th 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 10th, 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 10th, 2019**

ADJOURNMENT

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

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**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 form 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

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 11th, 2019
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the September 11th, 2019, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:28 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Ali Rood, Cities Area Transit; Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Paul Konickson, MnDOT Planning Engineer; Ryan Riesinger, Airport Authority; Jason Peterson, NDDOT-Local District; Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Engineering; and Michael Johnson (via conference phone), NDDOT-Local Government.

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

Guest(s): Kshitij Sharma, Upper Great Plains Transportation Institute.

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 AUGUST 14TH, 2019, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY HALFORD, TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 14TH, 2019, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 11th, 2019**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL 2019 NORTH DAKOTA SIDE FUNCTIONAL
CLASSIFICATION MAP**

Kouba referred to a map of the North Dakota side Functional Classification System and reported that all of the comments and/or corrections that were discussed at our last Technical Advisory Committee meeting have been incorporated and this is the map that we came up with; although she does see two slight errors on Washington and Columbia, south of 62nd Street, that should be labeled County Major Collectors instead of Minor Arterials.

Kouba stated that staff is recommending approval of this map and staff will send the changes to the NDDOT along with the mileage numbers for their review and approval.

MOVED BY ROOD, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE 2019 NORTH DAKOTA SIDE FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION MAP SUBJECT TO NOTED CHANGES TO THE TWO ONE-MILE SEGMENTS TO REFLECT THEM AS COUNTY MAJOR COLLECTORS INSTEAD OF MINOR ARTERIALS.

Voting Aye: Riesinger, Rood, Johnson, Kuharenko, Peterson, Ellis, Halford, Konickson, and Emery.

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: None.

**MATTER OF DISCUSSION ON EXISTING PLUS FUTURE FUNCTIONAL
CLASSIFICATION**

Haugen reported that as we've been discussing, with the action of the Existing Functional Classification Map and having this new limitation on only showing future coinciding with S.T.I.P./T.I.P. timelines, we have also been discussing bringing back a plan for a Future Functional Classification Map as well. He said that included in the packet is the current map that was adopted roughly nine years ago to give you some sense of what the classifications were at that time; most of what we just changed were potential stubs or some things that weren't fully in the plan for future areas, so this gives some sense of that, but added that since then Ms. Kouba has worked on some possible other things that should be included.

Kouba referred to a Functional Classification Map and explained that it is just adding to having the existing and then using the previously used Future Road System Network for this map so all the dashed lines are the future roads that we have previously stated were probably going to happen. She stated that what we are really looking at whether these are still viable and are there others that should be added in.

Kuharenko pointed out that south of 62nd Avenue South there should probably be a north/south street between Belmont and South Washington; between South Washington and South Columbia; and then 34th and 38th should probably also be extended. He stated that 34th and 38th are probably quite a ways out be he could see the extension of South 20th Street and Cherry

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 11th, 2019**

Street potentially being earmarked for development in the near future. He said that beyond that south of 32nd Avenue and west of I-29 South 42nd Street and South 48th Street, going north/south, they would like see those extensions as classified street. He added that they will probably have an east/west roadway in there similar to what they have at 40th Avenue as well. Kouba commented that most of that should already be there although it may be a little hard to see on the map.

Discussion on these additional roadways/corrections ensued.

Haugen commented that they can get this figured out and have it available at our next meeting. He added that the intent wasn't to have any action today, but just to start looking at it.

Kuharenko stated that, unfortunately, that area on South 42nd Street, south of 32nd Avenue; until they find out if there is an interchange going in or not, and what the developer has planned for the area, it will kind of be up in the air as to how it will all connect down to the 47th Avenue area.

Haugen asked Mr. Johnson; if you are looking at the map, 17th Avenue South west of the interstate, regarding stubs, does it matter if our future map shows stubs or not. Johnson responded that that would be fine. Haugen said, then, as a City do we think there will be a road that connects on the west side of the railroad tracks, 17th back up to DeMers before we get to the township road. He stated that we have that functionally classified extension. Kuharenko asked if that would be 62nd potentially. Haugen responded that it would be more like 60th.

Kuharenko asked what their land use plan shows for the next twenty five years, how much of this is in it. Haugen responded that quite a bit is in the plan.

Haugen commented that the only other question for Mr. Johnson is about Merrifield Road. He explained that in all of the past plans we showed Merrifield becoming a Principal Arterial, extending South Washington and Columbia Road south as Principal Arterials, but then since we also have a bridge planned there we've extended the Principal Arterial all the way to the Red River on the North Dakota side, and knowing what we did with MnDOT and reclassifying on the Minnesota side it is unlikely it would become a Principal Arterial on the Minnesota side, so do you have any advice if it should be truncated as a principal at Washington and then carry it over as a Minor Arterial. Johnson responded that that might be a good option.

Haugen referred to the map and asked if there might be some consideration to upgrading Belmont from a Collector to a Minor Arterial between 62nd and Merrifield. Kouba commented that she believes it already is although it might be a bit hard to see on the map because it is dashed green over the collector.

Haugen stated that this is something to also give some thought to and engage our Minnesota friends. He added that they did not really do a future map when they did the 2015 Reclassification because they were also doing the Transportation Plan, but now that we have the Transportation Plan done we will be working with the City of Grand Forks, primarily to the south, on some of the classifications and roadway extensions.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 11th, 2019**

Information only.

MATTER OF DISCUSSION ON NEW PROPOSED SAFETY TARGETS

Haugen reported that the information in the packet came late to you so Mr. Viafara has prepared a power point presentation that he would like to go over.

Viafara stated that the purpose of this presentation is to introduce the 2020 Performance Measure Targets for the MPO area.

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

Presentation continued.

Kuharenko commented that the biggest concern he has with dropping some of these targets as far down as what you are showing here is if we are potentially setting ourselves up for failure. He said that when you look at the data we are showing zero fatalities in 2015, zero in 2016 and as those years start to roll off if we end up having more fatalities in the future all of a sudden we aren't going to be meeting our goals, and is part of that just because we set too high of a goal for ourselves, or too low of a goal, however you want to look at it. He added that in looking at the DOT targets for both Minnesota and North Dakota you can see that they are changing, Minnesota saw some of their items staying the same or potentially going up a bit and on the North Dakota side you see a number of them going down. He said that he would be curious to see what the proportion; what we should be seeing in the MPO area in relation to these two goals, if it would be comparable to what we might be seeing as potential targets. Viafara responded that Mr. Kuharenko is the engineer, so that is why as a MPO, it is with your help, the help of the local governments, the local agencies that these targets are set, and the points that you are making for our consideration are really valid, so you need to think about what to do in that particular situation, he will leave this consideration to his supervisor to see, with his knowledge, what he can illustrate to see about what we can do in that regard.

Halford asked if this was coming back next month for approval of the targets. Haugen responded that it would, and reiterated that no action is being sought today, they are just introducing the topic, and showing you what the calculations come out to be. He stated that the positive news is that the calculations are just looking at our MPO area and the State of North Dakota we are seeing good numbers; Minnesota is seeing a plateauing, two things involved, one is that they have been doing this a lot longer than North Dakota so they have been able to reap more benefits longer than North Dakota, and the other is that Minnesota changed how they reported serious injuries in 2016 and 2017 so their data is skewed comparison in these rates in the 2018 to 2020 time period, so because the serious injury change created 30 some percent more crashes identified as serious injuries in 2016 and 2017 so that isn't reflected in their numbers. But that is our intent to request next month for action. He added that we have until February, however this is no need from our perspective to wait until February, we have the numbers, and additionally we are supposed to be programming off of these targets and prioritizing for

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 11th, 2019**

programs, but we will be making T.I.P. selections priorities and it makes sense to have the targets ahead of time and select our projects and identify what the target is.

Halford asked if we don't meet the targets is there any kind of negative impact. Haugen responded that there isn't at the MPO level. He added that at the State level there are; Minnesota has been frank in saying that because of the change in how they classify serious injuries in their data set, that they don't believe that they will be able to show significant progress, so they are anticipating that they will be have a penalty imposed on them, the penalty is that they will have to obligate out 100% of their HSIP dollars as a first step to show progress, if they still aren't showing progress after that then they have to shift over some of their other program dollars as well. Halford said you say that affects only at the State level, but that won't roll down hill to the local level if we don't meet our goals at all. Haugen responded that the way it rolls down is Congress appropriates \$100 million dollars, but they set an obligational limit of \$90 million dollars; in the past you could play somewhat of a shell game and say that the NHS program is obligated at 100%, but then they Safety program is only obligated at 85% because you can't go over \$90 million dollars; this would say that you lose that flexibility and Safety would always have to be at 100% and you would have to shift the other programs down to reach the obligational limit, so it is that flexibility that is lost. He explained that the Safety program is a good program, it has a lot of dollars to it, but in comparison to the other programs it is much smaller so 100% of the Safety dollars in either State is not a real significant hit on the programs and the flexibility.

Rood said, then, that we are setting the targets annually, but are we being evaluated over the longer period time that you showed on the chart on the previous slide, because you could have one on here that really throws things off. Haugen responded that on the PM one the target is set every year and the evaluation is over a four year period, at the State level, at the MPO level the evaluation is every five years, that is part of our Long Range Transportation Plan update process.

Kuharenko asked for a reminder of how we came up with our targets in 2019, and those originally set in 2018; but then how did we redetermine what our goals would be in 2019. Haugen responded it was the same process that we are using today. Kuharenko said we used the data. Haugen responded we did, and added that the Technical Advisory Committee recommended; he believes the data was suggested that our non-motorized fatalities and injuries would have been less than the four that was identified, and the Technical Advisory Committee recommended that we have it at four.

Kuharenko commented that the reason he asked that is because in looking at the data we have the number of serious injuries per million miles; in the data in the back we have the proposal of the 3.9 but previously we had closer to 5.9, but in looking at the data on the last sheet it is a 4.4, so he is just trying to figure out what is different or how we are coming up with those numbers because they appear to be different than the data. Haugen responded that Mr. Viafara will have an explanation next month.

Haugen reiterated that we will take this item back and will work on providing some of the answers to the questions brought forward today.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 11th, 2019**

Information only.

MATTER OF PRESENTATION ON TRAFFIC COUNT PROGRAM

Haugen commented that we have been enjoying our traffic count program, and Mr. Sharma is here today to give us an update and presentation on the program and some of the new features that they are implementing.

Sharma introduced himself, stating that he is an Associate Research Fellow in the Traffic Operations Advanced Traffic Analysis Center at the Upper Great Plains Transportation Institute; and that the Autoscope Data Collection & Analysis is a series of projects that he has had the opportunity to work on since 2013.

Sharma referred to a power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request), and went over the information briefly.

Sharma reported that in 2013 they began with one intersection, and there were some feasibility studies to see if this could be done. He stated that the cameras that are out there at the intersections, the main purpose of them is to detect traffic and tell the traffic signal controller – hey, we’ve got traffic over here, but at the same time we can count traffic, and with the help of the MPO the City added 30 more intersections in 2014 and 2015, and in 2015 and 2016 another 7 intersections. He said that some of these situations that they have gone through have been to reset previously set intersections because things might have changed, there might be an additional left turn lane now, etc. and then kind of reset the entire approach if not the intersection.

Sharma showed examples of the images from the old cameras versus the new Vision cameras that are located at nine intersections and explained how and why they are different.

Presentation continued.

Viafara asked how many new cameras are already being used in the network now. Sharma responded that the older cameras are being swapped out throughout the network, for example at Columbia and 36th, Columbia and 40th, those had the Due cameras and now they have the Vision cameras, so he has a feeling that the City of Grand Forks is finding out that these are a lot better, especially for detection because you can see the vehicles better and are able to detect them better, and you can serve them better and not have so many false calls saying such things as the camera just shook and because of the context change that there was a vehicle, but there isn’t, and that movement is getting green and the person sitting at the cross street sees that there is no vehicle but he is waiting for the light so they call and say that they were sitting there for like five minutes, so they must be seeing a reduction in those calls at the intersections that have the Vision cameras.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 11th, 2019**

Kuharenko commented that to follow up with that they do have a program whereby they are going through and swapping out the cameras, and it is exactly as Mr. Sharma said, they are seeing fewer calls at those intersection where the Vision cameras are located and the resolution is a lot better. He added that they are seeing a lot less of the false positives for calls or missing calls because the camera can't see or discern a vehicle that is there because there is a substantially better resolution with these new cameras.

Sharma stated that another thing he should mention is that he has found out that these newer cameras are a little less susceptible to wind, which may have something to do with the fact that they are a little bit smaller so there is less area for the wind to hit, and it might even be lighter so the wind doesn't move it as much, so there is less of an issue with wind movement with them.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2019 Annual Work Program Project Update

Kuharenko said that he did bring this up last month, but he would like to see updating of those projected completion dates, getting that information in there. He asked if they could actually see that for the completed projects as well, he knows that it looks like we are removing those now but it would be good information to have throughout the calendar year.

Halford asked if this was all of the projects that we will see this year or are there other things that are being considered. She said that she brought that question up, and the reason she is asking is they recently got an email from Mr. Viafara on the School Study, and that wasn't on here saying that it was coming up or when it is supposed to be completed or anything like that, so she is asking if there are any other projects that they will be seeing coming down the line. Haugen responded that there shouldn't be. He added that the School Study is in the Work Program itself.

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY HALFORD, TO ADJOURN THE SEPTEMBER 11TH,
2019 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:55 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 9th, 2019
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the October 9th, 2019, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:31 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning; Patrick Hopkins, MnDOT Planning Engineer; Ryan Riesinger, Airport Authority; Jason Peterson, NDDOT-Local District; Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Engineering; and Becky Hanson (via conference phone), NDDOT-Local Government.

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

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 SEPTEMBER 11TH, 2019, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY PETERSON, TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 11TH, 2019, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FY2020 SAFETY TARGETS

Viafara reported that he has a presentation that will touch on three topics:

1. Proposed MPO's Safety Targets for CY2020
2. A presentation of a comparison between the targets set for CY2018 and the actual results.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 9th, 2019**

3. A response to a stakeholder's questions concerning a difference on why the rates for the millions of vehicle miles traveled differ.

Viafara stated that the number one point is for us to bear in mind that even though most of emphasis has been placed on the safety targets, it is also important to remember that there are other sets of targets that will come that have to do with transit asset management, system performance, bridge condition, pavement condition and transit safety, so we will be discussing those later.

Viafara said that what he would like to present today are the proposed MPO Safety Targets for FY2020. He pointed out that there is information in the packet that he would like to go over, including tables.

Viafara reported that Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 show what the calculations are indicated and those are based on the 5-year rolling averages. He said that the ones highlighted in red are the proposed numbers for us to consider.

Viafara referred to Table 2 and explained that it shows that for the number of traffic fatalities the expectation is to have 1.8 or fewer for the rates of fatalities that means that 100 million vehicle miles traveled will be 0.57492; for the number of crashes these are related serious injuries we are expecting to have 16.56 or fewer, and the rate of those serious crashes will be 5.06422, and the number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized injuries will be 3 or fewer.

Viafara commented that the mechanics and the data that is supporting this measure, it is indicated and has been provided to you, so later we would like to request your cooperation in approving or accepting recommending these measures.

Viafara stated that the second point is the discussion concerning the targets for the year 2018. He said that if you look carefully at the table, at the rate of fatalities, we have number 0.673 and then for the rate of serious injuries we have 5.93; where do these numbers come from, these numbers come from the analysis using a 5-year rolling average; so in that case we have the 0.67, but when we have the serious injuries, remember that these were set prior to our engaging in an analysis. He said that it was decided to take the 5.9 to be the highest number at that particular moment as a possible target. He added that when we have the targets for the year 2018 set, and then when we compare with the actual results now we can see the trend lines in one particular direction, which is kind of declining; so for the number of fatalities we were expecting or were set to have 3 or fewer but in reality when we did the 5-year rolling average it was 1.8. He said that the rate of fatalities, 0.73, you will see we now have 0.55; the number of injuries we were expecting 18 or fewer but the actual number when we did the analysis came to be 13; and then for the rate of serious injuries we expected 5.933, but the actual number was 3.76. He added that we then have the number of non-motorized fatalities or non-motorized injuries, and we were expecting 3 but the real number was 2.

Viafara said that overall we can see a declining trend concerning the comparison between the targets and the actual numbers that are happening.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 9th, 2019**

Viafara commented that the final point is the response to the Technical Advisory Committee's question that came to the MPO Staff's attention. He stated that on the draft submitted last month the FY2020 rates he made a mistake. He explained that the mistake was that he used one 5-year rolling analysis rather than using 5 sets of rolling averages, that was the reason the numbers were rather low, but when they compare now the 5 sets of 5-year rolling averages we get the correct numbers, so he is asking the committee to please consider these targets set as the numbers that are the real ones, and they are following what was provided by the feds.

Williams asked if this is something that we have to do every year. Haugen responded it is. Williams said, though, that we don't have to make any adjustments to the numbers, we just need to look at them and decide whether we are going to change the target or not, correct. Haugen responded that really one of our basic decisions would be whether we want to carry through on some decimal points versus full numbers. He said that you will notice that both States, now, on some of these numbers you have a decimal point, that is following truly the federal method, but we have in the past thought it made little sense to talk about a portion of a fatality, or a portion of a person injured, but we are presenting you what the federal methodology is to the "t" and we've done the 5 sets of 5-year rolling average, with the exception of the very first time that we did this, to set the 2018 target where we, instead of using the 5 sets of these 5-year rolling averages we determined to the highest of the 5 sets as a starting point. He added, though, that that was in 2018 but in 2019 we used the average of the 5-sets, and maybe last month we received the 5-year rolling averages of the most recent set, and now we are presenting you with the average of 5 sets.

Peterson referred to the table and commented that the column there is the targets that we would be recommending be approved for 2020. Haugen responded that that is correct. Peterson said that that takes into account the comment that Mr. Kuharenko had, that was listed in the packet. Viafara responded that it does. Haugen explained that they noticed that in 2019 the serious injury rate was 5.2 something, and last month we had presented 3.97, and that was based on just one set so now that we've done the 5 sets it is 5.06. Peterson said that it should be a more representative set. Haugen responded that that is correct. He added that when we would start analyzing the performance, that is why we look at just the most recent 5-years, and the growing average that comes out of those 5-years, not 5 sets of 5-year rolling averages.

Bergman asked what happens when you go to say 1.8 or 1.9, will it be fluctuating every year. Haugen responded that it likely will be fluctuating every year, or at least until you reach zero fatalities it will fluctuate every year, some years you will have less fatalities some you will have more fatalities, so until you have 5 years of continuous zero fatalities you will have fluctuation. Haugen added that it will be a state of circumstances if it happens to be the same number of fatalities for many years in a row, then there wouldn't be any fluctuation, but that would be atypical. Bergman asked, so if you do go to like 1.9, do they want you to fix something or is it just a keep an eye on it and then the next year it goes back to 1.9, you need to readjust it then and say it's good. Haugen responded that from the MPOs targets there is no federal penalty if we meet or don't meet, however we are trying to help the State meet it's targets by having our targets set, so if we have a target at 1.8 and go to 1.9, first year it probably isn't that big of a deal but if we see the trend line going up instead of going down then we probably will have to do some rethinking of how we are programming projects for safety.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 9th, 2019**

Peterson asked if this methodology with the decimal point, is that what is recommended by the feds or are they actually mandating that we do that. Haugen responded that it is a recommendation; you can see both States do this, but we don't have to if we were to decide to go whole number, that is within our ability, but we couldn't go to a much more radical whole number, but one that is reasonable, so if you want to go from 1.88 to 1.9 or to 2 whole people you could.

Williams asked how these goals compare to what the State goals are. Haugen referred to both Minnesota's and North Dakota's goals and stated that you can see that both States, for the most part, are targeting fewer. He said that on the Minnesota side there is the issue of in 2016 they changed the definition of some of their crash reports, so they had a big spike in their serious injuries in particular, and that data set is still in there.

Peterson commented that he thinks that what we have before us is actually a much more accurate representation, but, to Mr. Kuharenko's point, he thinks it would make sense that if it is actually 1.88 that we call it 1.9 or 2 to try to not set ourselves up for an unrealistic goal, so that would be his recommendation.

MOVED BY PETERSON, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FY2020 SAFETY TARGETS AS PRESENTED SUBJECT TO ROUNDING THE FATALITIES UP ONE DECIMAL POINT TO 1.9.

Bergman asked for clarification that there is no penalty if we don't meet these goals. Haugen responded that at the MPO level there are no penalty. Williams asked if our goals work in both States. Haugen responded that they do as we are a much smaller geography and a much smaller population. Williams said, though, that it is all based on miles traveled. Haugen responded that it is based on our 327 million miles traveled in the metro area.

Voting Aye: Riesinger, Bergman, Hanson, Williams, Peterson, Halford, Hopkins, and Bail.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Kadrmas, Ellis, Emery, Gengler, Brooks, Audette, Laesch, Konickson, Johnson, Kuharenko, Rood, West, Magnuson, Sanders, and Christianson.

Haugen reported that we have to update the Safety Targets every year; transit asset is updated every year; system performance, bridge condition and pavement condition are all updated every four years, however each State has the ability to adjust theirs after two years if they wish, so there might be something coming on these in the next six months should North Dakota or Minnesota adjust theirs. He added that he isn't sure if transit safety will be updated every year, but it isn't due until next July so we'll find out more then.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 9th, 2019**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE PLANNED FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION
MAP**

Haugen reported that we took action on the existing functional classification to update it, but the MPO Executive Policy Board did not have a quorum at their September meeting so you will see it on their October agenda as well.

Kouba commented that these existing and future functional classification maps were requested by the Technical Advisory Committee in order to be able to show future road classifications.

Kouba referred to the Grand Forks map and stated that she did put in the various areas that were discussed last month, mostly those areas south of 62nd. She said that there were a few more connections added within the Tier 1 Growth Area as well, which is the reason why these maps now have the Tier 1 Growth Area included on them.

Kouba referred to the East Grand Forks map and stated that it is new to everyone, so the discussion for that is pretty wide open. She said that once again they reviewed the growth area between 2015 and 2045 to make sure that the network is extended into those areas.

Kouba commented that she is asking for any additional changes or additions anyone may have for either map.

Williams referred to the Grand Forks map and asked if it can be noted that the bridge location is still under study. Haugen responded that that is the designated spot. Williams said, though, that it is being studied for possible change. Haugen responded that yes there are additional studies being done, but whether there will be a change or not we don't know yet. Williams said that this is her point. Haugen asked why would you confuse the map. He added that by this time next year there will probably be different Tier 1 Growth areas as well, so we are reflecting what is current in the plan.

Haugen stated that, as noted, these maps are not forwarded to the State or Feds for their formal consideration or approval. He added that if at some time in the future we decide that locations are different as part of the adoption of the amended transportation plan we would also be amending the future classification maps as well.

***MOVED BY BAIL, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A
RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY
APPROVE THE EXISTING AND FUTURE FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION MAPS
FOR GRAND FORKS AND EAST GRAND FORKS, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Riesinger, Bergman, Hanson, Williams, Peterson, Halford, Hopkins,
and Bail.***

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 9th, 2019**

Absent: Kadrmas, Ellis, Emery, Gengler, Brooks, Audette, Laesch, Konickson, Johnson, Kuharenko, Rood, West, Magnuson, Sanders, and Christianson.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MANUAL

Haugen reported that as our work program for 2019 indicates we are updating the Public Participation Plan, and today we are discussing the Environmental Justice Manual. He pointed out that included in the packet were suggested changes.

Kouba commented that most of the changes were due to additional data; we updated the years that we used the data, the ACS data, from 2013 to 2017, and the most significant change is how we look at the meaningfully greater, otherwise if we didn't change some things we would have ended up without very much on the ground truth, basically. She stated that we can go into certain areas and we can see whether it is a high minority or a high low income area, so we changed that from three times to two time the total percent of population within the MPO boundary, and the wording in the document itself was changed to represent that as well.

Haugen stated that they already kind split both sides of the river. Kouba added that they did change it to, also just looking at East Grand Forks and Grand Forks because otherwise East Grand Forks gets overshadowed and areas that would be considered and EJ area wouldn't be seen in East Grand Forks.

Haugen commented that one other thing that they kept constant is the switch from three times to two times, that was a change, but if it is 50% or larger that is maintained and that really affects the low-income, there is no minority population that is 50% or larger, but when you look at the low-income calculations there are, in Grand Forks, some census block groups that are 50% or larger; otherwise the body of the document, the essence has not been changed too much.

Haugen stated that comments are welcome. He added that as the months proceed, before the end of the year, you will notice some updates on Limited English Proficiency, updates in Title VI, plus the actual Participation Planning document itself. He explained that because there are quite a few parts to the Public Participation Plan they thought that instead of hitting you with five to six different things at once it would be better to give you pieces as we progress and the first one was the Environmental Justice Manual. He added that, as Ms. Kouba explained, as we compared it to our current Environmental Justice Manual, and what has happened with the ACS data is that we've become a more diverse metro area, so we have more minority populations, so that three times threshold became, would zero everything out, so we felt that that would be too obvious of us trying to eliminate populations, further consideration, not following the intent Environmental Justice, so we went to two times and we came up with some geographies that made sense to us, but we still had the Minnesota side overshadowed by North Dakota so we separated out the two sides of the river to get specifics on their characteristics of their populations.

Peterson asked when the final document is due. Haugen responded that it is due by the end of the year.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 9th, 2019**

Haugen commented that he would also note that our local transit operations rely on this public participation process as their required public participation process.

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY BAIL, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MANUAL UPDATE, AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Riesinger, Bergman, Hanson, Williams, Peterson, Halford, Hopkins, and Bail.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Kadrmas, Ellis, Emery, Gengler, Brooks, Audette, Laesch, Konickson, Johnson, Kuharenko, Rood, West, Magnuson, Sanders, and Christianson.

MATTER OF ANNOUNCEMENT OF SOLICITATION OF CANDIDATE T.I.P. PROJECTS

Haugen commented that it is that time of year, on our annual cycle of T.I.P. updating, when we announce the solicitation of projects.

Haugen stated that on the Minnesota side they are only announcing one open solicitation, and that is for their Transportation Alternatives program. He added that on the Minnesota side this program includes a State program for Safe Routes To School. He said that there is a two step process on the Minnesota side; first is a letter of intent, then that letter of intent gets vetted to make sure it is for an eligible project before it goes through the full application process, so the letter of intents are due at the end of October, and as noted we typically announce the solicitation for the other programs at the end of November/December.

Haugen said that on the North Dakota side we have distributed letters of solicitation to our local partners. He added that North Dakota also has their Transportation Alternative program open for solicitation; the Highway Safety Improvement, the Highway Safety Improvement subset of railroad crossings. He stated that all of those are due December 4 to the MPO.

Haugen reported that there was a meeting in Bismarck on Monday, and we are not ready to announce the formal solicitation for the Urban Grant; the Urban Roads or Regional Roads, but it is coming soon. He said that the expectation is that if it does come out soon that December 4th will be the same timeline for submittal.

Haugen commented that the only other piece of information he can share is that the State is revamping their forms, so anticipate having to answer more questions than in the past.

Haugen stated that the last thing to note is that North Dakota will be releasing their Recreational Trails. He explained that they had a switch over in staff so he isn't sure if they are ready to do this December or January, but keep an eye out for that as well

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 9th, 2019**

Information only.

MATTER OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN NORTH DAKOTA S.T.I.P./T.I.P.

Haugen reported that although the NDDOT has not formally released their final Statewide Transportation Improvement Program, they have released a document they term “Final Urban Program” which impacts the Urban Roads and the Urban Regional Roads Program; and when he compared what that list was to what was just in our approved T.I.P. there were some changes. He stated that he did have a chance to visit with Stacey Hanson with the NDDOT, to somehow improve our process so that we aren’t approving a document that then gets changed when they approve their document.

Haugen commented that there are five projects, the first two are something that you are aware of that are coming down the pike, and we mentioned that as we approved the T.I.P. we would have to visit an amendment for those projects. He stated that the next two are projects that were originally programmed to be done in 2019, and for a variety of reasons the State has decided to use 2020 funds and timeline for them, and there has also been some cost increase for the projects as well. He said that the fifth one was a project that was programmed in our T.I.P. in FY2023, but is now being considered programmed in 2020.

Haugen stated that part of what we are discussing with Ms. Hanson is to improve when they are considering changes, but he would ask our local partners, as you are discussing changes in your projects and costs and scopes, that you communicate with the MPO early so that we have some sense how that would impact our documents and when we should be processing changes.

Haugen commented that, again, at the meeting on Monday; and he isn’t sure of the outcome yet, but as noted in this agenda item, more paperwork; there was a considerable amount of discussion on project creep, so whereas the last three or four years the examples used were mostly on the State Highway side regional projects, where some scopes have doubled or tripled in cost from the programming stage to the contract award stage, and how there is only an “x” amount of federal dollars and if your project goes up double or triple in cost, that means a project has to go down, so there are more checks and balances that are being established in the system to somewhat wrangle that in on the North Dakota side, so that will be part of the things that are happening from these results that haven’t taken place in the past.

Haugen said that maybe in December you will be receiving amendments to process to reconcile the North Dakota side S.T.I.P. and T.I.P.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

- a. 2019 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that attached is the monthly update to the work activities.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 9th, 2019**

Viafara commented that for your information you may be seeing posted an updated version of this report, that will include the final dates for the completed projects and also the projected completion dates for a couple of projects in response to the stakeholders insights and review, and therefore we have heeded their advice and produced a new revised version.

Information only.

b. TAC Agenda/Package Notification Issue

Williams asked if, when the packet is posted on a Friday and it isn't always complete, is there any way that they can get an e-mail to let us know when additional information has been updated instead of having to just keep going on the website and looking and looking. Haugen responded that there is a way to do that; whether there is staffing available and knowledge to do that is the issue. He explained that this past Friday in particular we had to post what we had available as staff was going to be out of the office, so the remaining staff did the best they could to get additional information posted, so we promise to do our best.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY HALFORD, TO ADJOURN THE OCTOBER 9TH, 2019 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:15 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 13th, 2019
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the November 13th, 2019, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:34 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Ali Rood, Cities Area Transit; Patrick Hopkins, MnDOT Planning Engineer; Ryan Riesinger, Airport Authority; Jason Peterson, NDDOT-Local District; Nancy Ellis, EGF Planning; and Michael Johnson (via conference phone), NDDOT-Local Government.

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

Staff: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF Executive Director; Teri Kouba, 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 OCTOBER 9TH, 2019, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Kuharenko referred to Page 6 of the minutes and pointed out that the last sentence in the second paragraph has question marks, and he is wondering what should be placed there instead. Kouba responded that she doesn't remember exactly what she said. McNelis stated that she would go back and listen to the recording of the minutes with Ms. Kouba to try to determine what was said and make that correction.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 9TH, 2019, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, SUBJECT TO FIGURING OUT WHAT WAS SAID AND REPLACING THE QUESTION MARKS IN THE LAST SENTENCE OF THE SECOND PARAGRAPH ON PAGE 6.

Haugen asked if there might be consideration to just remove that portion of the sentence from the minutes. Kouba agreed.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 13th, 2019**

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE AMENDING THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 9TH, 2019 MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, SUBJECT TO REMOVAL OF THE CLAUSE CONTAINING THE QUESTION MARKS FROM THE SENTENCE IN THE SECOND PARAGRAPH ON PAGE 6 OF THE MINUTES.

MOTION, AS AMENDED, CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

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

Haugen reported that as we discussed last month there are some differences between the S.T.I.P. on the North Dakota side, and our T.I.P., so today we are trying to address those differences, and amend the T.I.P. document.

Haugen commented that we did put out a notice that today is the opportunity for the public to attend the meeting or send written comments; however there is no one from the public here, and we also did not receive any written comments, or oral comments prior to today's meeting.

Haugen stated that the amendments cover Grand Forks projects and also one East Grand Forks project. He added that since we discussed many of them last meeting he won't focus on any of them unless someone has a question or concern regarding any of them.

Haugen said that there is one new project, that we didn't discuss last week, and that is a Transportation Alternative project that Grand Forks has going on on 17th Avenue South, so that is a project that is new to this package. He added that it is already awarded. Kuharenko said that he has a question on this project, and maybe Mr. Johnson can answer it. He asked that since it was bid in October is it actually a fiscal year 2019 project or would it be covered in 2020. Johnson responded that it depends on how it was authorized. He explained that he just went through and highlighted the projects that were in the 2020 to 2023 program so it depends on how it was actually authorized and he would have to go in and look at it to know for sure, but it was shown in North Dakota's S.T.I.P. as being in 2020.

Haugen commented that some of the things shown in green are just modifications identifying a correction to the program or the dollar amounts that didn't change the federal amount.

Haugen stated that the projects that we will spend some time and, and the were previously listed as illustrative projects. He explained that these are projects that North Dakota is identifying as "pending" in their S.T.I.P. list. He added that North Dakota has adopted a new philosophy or procedure for how pending projects are being handled in the urban area, the Urban Program. He explained that previously they were identified as "pending" and if they didn't get funded in the year shown they were not guaranteed funding in any subsequent year, they would have to go through the process again, but this year North Dakota is changing that and are indicating that if a pending project isn't funded in the year they are identified in the S.T.I.P., they will be funded the following year, so in trying to convey that message in our T.I.P. document, he put them in the year they are pending in the S.T.I.P. and then in the remark section he identified that if they

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 13th, 2019**

aren't funded in 2022 they will be funded in 2023. Kuharenko commented that on the regional side he thought that the project was pending in 2023, otherwise in 2024 for the regional, based off a document he has. Haugen responded that he knows that something newer was sent out so he will make any necessary changes.

Haugen pointed out that both traffic signal projects were updated, and there was also a small chip seal project on U.S. Business 2, or North 5th Street as well. Kuharenko commented that just as a point of clarification; pending 2023, otherwise 2024 that was all for the Regional, and he thinks that the Urban is still 2022, with 2023 if not funded in 2022.

Haugen reported that there is one East Grand Forks project, which is the 2019 Fixed Route Operation Project listing that wasn't awarded in FY 2019 so we are amending it into FY 2020, and is showing just the federal amount.

Haugen explained that since these were previously illustrative projects the T.I.P. document is being amended to show that the three projects are being programmed. He added that the end result of this is that we no longer have illustrative projects in our T.I.P. document, they are all now programmed, they are the various years of pending funding for that year, if they don't get funded in the year listed they will be programmed to be funded the following year.

***MOVED BY ROOD, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A
RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY
APPROVE THE FY2020-2023 T.I.P. AMENDMENTS SUBJECT TO CLARIFICATION ON
THE REGIONAL TRAFFIC PROGRAM PROJECTS.***

Voting Aye: Riesinger, Rood, Johnson, Kuharenko, Peterson, Hopkins, and Ellis.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

***Absent: Kadrmaz, Bergman, Bail, Emery, Gengler, Brooks, Halford, Audette, Hanson,
Laesch, West, Magnuson, Sanders, and Christianson.***

MATTER OF CAT/UND MERGER STUDY

Kouba reported that this is the final document. She stated that one of the biggest reason for the delay was due to the fact that it took some time to determine whether or not this was a feasible idea or not; and it was final approved.

Kouba said that, as you can see, they have a final budget, and the two biggest negotiating points were the cost of service and the cost of vehicles. She explained that the City, CAT and UND came to an agreement that the City would be covering an additional \$114,500 for the operating costs, which would reduce the amount UND would have to pay; and then CAT agreed to purchase the three buses needed for the UND Shuttle Routes up front and then an annual reimbursement plan would be put into place for the local costs by UND so this cost will be added to their quarterly billing.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 13th, 2019**

Kouba commented that the document also stated that there may be a possibility that we could receive some additional funding with the additional routes, but after an analysis was completed it was determined that the routes were too short in length and time and we wouldn't be getting enough ridership to be able to get any additional federal funding.

Rood stated that, just as a point of clarification, adding the new UND service will actually not increase any costs to either the City of Grand Forks or the City of East Grand Forks. She said that when Ms. Kouba mentioned the \$114,500 being picked up by the City of Grand Forks, that is just part of UND's allocation based on a cost allocation model, so we agreed to absorb some of the administrative costs that were allocated to UND because we weren't actually hiring additional administrative staff or expanding our facilities or anything like that based on this expansion, so it is not a cost increase to either City.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY HOPKINS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FINAL CAT/UND MERGER STUDY, AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Riesinger, Rood, Johnson, Kuharenko, Peterson, Hopkins, and Ellis.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Kadrmas, Bergman, Bail, Emery, Gengler, Brooks, Halford, Audette, Hanson, Laesch, West, Magnuson, Sanders, and Christianson.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON FAMILY OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLANS

Haugen reported that we are proceeding forward with the next couple of documents. He stated that the first agenda item covers our Limited English Proficiency and Private Sector Participation documents, which are part of our requirements for our federal funding; in particular to engage all and any interested parties, and then there are things we have to identify for particular populations, and Limited English Proficiency is one of those.

LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY

Kouba stated that we were looking at the high concentration of Limited English Proficiency and decided to have that meaningfully greater be basically the same across all of these documents, of it is either 50% of the census block group or it is 2 times the total percent of the population average.

Kouba said that they brought this forward into the Limited English Proficiency document and it works out that there is not a lot of Limited English Proficiency areas but there are areas within each City. She added that they also divided that into each City as well, so we have areas to be considered within each City.

Kouba commented that there is the statement of how often we will be updating the information in the document, and that will be every four years.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 13th, 2019**

Haugen said that we don't have a strong Limited English Proficiency language yet, but we are generating some concentrations that might mean we will have to face with future efforts. He added that the other thing is that we are relying on the census, and they group a lot of other languages together so we still don't get a good sense of what the strong other languages are; Spanish is one that they include, however we identify that it is our largest language, so we can't really focus on just specific languages that are spread fairly well out and they aren't specific to us.

Rood commented, then, that the high concentration areas of 4% and 6%, that was just defined locally, it isn't a national standard of high concentration. Haugen responded that that is correct.

Williams asked if this is the same as the Environmental Justice map, or is it different. Kouba responded that it is different because it isn't based on the environmental justice, which is minorities and low income, this is based on the ability to speak English. Williams asked what is located north of Gateway, is there residential there. Kouba responded that there isn't a whole lot. Haugen commented that because there is such a large census tract, it doesn't take much for a small population to show up in the statistical analysis. Ellis added that it is kind of like East Grand Forks, a majority of it is Crystal Sugar.

***MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY PETERSON, TO APPROVE FORWARDING
A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY
APPROVE THE LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY DOCUMENT, AS PRESENTED.***

Voting Aye: Riesinger, Rood, Johnson, Kuharenko, Peterson, Hopkins, and Ellis.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

***Absent: Kadrmas, Bergman, Bail, Emery, Gengler, Brooks, Halford, Audette, Hanson,
Laesch, West, Magnuson, Sanders, and Christianson.***

PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION

Haugen referred to the packet and explained that a couple pages of this agenda item covers our Private Sector Participation document. He stated that it is specific to our FTA funds, however it covers planning activities and program activities that we have to give this population some attention when we try to get public participation on our documents.

Haugen said that there are no real population percentages or other analyses, it is straight forward verbiage on what FTA expects us to do to make sure that the private sector still has the ability to participate in public transportation opportunities.

Haugen reported that this document, again, is a requirement of FTA; particularly, as was already mentioned, why it is there, it is just a little thing and it does clearly state that when the transit agency is supposed to do a program of projects, they are utilizing the MPO's T.I.P. process for

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 13th, 2019**

that purpose, so it states that, and, again, it is part of our family of public participation plans, and this way the transit operators don't have to produce their own process for public engagement.

MOVED BY ROOD, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION DOCUMENT, AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Riesinger, Rood, Johnson, Kuharenko, Peterson, Hopkins, and Ellis.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Kadrmas, Bergman, Bail, Emery, Gengler, Brooks, Halford, Audette, Hanson, Laesch, West, Magnuson, Sanders, and Christianson.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN

Haugen said that before we get to the Public Participation Plan he will note that Civil Rights Title VI is an ADA requirement. He stated that the NDDOT just published a new Title VI document, and they are our lead agency so we are reviewing their document with our Title VI document to make sure that they mesh, so that we aren't adopting something and then find out later that we have to change it because we aren't meshing with their Title VI document, so we are hoping to have the update to the Title VI document next month.

Haugen commented that initially when we started this process we didn't think it would be a major update for those documents because North Dakota, as part of their review and oversight, they have to pick an FTA Sub-Recipient every year to do an audit of their Title VI ADA program, and we were recently successful on two of those audits so we thought we were pretty good but we found out late that North Dakota DOT updated their documents, which will cause us to update our documents, so with that we have covered all the rest of the documents, and now we will discuss the Public Participation Plan document itself in our family of plans.

Haugen stated that with this update there were several things that we decided to suggest doing; the first one was to delete all of the recitation of federal law in the document, to trim it down, and if people are interested in that information it is readily available elsewhere, and so the document is half the size it used to be. He said that the other thing that they did was to update our study area and our organizational charts, then before we get into the participation goals and objectives and standards changes, also shortened were specific things that we had to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the T.I.P., we do have separate documents that outline how we prepare those documents and amend those documents, so in this participation plan, instead of reciting them we are more focusing on just generically what those two things are, the processes, and referring people to those other manuals.

Haugen commented that the only other real substantial change that we made deals with standards on notices and public hearing notices. He explained that we used to have a standard of everything needing to have a ten day prior notification timeline, but we separated that out for the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 13th, 2019**

public hearings to continue to have a ten day prior notification timeline but for public notices, etc., we will now have a five day prior notification timeline, so we modified this in the plan.

Kuharenko referred to Page 4 of the document and said that it indicates that the MTP is comprised of the Street and Highway Plan, Transit Development Plan, and the Bike/Ped Plan; is the Land Use Plan not considered a part of it as well. Haugen responded that it is not.

Kuharenko referred to Page 3 of the document, and pointed out that he may want to look at updating the map because there are a lot more streets in Grand Forks than is shown here. Haugen responded that they will look at updating that map.

Haugen stated that one thing that will be happening with this, and also attached, are all the rest of the documents that we have been talking about, is that Federal Law requires that this document actually be out in the public for a 45-day comment review period, so what we action we take today is to get it to submit to the public comment period, the 45-day public comment period; and then because these are family plan documents, all those other documents are subject to that 45-day review and comment period as well.

Williams referred to Page 1 of the document and asked where it says "...define principles and strategies for public involvement throughout the transportation planning process", that is throughout the MPO transportation planning process or does this cover things that the City might do. Haugen responded that this is an MPO document, so it is covering the MPO and whatever MPO assisted activities we do for either City, so we are talking about doing the Land Use Plans next year, and when we start doing land use plans there are City processes and procedures that have to be followed, but with this MPO assistance come out public participation plan. Williams said, though, that if the MPO isn't involved in something that the City is doing it wouldn't apply. Rood responded that we are required, the City as an FTA recipient, for example, to have a Public Participation Plan, so what we do is we have an MOU with the MPO certifying that we will follow their plan instead of having our own, so that might be something to look into. Haugen added that that is an FTA allowance into the process because of the POP requirement we talked about earlier.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY ROOD, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN DOCUMENT, AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Riesinger, Rood, Johnson, Kuharenko, Peterson, Hopkins, and Ellis.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Kadrmas, Bergman, Bail, Emery, Gengler, Brooks, Halford, Audette, Hanson, Laesch, West, Magnuson, Sanders, and Christianson.

Haugen stated that provided the MPO Executive Policy Board approves this next week that will open up the 45-day comment and review period for all of the documents.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 13th, 2019**

MATTER OF ANNOUNCEMENT OF CANDIDATE PROJECT SOLICITATION

Haugen commented that this item is announcing the remaining solicitation of projects for the next T.I.P. cycle.

Haugen stated that on the Minnesota side we did have the Transportation Alternatives program open, they closed on October 31st, and there were no projects submitted in our study area so we are done with Transportation Alternatives and Safe Routes to School programs.

Haugen commented that now on the Minnesota side there is an HSIP process that is open until the 17th of November.

Haugen reported that we are opening the rest of the solicitation because the City of East Grand Forks gets funding every four years, and we have 2022 already programmed, so 2024 isn't eligible. He said that we aren't opening up the City Sub-target, but we are seeing if either the County of the State has projects that they are going to give us for either 2023 or 2024, and the deadline for those is December 27th.

Haugen stated that on the North Dakota side the final three programs are open for solicitation and the notifications have been sent out to the appropriate staff.

Haugen said that the Urban Program, which, again is the Main Street Program, on the North Dakota side; Urban Roads covers the local roads and the Urban Regional roads, and included in that pack of information with the solicitation there are specific instructions for the Urban Roads and Urban Regional Program, that they really only want the worksheets filled out for 2024 projects, that you would be submitting to us. He said that he is assuming, that although it doesn't say that we are still asking for the Regional System, the plus one year. Johnson responded that that is correct. Haugen said, then, that you need to focus on 2024, and on the Regional side the 2025 possibilities. He added that the deadline for those is December 20th, and because of the lateness of the solicitation they have been moved back to allow a reactive time to the local partners on nominating those projects.

Haugen reported that not yet identified is the North Dakota Recreational Trails solicitation, and when that starts. He said that it will be vetted through the Parks and Rec Department.

Kuharenko said that, just to give you a heads up, the Committee of the Whole met last night and they ended up seeing the item for the Transportation Alternatives and the HSIP requests, so provided they are approved by the City Council next week you should be seeing those sometime next week. Haugen asked if there was anything regarding railroad crossings. Kuharenko responded that he isn't aware of anything on railroad crossings at this time.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 13th, 2019**

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2019 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that attached is his first attempt at doing the monthly update to the work activities.

Information only.

b. Skewed Intersection Steering Committee Meeting November 25th

Kouba reported that the Steering Committee is meeting on November 25th to look at the final document for the Skewed Intersection. Haugen asked if the draft document was on the website. Kouba responded that it isn't but that she will get it on there.

Information only.

c. Downtown Parking Study Presentation To City Council December 2nd

Haugen commented that the Downtown Grand Forks Parking Study recommendations, a presentation is set to be given on December 2nd, but it isn't much of a presentation of the parking study. Williams asked if that was online. Haugen responded that the study is online.

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO ADJOURN THE NOVEMBER
13TH, 2019 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:08 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2019
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the December 11th, 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: David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Ali Rood, Cities Area Transit; Patrick Hopkins, MnDOT Planning Engineer; Ryan Riesinger, Airport Authority; Nick West, Grand Forks County; Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning; Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Engineer; Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Local Government; and Wayne Zacher, NDDOT-Local Government.

Absent: Brad Bail, Jesse Kadrmas, Richard Audette, Darren Laesch, Dustin Lang, Ryan Brooks, Brad Gengler, Nancy Ellis, Jason Peterson, Dale Bergman, Paul Konickson, Lane Magnuson, Mike Yavarow, Lars Christianson, and Rich Sanders.

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

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Mike Johnson introduced Wayne Zacher and explained that he just joined the Local Government Division and he is our new MPO Coordinator so they will be transitioning all MPO duties over to him and he will be attending the MPO meetings and will be involved in Steering Committees and all other MPO activities. He stated that he will still be involved in the background to help with anything that needs a little more attention, but Mr. Zacher is their new person who has been on the job for a week and a half. He said that he will come to this meeting one more time and then he will officially turn it all over to Mr. Zacher.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2019**

Williams asked if Mr. Zacher has Mr. Johnson's old phone number or does he have a new phone number. Johnson responded that he has all new contact information – 701-328-4828 is his phone number.

Haugen asked that everyone please state their name and the organization they represent as well.

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

***MOVED BY KUHARNEKO, SECONDED BY RIESINGER, TO APPROVE THE
NOVEMBER 13TH, 2019, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE,
AS PRESENTED***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF GRAND FORKS DOWNTOWN PARKING STUDY
REPORT**

Haugen reported that this has been a study that has been in the works for about a year from start to finish. He said that there was a subcommittee of the Grand Forks Downtown Action Plan Steering Committee assisting us, along with Grand Forks staff. He added that they hired the firm KLJ to assist.

Haugen commented that several months ago the actual document itself was reviewed and recommended by the Steering Committee, but it sat until the Downtown Action Plan was completed and then both documents were presented to the Grand Forks City Council a week ago or so and so it has been through the Grand Forks approval process and is now being finalized through the MPO process as well.

Haugen stated that a full report was identified in your staff report; and we did review the full report. He added that included in the packet were the recommendations that came out of the review, and they are divided into short-term, mid-term, and long-term.

Haugen said that staff is seeking approval of the report document.

Halford asked if it is normal. This is a clarifying question, is it normal since it went to City Council which is more of a receive and file thing, is it normal for it to then go to the MPO and then seek approval and not since it did not get approval through the council. Haugen responded that it is. He explained that it is an MPO document.

Kuharenko said that he has a general comment on the long-term section where it ends up identifying that it looks at parking meters and he knows that currently with the North Dakota Century Code there is language in there that prohibits parking meters, so just a general note.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2019**

Haugen responded that he thinks it talks about when that legislation is changed, not to say that they are going to do it however.

Williams asked, when it says availability on the second page, the little map, does that mean parking spaces in general or, using City Hall as an example where all of them are assigned parking spaces so they aren't available to the general public, so is it general public parking or all parking. Haugen responded that it is a synonym for occupancy, whether it is occupied or not occupied, it is available or it's not available by being occupied. Halford stated, then, that what you are saying is that it is all of the above, all sorts of parking including reserved and non-reserved. Haugen responded that that is correct and reiterated that it is a synonym for whether it was occupied or not occupied; and instead of using one term throughout the whole document they intermittently switched in available as a term.

Halford commented that they have gotten a question a couple of times where people were wondering how much is available to the public, so you would get rid of all the reserved ones, do we know that number. Haugen responded that roughly 50% are between the private and the public sector there are 3,600 stalls, so roughly 1,800 have no restrictions on them and that combines the private and the public spaces together. He added that there is a table in the beginning of the document that identifies each lot, what type of restrictions are on what number of stalls; including the two-hour limit, twenty-four hour reserved, disabled parking, loading and unloading; there is a table in the front of the document that details each parking lot with the total number of stalls that are somehow restricted, and that is for all three levels: on-street, private options, and public options.

Halford stated that overall she thinks this is a good study; and for a long time we have heard people say there is nowhere to park downtown, so it is nice to see that it is more of a perception, and the ones that we do have control over as a City, we're not using those spaces to their full potential as we could be. Kuharenko commented that he thinks it also speaks a lot to just the culture that we have here, where there is the desire to park in front of their destination, and not necessarily a block or two away.

Haugen said that on the first short-term, and he thinks we have already started on it, and it is marketing information and changing the perception issues.

MOVED BY HALFORD, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE DOWNTOWN PARKING STUDY REPORT, AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Riesinger, Rood, Johnson, Kuharenko, Emery, Halford, Hopkins, and West.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Kadrmas, Bergman, Bail, Ellis, Gengler, Brooks, Audette, Hanson, Laesch, Magnuson, Sanders, Peterson, and Christianson.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2019**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL AND PRIORITIZATION OF NORTH DAKOTA SIDE T.I.P.
CANDIDATE PROJECTS**

Haugen said that before we get to these he would like to remind everyone that December 20th is the due date for the remaining North Dakota solicitations, with the exception of Recreational Trails, and he believes that Recreational Trails may not be due until January. He added that on the Minnesota side all of the programs except for the TAP and HSIP which are due on December 27th.

Kuharenko commented that to follow up on a couple of those he thinks they already submitted the Regional and the Urban Roads and are waiting for a signature from the Mayor's office for the Urban Grant Program and that should be sent over shortly.

a. H.S.I.P.

Haugen reported that one project was submitted from the City of Grand Forks. He stated that the project is located at the intersection of S. 20th Street and 32nd Avenue. He said that the application is to install right turn lanes, and the total funding amount is \$578,000, and there is a 90/10 split so the federal share is just over \$520,000. He added that this project is consistent with the standard of our Transportation Plan, although he noted that neither the Strategic Highway Safety Plan nor our Local Road Safety Program identifies the strategies of the high priority ones which doesn't make it ineligible, it just states that it is not part of the list of high priorities. He stated that staff is saying that it is consistent and is a high priority project for our H.S.I.P.

Kuharenko commented that this is pretty straight forward and it is mostly addressing the number of rear end crashes that we have at this intersection. He said that he believes it is identifying that once the left turn lane realignment project is completed rear end crashes he believes are the second most number of crashes that occur at this location.

Johnson referred to the H.S.I.P. application and said that he has one comment; in the bottom box where it describes the proposed safety improvements he is wondering where you got the project number STM-SUU-986(088)092 because that is a stimulus project number so he isn't sure where you got it from but he has the right one if you want to change it; it is HEU-6-081(094940). Kuharenko stated that he would get that corrected and sent back to the MPO.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY ROOD, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE H.S.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE FY2021-2024 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND GIVE PRIORITY RANKING.

***Voting Aye: Riesinger, Rood, Johnson, Kuharenko, Emery, Halford, Hopkins, and West.
Voting Nay: None.
Abstain: None.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2019**

Absent: Kadrmas, Bergman, Bail, Ellis, Gengler, Brooks, Audette, Hanson, Laesch, Magnuson, Sanders, Peterson, and Christianson.

b. Transportation Alternatives

Haugen reported that again only one project was submitted by the City of Grand Forks. He said that the project involves converting an existing gravel path that exists along 32nd Avenue just west of the on and off ramps of the interstate, and it connects to a gravel path that heads north and connects with the Business and Industrial Parks. He stated that the total estimated cost is \$302,000 and with an 80/20 split the federal share is \$241,600.

Haugen commented that reviewing this in our Metropolitan Transportation Plan Bike/Ped section, there was no real specific mention of converting this from gravel to pavement, nor is it listed specifically in the table that shows projects individually by timeframe, so they are finding sections of the standards and objectives sections that support this project, but it is not found in the data base specifically, but we think that was perhaps just an oversight of gravel trails, and so there might even be a follow-up because there are a couple other gravel paths and we want to make sure that we are identifying future growth status, so staff finds this project consistent with our Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

MOVED BY HALFORD, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVE PROJECTS FOR THEFY2021-2024 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND GIVE PRIORITY RANKING.

Voting Aye: Riesinger, Rood, Johnson, Kuharenko, Emery, Halford, Hopkins, and West.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Kadrmas, Bergman, Bail, Ellis, Gengler, Brooks, Audette, Hanson, Laesch, Magnuson, Sanders, Peterson, and Christianson.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT #1 TO WORK PROGRAM

Haugen reported that as we transition from year one to the second year of the work program we find it necessary to make an amendment to the work program. He said that, ironically, this will be the first amendment to a two-year work program, which is almost a first for us.

Haugen stated that the main focus of this amendment was something that we identified mid-year of 2019, and that was to follow-up on a future river crossing. He said that at that time it was doing both a water hydraulic study and a traffic impact study, but since then it was determined that the water hydraulic study is not an eligible MPO activity so an RFQ was sent out by both Cities to participate in financing that portion of the study, so the work program is being amended to do the follow-up traffic impact analysis on a river crossing.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2019**

Haugen explained that, as we identified six months ago, there are some items in our work program that could be switched over to finance this:

- 1) Bus Route Study – It was determined that once the CAT/UND Shuttle Service Merger was approved it should operate for a couple of semesters and then once they learn the ropes we would then follow up with a route study but the merger physically won't happen until next fall so the route study was pushed out.
- 2) School Safety Study – this was eliminated as a separate line item but the MPO Executive Policy Board wanted to place emphasis on school safety with the future bridge study so it was rolled into that.
- 3) Traffic Count Program – we have eight intersections that are waiting for the actual hardware to be installed so those are already under contract and will carry over into 2020 and there will be no new intersections done in 2020.
- 4) Equipment – we have zeroed out our equipment line item. As the City of Grand Forks has purchased the Herald Building and are remodeling it and are looking to see if the MPO is interested in renting space there, and there is interest in this by the MPO but we still have to work out details and that will take most of 2020 to work out and the space won't be available until 2021 so we zeroed out our equipment budget to let things shake out before purchasing and new equipment.

Haugen commented that the document itself, he just attached things that were changed, with the exception of the timelines for the 2050 MTP Update, just to remind everybody that this work program is progressing us towards our 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

Haugen stated that another thing that has happened is that both Cities have decided that they would like to postpone starting their Land Use Plan Updates until the second half of the year. He explained that the primary reason for that is that they want to make sure that the 2020 Census results are a part of the update process at the appropriate time, so they felt that by delaying the start of the update they won't get too far into the process before the results are available, and it still fits in with the timeline that we currently have identified so there was no need to change that. He added that the counting program you will notice we identify that our current addendum will carry over. He stated that on the Land Use Plans we have it in there that we are now waiting until the second half of the year and so we've split the consultant costs in half and carry them into January of the following year, and the new item is the Traffic Impact at a bridge corridor, although it could be more than one corridor depending on the water hydraulics study.

Haugen reported that one other change involves a document we used to provide called the Monitoring and Surveillance Report, but it was changed to Performance Reports, so we have identified that.

Haugen stated that some minor changes to some of the language and some dates for the GIS.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2019**

Haugen commented that for the financial side of the report, unfortunately our revenue stream is not growing so we maintained the same budget amounts and funding sources; and then the detail table shows how the individual cost components are identified, how much is remaining for the consultant costs, etc.

Haugen said that the only other major study that is carrying over into 2020 is the Downtown Transportation Study.

Haugen stated that these are the proposed amendments and once approved by our MPO Executive Policy Board we will send them to our State and Federal Partners.

Williams referred to the Activity Page that has all of the costs and said that Mr. Haugen said that the hydrology part is being removed from the MPO funding; does this number reflect that removal. Haugen responded that it does, adding that the hydraulic study is not being reflected in the MPO budget at all.

Kuharenko referred to Page 22 of the report, under completion dates, and pointed out that 300.52 shows a completed date as December 31, 2017/18. Haugen responded that that will be removed. Kuharenko referred to Page 21 of the report and pointed out that there is a spelling error, Shroeder Middle School is misspelled.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY HALFORD, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE AMENDMENT #1 TO THE 2020 WORK PROGRAM SUBJECT TO REVISIONS AS DISCUSSED.

Voting Aye: Riesinger, Rood, Johnson, Kuharenko, Emery, Halford, Hopkins, and West.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Kadrmas, Bergman, Bail, Ellis, Gengler, Brooks, Audette, Hanson, Laesch, Magnuson, Sanders, Peterson, and Christianson.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON US2/US81 SKEWED INTERSECTION STUDY

Kouba reported that the Steering Committee received the final draft document to review and provide input.

Kouba stated that, just as a refresher, we are looking at traffic flow operations and things like that in that very small tight corridor, so there are a lot of challenges. She said that they are also looking at increases in traffic volumes out to 2045, and in 2045 we are looking at higher delays, more blockages mostly due to unit trains, which are longer and will block traffic all the way through that corridor at one point in time as it runs through.

Kouba commented that some of the other challenges are that there are a lot of driveways and access points; and she knows that the City's Planning and Engineering Departments has been

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2019**

working with businesses as much as possible to close some, or share some of them, but it makes things difficult and makes things feel unsafe when looking at it from a pedestrian viewpoint.

Kouba stated that they evaluated signal warrants on all of the traffic signals in the corridor and also for stop signs as well. She said that as things stand today and into the future the signal at 20th and Gateway is not really warranted, and it is kind of a high location for crashes. She added that the signal in front of Wilder at 3rd and Gateway is not technically warranted but there are a few other things that should be considered when we look at that signal. She said that there is an underpass for pedestrians, but it isn't always available during certain situations such as snow, flooding, etc., so those situations should be taken into consideration before deciding to remove that signal.

Kouba said that there are also signals that don't have any kind of pedestrian control, so it makes it difficult and unsafe for pedestrians trying to cross at those various intersections.

Grasser referred to the slide discussing signal warrants and commented that there is a pretty impressive list of crash reductions and such; and if he is understanding it right those numbers are based on removing both of those signals, the ones circled in red. Kouba responded that that is correctly, generally, especially at the one on 20th, but in general overall what it statistically states is that that is what happens when you remove unwarranted signals. Grasser said then, that it is more of a statistical typical analysis, because he was wondering because those numbers, if he understands the conversation, even though you show the signal at 3rd in red, it would probably be more difficult to remove it so what would the resulting anticipated reduction of crashes be then if that one was left but the one at 20th is removed, would it be half the numbers shown or some other percentage. Kouba responded that she doesn't know if they have looked at the exact numbers that could happen if both or one was removed, but overall in an average statistic that is the number they would use.

Kouba commented that one thing to note about the signal at 3rd and Gateway is that it tends to become warranted in 2045, or close to being warranted, so do we want to remove it and then have to put it back in then, plus there is the issue of crossing from that neighborhood to the school. Grasser agreed that his sense is that that would be a difficult one to take out.

Williams commented that the signal at 20th and Gateway, the study did not look to see where that traffic would be diverted to if you are coming north and want to make a left turn onto Gateway, and if you can't do it with not enough gaps, it didn't look to see where that traffic would go to try to find a way out. West said that the next light west would be Columbia. Williams agreed, adding though that that would mean they would have to go through the neighborhood. Haugen asked, though, that it is assuming there is enough gap, or if there is no warrant for the signal because there is sufficient gap for movements. Williams responded that the problem is that the signals are too far apart to do that because once you get more than a quarter of a mile people start to spread out and you have other intervening intersections and that sort of thing so it makes it much more difficult to try to create a gap for vehicles to make left turns.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2019**

Johnson reported that, just to add to this discussion, NDDOT has been having problems with signal warrants in a lot of their projects, especially as part of the new Urban Grant Program Project, where they are redoing downtowns and looking at existing traffic signals that have been there for thirty or forty years or more because they were always there, but none of them are warranted; very few of them are still warranted and they are going through a process where they are removing signals across the State and the warrants are pretty black and white, there is no leniency given, the direction was given from their federal oversight that if it is an unwarranted signal it either needs to come out or the other option for the local jurisdiction is to just leave it as is and zero improvements can be made to it, you can change light bulbs and all red light confirmation, but no painting, no rewiring or anything like that can be done to it, so that is something you need to keep in mind when you look at this type of stuff that the eventual control of that intersection may change regardless of maybe what you want to do so looking at other options, for example at 3rd, is that it might be a location for a hawk or a pedestrian activated beacon instead.

Halford said that as you get rid of more traffic signals, for someone to cross Gateway as a pedestrian, it will be much harder because there will be longer spans of lights and be able to do that because there is no way that, you might get lucky and there will be a gap in traffic for you to cross, but if you are able to add Hawks, but then when you are talking about downtown though that is such a walkable bikeable, that is what we want our downtowns to be, but if you take away traffic signals it seems like it is just going to speed up traffic and make it so you can't cross the street. She said that people are crossing in so many different places that it is going to make it very difficult for that to happen. Johnson agreed, adding that thought that that is why you look at interjecting different elements of traffic calming like bulb outs, but the City didn't want bulb outs. He said that as a perfect example, US 52, 1st Avenue or 1st Street through Jamestown, there are five signals there now but only one is warranted, so they are working on a project right now where they are probably going to lose four signals in their downtown, but they are looking at putting in bulb outs, and it is really interesting listening to the public and their reaction, where they almost sound like DOT employees sitting out there, this is a truck route, this is a US Highway, we have to get trucks through here, what are you doing, what are you doing; so it is something that they are battling across the State, it is kind of a newer nuance to this new program that they hadn't really experienced in the past, most of their projects are on the fringe where there is growing and signals are warranted, they didn't do a lot of internal projects prior to that program. Halford asked if Downtown Grand Forks being looked at. Johnson responded that DeMers is done so those signals meet warrants.

Discussion on signals that have been removed or will be removed throughout Grand Forks and the State ensued.

Williams suggested that may this warrants further discussion with a different focus group that, in essence what the Feds have done is they've taken away engineering judgement by saying this, and then the other thing is is that to truly, if you are only going to use one day out of the year, who picks the day. She said that they have a signal, such at 11th and 42nd, that on a day to day basis may not seem warranted but tell you what, we wouldn't be able to operate an event at the Alerus without it, so that is another problem, where some of these may be, like the signal at 3rd,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2019**

if the underpass isn't available and you have all the kids crossing you are going to meet school warrants every single day, so that is another problem as to when the counts are done, so maybe that is something that we need to internally look at as far as how we determine when we are going to do this. Johnson agreed that he thinks that is a good point but he would argue that, and he isn't an expert on this, but good engineering practice is to do it on a normal day, it isn't to do it when the Alerus Center has an event or right as school is getting out, because you are designing the roadway and the infrastructure for a normal day so you have to be careful doing that as well because that falsifies some of the information they are trying to get done for the infrastructure and the money we are spending. Williams said that she is going to tack on the Ms. Halford's comment though that on some of that, when you look at pedestrian and bicyclists trying to cross a street on an unaverage day doesn't help you if the signal has been removed, so it warrants maybe a lot more discussion as far the parameters. Johnson stated that he completely agrees but we just don't have the pedestrian traffic in this State to warrant, there is pedestrian warrants as part of the signals, but it is an enormous number, we don't even come close. Williams said thought that the school warrant isn't, the school warrant for pedestrians is fairly low; and that is for further discussion.

Kuharenko said that one question he is going to have is that since we've got projects in the S.T.I.P. for our traffic signal rehabilitation program, he is assuming that they are going to have to look at traffic signal warrants at every single one of those. Johnson responded that if you have the time and capabilities to do some of that now it might be something you might want to do so you can get ahead of it. Williams asked what year this project is scheduled for. Kuharenko responded that he thinks it is pending 2022 for Urban and 2023 for the Regional, otherwise it would be 2023 and 2024 respectively.

Kouba continued by saying that in looking at the rest of the network they are looking at the ADA crossing issues that are on the corridor. She said that the bicycle network is not as robust along the exact corridor, but there is a trail to the north, but there aren't many good places to cross, especially on Washington.

Kouba stated that through the plan, after they presented all of the alternatives they asked for feedback from the Steering Committee and also from the public, which was done through public meetings, as they were trying to get back as much information as possible. She said that they also attended the Near Northside Neighborhood meetings; and one highlight they got from that is that people are very interested the ability to cross the streets and the closeness of all the driveways and running into traffic from a pedestrian point of view.

Kouba commented that most of the feedback they received supported a realignment of the railroad; we can't remove it all just because of the need for the railroad to serve other areas, but the idea that all the trains can come in from the north and have less interaction with traffic, as well as to some extent pedestrians wanting to cross the tracks as well. She stated that this would be considered a long-term improvement, which they know. She added that they did get rid of some alternatives that weren't very viable, and eliminating the skew is not going to be something that is really feasible, so the suggestions and alternatives remaining show ways to improve safety for pedestrians and to ensure there are fewer crashes along the corridor. She stated that they also

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2019**

eliminated some of the more expensive at grade alignments and non-grade alignments as they would also highly impact a lot of the area businesses.

Kouba referred to a map and pointed out that it shows a footprint where they would improve the sidewalks to allow for bicycle traffic to use it so they can cross properly at the lights; right-in and right-out additions so that we can make it safer. She stated that this is further south so we wouldn't have the railroad as an issue, but we would still have to have a crossing, but we wouldn't need it all the way through if we are going to bring things from the north, but we would probably still need it because they would have to back trains and things like that in order to serve the various businesses in the area. She said that it would move all those trains to 42nd and Gateway, but that location has had an overpass plan on the books for quite a while that is a desired thing, so overall between that and the reduction of conflicts there would be a little bit freer flow of traffic, not blocked by trains.

Kouba stated referred to a slide showing the cost of realignment and stated that this the total cost including the other elements of safety that don't include the rerouting of the rails, so those could be implemented sooner rather than later.

Grasser asked if these costs capture property acquisition and engineering. Kouba responded that it does to a certain extent. She said that they included it in with some of the pre-engineering, but you can only guesstimate so much of the planning of it. Grasser said that the struggle sometimes on these things is having the ability to implement a particular plan; some of those things can be an operational issue, such as with the Mill, or a part of the property that sometimes almost not a deal card, and he isn't sure he is able to understand where that type of, call it a deal card, comes into play. Kouba responded that that is kind of the reason why we understand where it comes into be a deal card is that whole realignment section, which will cost the most out of the whole total cost, but we have put in what it would take to just put in the safety improvements. Grasser said, then, that this slide reflects one that probably doesn't have it implemented. Kouba stated it doesn't include the realignment part which would be working with the railroad; that is how we got the \$5.6 million dollar estimate of the total was reached. Grasser asked if we have the BNSF railroad, then, on board. Kouba responded that there would need to be negotiations held with BNSF as well as with them now because if they are additional. Grasser agreed it would be for both sites. Kouba added that the needs of the various businesses rely on that rail.

Kouba commented that the one that sparked the most interest is the one that, there are implementable parts and there are parts that are understood will take a lot more time to implement, but if you have intersection consolidation when you have rail but its elimination that, it doesn't help to have it if it doesn't do anything to improve any of the traffic issues and pedestrian safety issues, so they eliminated a lot of those types of things.

Kouba stated that for the short-term there are things such as ITS or ways of letting people know that there is a train blocking at various intersections in order to allow them to turn off and go a different route.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2019**

Kouba said that at the MPO level our next steps are us working with Engineering to update the City Council, especially because Mr. Weber was at one of our public meetings and he would like an update, so we will do that. She stated that Mr. Johnson had also said that there might be a need to have some upper management involvement as well. Johnson responded that he hasn't had the opportunity to follow up with them, but he is confident that he can just provide any information provided here and just brief them on the study findings.

Kouba commented that the final step will be final approval of the study.

Grasser said, maybe you've done this, but he can't pick it out of the information but it seems like one of our key stakeholders would be BNSF, has anybody given them a sketch of what all that might look like and see what their reaction is to it, it would be interesting to know if they are favorable or unfavorable or where they might be with that. Kouba responded that they were part of the Steering Committee up to the point where we started doing alternatives, and at that point they said that they can't take part in those decisions one way or the other, and they pretty much stopped coming. Zacher added that BNSF does that on pretty much every project; they will be involved up to a certain point and then they back away and wait for the permitting process. Johnson said, though, that they continually stress that early coordination is the best key.

Haugen commented that the documents are available for review, and the Steering Committee has had the documents for a while and will give their recommendation so next month we anticipate that we will ask the Technical Advisory Committee and the MPO Executive Policy Board to complete the study.

Kuharenko asked if a copy of the draft final or final report available on the MPO Website. Kouba responded that it is available on the Website.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2019 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that attached is his first attempt at doing the monthly update to the work activities.

Haugen commented that three weeks ago A.T.A.C. distributed out their ITS Diagrams and are asking for feedback on them. He said that there will be some additional information on this before the end of the Holidays and they are asking for feedback so they can finalize the ITS Regional Architecture document.

Williams asked that Mr. Haugen forward the email with that information to her.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, December 11th, 2019**

b. Continuing Resolution Update

Haugen stated that we are on a continuing resolution for funding, so hopefully Congress will keep federal funding funded through the holidays at least, and beyond.

Johnson commented that one thing to note on the latest resolution that congress passed they removed the rescission clause of the FAST-ACT; other than just kicking the can down the road they removed that. He said that they don't know for sure exactly what that will mean yet though.

c. ND Federal Highway Announcement

Haugen reported that North Dakota Federal Highway has announced that they have filled their Planner position and the new person will start right before Christmas.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ROOD, SECONDED BY WEST, TO ADJOURN THE DECEMBER 11TH, 2019
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:29 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager