

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 12th, 2020
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the February 12th, 2020, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:30p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Patrick Hopkins, MnDOT-District 2 (Via Conference Call); Ryan Riesinger, Airport Authority; Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Engineer; Kristen Sperry, FHWA-Bismarck (Via Conference Call); and Wayne Zacher, NDDOT-Local Government (Via Conference Call).

Absent: Brad Bail, Jesse Kadrmas, Jason Peterson, Nancy Graham, MnDOT-District 2, Michael Johnson, Richard Audette, Dustin Lang, Ryan Brooks, Brad Gengler, Dale Bergman, Ali Rood, Lane Magnuson, Lars Christianson, Nick West, and Rich Sanders.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

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

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 8TH, 2020, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 8TH, 2020 MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 12th, 2020**

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF U.S.#2/U.S.#81 SKEWED INTERSECTION STUDY

Haugen reported that we are at the last stages of our Skewed Intersection Study of U.S.#2/U.S.#81; Gateway Drive and North Washington Street.

Kouba commented that since we last discussed this item it has been presented to the Grand Forks City Council and Grand Forks Engineering did have a few more comments and input, which is shown in red in the Staff Report.

Kouba stated that one of the major comments was that they are still not comfortable with the cost estimates, especially the most popular alternative, so we asked KLJ to update their estimate to account for some of the things that were recommended be eliminated. She said that there are some things that we cannot estimate for, or cannot take into account simply because this is a planning study and those items come at a different level in the process, specifically the design and construction process.

Kouba said that we did have several alternatives that we shared with the public for input; and several of those were not well received or desired; such as a grade separation, which is something that not everybody wanted for the simple reason that this is such a very densely populated area so there would be a need to buy out a lot of businesses. She stated that some of the other less desirable alternatives didn't solve many of the issues, and may even have made some worse, so they were eliminated as well.

Kouba commented that the alternatives that were moved forward, that are still viable are those that don't require realignment of the railroad and that do require realignment of the railroad. She said that they both require similar changes on the ground, but it is just a matter of whether or not the railroad can be realigned or not.

Kouba stated that the most popular doesn't make too many elaborate construction changes, it mostly involves making it easier and safer for people to be able to walk along the corridor.

Kouba said that they also discussed changing access points, reducing the number of access points so that there isn't as much potential for crashes. She added that that is something that will take a lot of negotiating and a lot of work with the various businesses along that stretch of the corridor so the chances of it being implemented is questionable, specifically how well the businesses would receive the changes.

Kouba stated that they also discussed adding some ITS capabilities along the corridor, specifically the ability to reroute yourself if a train is blocking the tracks.

Kouba commented that the key takeaways from the study are that eliminating skewed turning movements comes at a heavy cost either financially, environmentally or to operations and isn't something that many want; it is more expensive and impactful to grade separate then realign the railroad; traffic forecast on Gateway Drive are high and make solutions without added capacity

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 12th, 2020**

challenging; forecasts should be monitored; and consolidating Washington with 5th/Mill Spur is not likely accomplished with acceptable operations.

Kouba said that the next steps would be to establish a connection to the other Mill Spur users so that we can understand how the trains actually move to get to their destinations; to expand benefit/cost analysis to the entire Mill Spur instead of just the area this study covered; to identify funding strategies; to do additional refinement of the Access Management Plan; and to refine and assess environmental impacts.

Kouba commented that there are other ways of financing some of this, including various grants and things of that nature.

Kouba stated that staff is seeking approval to move this forward to the MPO Executive Policy Board for their review and approval of the study.

Kuharenko thanked Ms. Kouba for working with the consultant to get those cost estimates revised and updated. He said that he knows that it was discussed at previous TAC meetings that having detailed cost estimates are important for the T.I.P., and moving forward, and that a lot of the time we end up looking to studies like this one as a basis for those estimates.

MOVED BY KUHARNEKO, SECONDED BY EMERY, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE U.S.#2/U.S.81 SKEWED INTERSECTION STUDY, AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Riesinger, Zacher, Kuharenko, Emery, Ellis, Halford, and Hopkins.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Kadrmas, Bergman, Rood, Peterson, West, Graham, Bail, Gengler, Brooks, Audette, Magnuson, Sanders, and Christianson.

MATTER OF PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Kouba reported that, as you know, we recently did a feasibility study for Cities Area Transit to provide service for UND's Campus Shuttle, and the City and UND have decided to move forward with that plan so we need to update our Transit Development Plan to include this plan.

Kouba explained that originally, in the current TDP, the cost of CAT providing the Campus Shuttle service was higher than UND's cost to provide it so UND decided to continue to provide the service. She said, however, that there were some things that UND wanted to change, as well as some high fluctuations of their cost ratios that changed in the interim, so the feasibility of CAT providing the service became more beneficial to UND, so they reconsidered having CAT provide the service. She added that there was also the ability to purchase buses that are more well matched to the type of route that the UND Campus Shuttle is providing, and they can also get some federal funds to help with the expansion of the service.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 12th, 2020**

Kouba commented that they then updated the financial information; with the addition of UND into the Cost Allocation Model it changed some of the variables for each of the three partners so that cost was updated. She added that in addition both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks have decided to have the City provide drivers for the Dial-A-Ride service that was previously contracted out, so that caused changes to the cost of operation, so since we were looking at those changes we also updated the various capital projects that we have, particularly on the Grand Forks side. She said that previously some of the capital projects were listed as candidate or illustrative projects but have been programmed. She stated that East Grand Forks had a couple of projects that were funded by MnDOT, so they were removed from the capital project list.

Kouba stated that these are the things that we are looking at updating in the TDP. She added that they are looking to both Cities for direction on what they would like us to do with this; if they want us to bring it forward and do a complete update of your TDPs and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, or if you feel that these changes don't warrant a complete update we would like a letter stating that.

Williams asked, when the shuttles go away, and she is assuming that will start this fall, are the City buses going to run more frequently, or will they adjust their current routes. Kouba responded that the current routes are going to stay as they are; the City purchased three additional buses, which would then replace the three UND shuttles that are running campus, and they will run those same routes. She added that when they do the next TDP update they will re-evaluate the service to see if there are better ways to mesh all the services at that time.

Haugen commented that the MPO is seeking preliminary approval of this, and assuming that the MPO Executive Policy Board also grants preliminary approval of it at the meeting next Wednesday, it will then be submitted to each City and they will be asked to inform us if they feel there should be a formal amendment to their City Comprehensive Plans, or if they want to just submit a letter stating that it wasn't significant enough to warrant such an amendment to their plans, then the MPO will take action for final approval of the proposed amendments. He explained that per the MPO's By-Laws, we give each City up to 60 days to make that decision, but after 60 day the MPO would then move forward without any formal City action. He reiterated that the step today is to get that preliminary approval out so we can seek the City feedback on the amendment in relationship to the Comprehensive Plan and also to start planning our formal publishing process as noted in the actual study that was done there was a lot of public input that took place on the study that led us to this amendment so it should be well known to the transit community.

Kuharenko referred to Page 7-22, Table 7-15, and stated that he was looking at comparing Table 7-15 and Table 7-14, and he is wondering if it would be possible to add in a total row for Table 7-15 like the one on Table 7-14.

Ellis pointed out that 10-4, under Long Term Needs, the first paragraph states "The Grand Forks capital analysis is not inclusive of needed ongoing upgrades and expansion to the CAT Bus Garage...", and asked if we can change that paragraph considering we are redoing the facility. She said that she doesn't know if we still need to have a statement about the \$8 million, or if we

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 12th, 2020**

are just addressing the expansion, but she would work it as such. Kouba responded that she believes that if you go down further it is in the 2018 update, and that year it was changed to \$4,000 and then. Ellis asked if the whole paragraph should be removed then. Kouba suggested just striking it out. Ellis agreed because since we addressed it in 2018, it is confusing to her because we address it there and then later we address that it is fixed, so she would strike it out.

MOVED BY KUHARKENO, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY PRELIMINARILY APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN SUBJECT TO INCORPORATION OF THE CHANGES DISCUSSED.

Riesinger said that he didn't notice in the plan; there has been prior discussion about the route to the Airport, specifically for Aerospace students, and he is wondering if that is going to continue to be a standalone service. Kouba responded that it is as UND will still be providing some of the transportation services they currently are. She added that they will be keeping a few buses to be used for events and such as well. Riesinger asked if there shouldn't be a note to that effect in the plan as well, what sort of things are going to continue to be operated. Kouba responded that they will add a note to that effect. Haugen added that in the actual separate UND/CAT merger report that is fleshed out a lot more. He said that the one out to the Airport operates for longer hours, which would really disrupt how the public transportation service could operate it if it were absorbed and those hours maintained. Riesinger said that he thinks it suits the Aerospace Center and their needs the best, but he just wanted to make sure that there wasn't some other change that he wasn't aware of. Haugen stated that there is no other change that they are aware of than that the current on-campus shuttles will be absorbed in the CAT system come fall, so you will have to continue to work with UND on any other services or changes to them.

Voting Aye: Riesinger, Zacher, Kuharenko, Emery, Ellis, Halford, and Hopkins.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Kadrmas, Bergman, Rood, Peterson, West, Graham, Bail, Gengler, Brooks, Audette, Magnuson, Sanders, and Christianson.

MATTER OF DRAFT T.I.P. PROCEDURAL MANUAL

a. MPO Draft Manual

Haugen reported that as everyone should know we do have Draft Update to our Public Participation Plan out for review and comments. He explained that previously our Public Participation Plan had a lot of information about the T.I.P. process but now the PPP directs people to this T.I.P. manual for that information, so we've already notified the public that we would be updating the T.I.P. Procedural Manual and that that is where they will need to go for information specific to engagement during the T.I.P. process. He added that we also knew that with both MAP-21 and the FAST-ACT inclusion of performance planning and programming, plus the consolidation of funding programs, that our T.I.P. manual was out of date and needed to be updated as well, so included in your packet is the Draft T.I.P. Procedural Manual. He said

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 12th, 2020**

that this draft reflects the comments that we received back from both DOTs, and he thanks them again for their input; and added that it also updates the Code of Federal Regulations citations and two other major areas; one is the matrix that shows the individual funding programs by State and the process specific to that program, and then Section 10 is completely new and has to do with performance.

Haugen referred to the document and highlighted where there has been substantial change(s):

Page 2 – 1st Paragraph

Haugen commented that the old draft essentially focused on the highway side, and said basically that the T.I.P. is about funding classified roadways, but we added a sentence near the end of the paragraph that says that there are other programs that have an eligibility uniqueness so we shouldn't only think of our highways; even some local streets could receive federal funding, so they added that sentence to give people some sense that there are other programs beside the highway side.

Page 4 – 1st Paragraph

Haugen stated that we used to just say that the T.I.P. was updated annually, but there was a request to have the clarified, so we are now saying that the current practice in both States is to have a new T.I.P. developed and adopted every year, but the federal minimum is to adopt one every four years. He added that both States wanted to address that sometimes there is the rare occasion when we don't produce a new T.I.P.; and then also because we are a Bi-State MPO we have, on occasion, adopted a T.I.P. that is specific to one side of the river versus the other at times, so we added language that there are rare occasions that the T.I.P. is not developed or adopted and then there are also rare occasions that we might have to adopt a T.I.P. on one side of the river.

Matrix (after Page 10)

Haugen commented that this is where we updated what the actual programs are on the North Dakota side. He said that if you compare the three North Dakota sheets with the two Minnesota sheets you will notice a couple of columns are being stricken out on the North Dakota sheets, and he is still showing the two columns on the Minnesota side but are proposing that one of the two be eliminated.

Haugen stated that the one column that is common to both States is just the process to amend/revise the T.I.P., and this is a cooperative thing that we talk about, and it has the same language throughout all of the cells so it is overly redundant.

Haugen said that estimating funding on the North Dakota side is common, so that has been eliminated as a column. He added that on the Minnesota side there are still a lot of different programs that have different cycles to them, so that still shows a column and there are still some

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 12th, 2020**

question makes that they are still working through with Minnesota's process to try to identify when the funding estimates become available for those individual program.

Haugen stated that the main thing is that we do identify all of the programs that have federal funds pass through them, that candidate projects from our MPO area can be applied towards, and ultimately can possibly be programmed into our T.I.P; the basic general funding distribution, percentage of federal funds, match funds; who the lead NDDOT Division is, and then who the lead federal agency is on that particular program. He said that for the most part he believes that North Dakota is polished, and as mentioned already Minnesota is still working through some of these question marks and procedures.

Ellis pointed out that some of them, like the 5307 shows 50% operations, which can now go up to 75% operations. She said that another one is the ADA for Transit, FTA will fund up to 85%, not 83%.

Williams said that she has a question on the North Dakota side, cost sharing; Urban Roads is at the bottom but it applies to all where it says 19.07% OR 100% above the project cap, is it OR or should it be AND. Haugen responded that the intent is that there is a cap and that everything above that cap is 100% local cost. Williams said then that it should be AND, because otherwise we could run it up with 100% over the cap.

Page 11 – B – Projects Not Programmed In the T.I.P.

Haugen reported that the next significant change is on Page 11 and it results from a recent example in North Dakota. He pointed out that originally the very first bullet under Projects Not Programmed In the T.I.P. stated that emergency relief projects resulting from a federally declared emergency...but we are now inserting the phrase "or state declared emergency".

Haugen cited that on I-29, south of Fargo, there was an I-29 Bridge over the Wild Rice River that has issues, but it was not during a federally declared emergency, so there was the standard T.I.P. procedure process that had to be followed, even though it was a State declared emergency, so no we are using a State declared emergency as a general exemption that they just responding to the emergency, but the caveats are still there if they are doing substantial functional location or capacity things, just because it is during an emergency or is caused by the emergency doesn't exempt it from the T.I.P. process, but simply recovering from an emergency now is exempt from the T.I.P. process.

Page 19 – Step 11

Haugen stated that because we are a Bi-State MPO we have language in here that talks about North Dakota being the lead agency, so most of the schedule talks about North Dakota's timeline; Minnesota is typically a month or two later in that, and the only place that we specifically note that out is on Page 19, under Step 11 where it talks specifically about State actions.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 12th, 2020**

Page 19 – Step 11b

Haugen reported that North Dakota DOT and Minnesota DOT are responsible to inform the Federal Agencies that the T.I.P. has been approved but the Federal Agencies don't actually look at our individual T.I.P. per say, they look at the S.T.I.P., which has our T.I.P.s included by reference, so this is cleaning up the language of how Federal Highway and Federal Transit actually get involved with our T.I.P.

Page 19 – Step 12

Haugen reported that they cleaned up some language under Step 12 as well.

Section 9

Haugen commented that we do know that we have our scoring system, that we do still have to update those scoring sheets but we haven't gotten to that yet so that is another step to the process, otherwise there hasn't been much change in this section.

Section 10

Haugen stated that this section involves when we get into Performance Measures. He said that predominantly we relied on the Minnesota Federal Highway Guidance that they gave us back when we initially had to address the inclusion of these performance measures into our T.I.P.; and we sort of reformatted that guidance into this section.

Section 11

Haugen said that in this T.I.P. Management and Interim T.I.P. Years section the only real substantial change is on Page 30, second paragraph from the end. He pointed out that we do treat T.I.P. amendments differently than how we treat T.I.P. modifications. He explained that T.I.P. amendments are more of a formal process in that we publish a public hearing for the amendment itself, while for modifications we don't process an official public hearing notice for them, particularly the NDDOT wanted us to include how the public is informed that we are processing modifications, so we added in the last sentence that no notice is published, rather the published agenda and then the packets will serve as the notice to the public.

Haugen stated that with the Minnesota Matrix still being filled out, in addition to us still updating our scoring sheets, which would be Appendix #3, the Draft is out for review and comment on it and they will continue working on those fill in the blank sections.

Kuharenko referred to Page 10, and said that there is information regarding regionally significant projects that don't necessarily receive federal funds, and it says in here that at a minimum this includes all principal arterial highways and all fixed guideway transit facilities that offer a significant alternative to regional highway travel; and then he believes on Page 11 under the Type 2 example it goes into some more detail as to what should be included in these projects for

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 12th, 2020**

informational purposes in the T.I.P., and it gets into that they are functionally classified as an Urban Collector or Rural Major Collector and add above that add capacity or provide other operational improvements; can we just go with the simpler version where if it is the principal arterial, because we seem to have a little conflicting information between those two. Haugen responded that the first one is more generic, and the other is the one that gets into the nitty gritty, so that is the actual nitty gritty ones that we follow, and we had to make the distinction between minor and major collectors because on the Minnesota side they do that. Kuharenko said that the question he is asking is instead of going into this amount of detail for information purposes, can we actually reduce it so it is just the principal arterials that the identifier is referring to as the minimums. Haugen responded that the minimum has to be the Federal Aid System, which includes the collectors. He added that you will also notice that we have to do the operation and maintenance of the Federal Aid System, and the Federal Aid System is the Functionally Classified Roadways, collectors and above, and the collectors are both the Urban Collectors and the Major County Collectors and the Major and Minor Collectors on the Minnesota side are the same. Kuharenko said that that is where he is drawing a little bit of confusion from because in here it is indicating that if it is on a Functionally Classified, and it is adding capacity, that is not necessarily operation and maintenance of, unless he is missing something here.

Haugen thanked him for bringing this issue up, and said that because of our Pavement Performance we probably should eliminate the word “and” adding capacity because we have to show our pavement performance measures and targets and so even if you aren’t adding capacity we still have to show evidence that we are maintaining the pavement, projects that do something that don’t add capacity but are addressing the pavement should be reflected, so then it should say whether or not it adds capacity. Kuharenko said, then, in that regard if these are for information only, on the following page, on Page 12, it gets into the T.I.P. project information required, is all of that information then required for an information only project as well, or is that simply for projects that are receiving federal funds. Haugen responded that they weren’t trying to make a distinction between only federal funded versus information projects. He said that year of expenditure is still a big item so a lot of that is just making sure that we are getting good cost estimates so that our financial plan is as meaningful, that our fiscal constraint arguments are as rounded as best they can. Kuharenko said that some of his concern with this is that right now they have their Six-Year CIP, which they have some projects in there that are on a classified roadway system; it might be construction of brand new roadways, it might be converting asphalt rural sections to concrete urban sections, and those things can change from year to year and so are they looking at every single year revising those, changing all of that information in relation to that or is that something where they can just give you a copy of our Six-Year CIP or do they need to go through every single project and provide all this information for each and every one of those projects and how they change on a year to year basis. Haugen responded that they would. He said that will creating good cost estimates, showing termini to termini, and getting a length, right. Kuharenko responded that that will be included, except for your length and probably your detailed scope, would be included in the Six Year CIP; the scope might just identify if it is construction or reconstruction, but that would be about it, your length probably wouldn’t be included in the Six Year CIP. Haugen said, though, that you do have termini, so the length should be included. Kuharenko stated that typically they don’t include the lengths in the CIP, so what he is trying to figure out is if they are going to need to do a lot of additional

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 12th, 2020**

paperwork and documentation, annually, as their CIP changes from year to year. Haugen said that they will try to minimize the paperwork as much as they can, so let's work on this section. He added that there is still a lot of this that needs to have information included in the T.I.P., but let's not try to make it so that you're producing a ton of documentation each year. Kuharenko said that that would be their goal. Haugen said, though, that year of expenditure is still important, indicating whether it has ITS elements is still important, so a lot of this is still important to be included.

Kuharenko said that it was stated that this is currently out for comment; what is the timeline and approval procedure for this. Haugen responded that until they have those matrix cells filled in, and the scoring sheet filled in, after that they would typically have a thirty day comment period. He added that their preference is that they get these comments sooner rather than waiting until it is a complete whole document and then providing those comments on stuff that you have seen previously, just the newer stuff. Halford asked if this would be coming back as a complete document to the Technical Advisory Committee and the Executive Policy Board. Haugen responded that it absolutely would be.

Kuharenko asked, for those Technical Advisory Committee members not here today, if it would be possible to get a red-lined and strike-through version of this document, to kind of show them the changes that we discussed. Haugen responded that he would get one out.

Haugen commented that the next step from an MPO Staff perspective was looking at those ranking scoring sheets, and seeing how we can change those. He explained that one of the issues they have with the scoring system is that it was based off of a program called TELUS, and that is no longer an offered program, so we are trying to either replicate it, which would be our preference, or come up with a new system but we do know that we have to somehow get it back to a system that might be a little easier for all of us to use. He added that the other big thing is waiting for MnDOT, in particular, to get back to us on the programs.

b. Minnesota Side T.I.P./S.T.I.P. Review

Haugen reported that outside of updating our procedural manual, as part of the finding from Federal Highway and Federal Transit on the Minnesota S.T.I.P., the Minnesota side is going to go through a formal T.I.P./S.T.I.P. coordination review these next few months, and that is outlined. He said that because of that he would anticipate that we would be adopting a new T.I.P. manual before the results of this review would be available so there might be a cause for us to revisit this T.I.P. manual, based on the outcome of the Minnesota review in particular.

Haugen stated that no action is being requested on this agenda item today, they were just bringing you up-to-date on where they are at on it. He added that they have the draft out for comments, absent those two items in particular.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 12th, 2020**

MATTER OF 2020 FLOOD FORECAST AND COORDINATION

Haugen reported that annually we do a flood forecast; the first forecast was released a couple of weeks ago and indicates that there is a high probability of a major flood event in Grand Forks/East Grand Forks. He referred to a graph showing various heights and the probability each had of being reached and went over it briefly. He pointed out that there is a 50% chance of reaching 48.8 feet, which would close down quite a few of our river crossings which would implement the possibility that all of the East Grand Forks Point traffic would have to head east to the Mallory Bridge over the Red Lake River and then come back into town, and vice versa, and that is a challenge because we have two city-wide schools in the Point area and two city-wide schools on the north end outside of the Point so a lot of school traffic would be rerouted.

Haugen stated that the last piece is a phone list. He said that last year we did quite a bit of changes to this list, so if there are any additional changes or update this is the opportune time to let us know so that they can be implemented. He added that if there are any changes made to the list the updated list will be distributed.

Haugen said that there is a second forecast being released tomorrow, so we can see if there are any changes to the forecast, but it will likely not change the probably of a major flood, just the forecasted height of the event.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Haugen reported that included in the packet was a summary presentation that was given to the Steering Committee in December. He added that an existing conditions report was available on the MPO Website. He said that also included in the packet were the summary of the meeting and the comments made at that meeting.

Haugen stated that he thinks from an existing condition point of view, each node kind of has some, from a technical point of view, acceptable operations; but we do have some areas where we have challenges. He said that some of the places where challenges really come to the forefront, where we do have some hot-spot crash locations, are identified in your new information.

Haugen said that one thing that catches his eye is the slide that shows DeMers Avenue crashes; there are 95 total crashes and a lot of them are rear-end type crashes, but 30% of them are occurring on the Sorlie Bridge, a high concentration of rear-end crashes taking place on the bridge itself (shown as the white dots along the corridor).

Haugen commented that, uniquely, most people wouldn't think of it, but 6th Street on the Grand Forks side has a couple of intersections that have a higher rate of crashes than the critical crash rates, and those are 2nd and 6th and 1st and 6th.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 12th, 2020**

Halford asked what is considered as “other” crash types, because there are a lot of black dots along North 3rd Street. Haugen responded that that is a infinite type range.

Haugen said that the other information to highlight is that they have tapped in to MnDOT’s permission to use their platform called “Streetlight Data”, and that is highlighted on the slide that talks about travel patterns. He pointed out that 85% of all trips are less than five minutes in duration, according to that Streetlight Data, and that Streetlight Data is, again, your cell phone tracking data that is taking place. He added that in addition a quarter of the traffic is really traveling through the downtown, 75% has destinations or origins in the downtown, 87% of trips are within a mile of the downtown study area.

Haugen commented that it doesn’t seem to take much for DeMers to degrade into tough traveling conditions, just in the variability of the traffic volumes; so from an average traffic point of view it might grade out as acceptable, but when we have a couple of unusual variations take place it degrades rather quickly for that short duration.

Kuharenko stated that he is trying to remember what year these traffic counts were taken. Haugen responded that predominantly most of them were done in 2018, winter 2018/2019. He added that the individual turning movement counts were done in the spring of 2019. He added that some of the traffic data was gleaned from the DeMers Reconstruction Traffic Operations Study as well.

Haugen said that travel time reliability shows that with the close spacing of signals, particularly on the North Dakota side, traffic does get delayed, but the slide that shows overall Multi-modal Operations, overall from the four major modes it is a Level Service C under existing conditions. He stated that the transit service, based on the measure used in the study, is the lowest one and that measure is just strictly based on how frequently a transit vehicle goes past that block face, and so from a transit perspective, you aren’t trying to get a bus across every block face, so it doesn’t do a good job of accounting for a reasonable walking distance speed for transit.

Haugen commented that they spent, probably too much time as a Downtown Transportation Steering Committee, talking about parking, since we just completed the Downtown Parking Study, but people wanted to talk about parking still. He stated that there is information regarding the parking in the downtown.

Haugen stated that Friday, February 14th, the Steering Committee is holding its second meeting here in the Training Room at 9:30 a.m. He said that on the MPO website you can find the information that will be shared at that meeting under the Projects, Plans and Reports tab; including a Future Conditions Report and the presentation that will be given.

Haugen reported that as part of the discussion at Friday’s meeting, they will start framing out their 1st Wholesale Public Engagement for this Study, identifying some potential dates and locations; so the study is progressing from there.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 12th, 2020**

OTHER BUSINESS

- a. 2020 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that this is our monthly progress report, it has been updated to reflect our 2020 Work Program.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO ADJOURN THE FEBRUARY 12,
2020 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:30 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager