

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:39 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Stephanie Erickson, Grand Forks Planning; Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck (via conference call); Paul Konickson, MnDOT-District 2; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Ali Rood, Grand Forks Cities Area Transit; Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineer; and Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer.

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

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

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 9<sup>TH</sup>, 2016, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY ROOD, SECONDED BY LANG, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 9<sup>TH</sup>, 2016, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS**

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that there was a meeting held last week on, again, trying to finalize the language of the Decorative Lighting Plan. He said that his understanding is that the initial draft presented allowed for some temporary events to be signed off on by the Mayors from both cities,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

but the Historic Preservation Committee did not approve of that language, so the second draft included their approval as well.

Haugen asked if anyone present had attended the meeting and could give an update on what may have transpired at the end of it. Konickson stated that he believes that both cities are going to make recommendations, via e-mail, to committee members when they want to make changes to the lighting of the bridge, and then there will be a certain time-frame for which responses can be made before the changes are implemented, so there will be some more changes made to the language, and an updated draft will be sent out shortly.

Grasser commented that he likes the concept of “unless you hear otherwise, it’s good to go” otherwise you will be dealing with that trap of not being able to get responses in time, or at all, so he likes that process. Konickson said that he agrees, adding that this is really a local bridge, and the cities will know the local issues, so unless someone has a real issue with a proposed lighting change, it should make it easy to implement any changes either City would like to see done in a timely manner.

Information only.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that he received an e-mail late Friday regarding the project bidding process. He asked that Mr. Konickson give an update on this.

Konickson commented that he believes they received five bids; with Zenith Tech, out of Waukesha, Wisconsin being the low bidder. He stated, however, that nothing has been approved yet, but their bid was somewhere around \$15,600,000 while the others were between \$16,500,000 and \$17,000,000, with one even higher. He said that most of them were a little lower than what was budgeted, so they are reviewing the bids now and will hopefully complete the process in the next month or so.

Kuharenko asked what the Engineer’s estimate was for this project. Konickson responded that he hasn’t seen the final Engineer’s estimate, so he doesn’t know for sure, but he believes it was higher than the bid amounts. Haugen commented that we show the estimate at \$18,000,000 in our work program. Konickson stated that he thinks that is the programmed amount.

Haugen commented that last month we also talked about the traffic timing, was there any advancement on that. Konickson responded that he talked to their traffic engineer, and gave her the contact information for Grand Forks, but he doesn’t know if any conversations have been held on that yet, but if not please let him know and he will pass it on to their contact person. He added that they have talked about getting a consultant contract set up to help work this issue out, and he thinks they have a list that they can pick from, so they want to see this worked out.

Information only.

**MATTER OF 2018-2021 T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS**

a. FTA 5339 Capital Grant Program

Kouba reported that staff is looking for approval of the list that we have from Cities Area Transit. She explained that they are looking to; the first two priority items are replacement buses, the second two are basically maintenance to fix the HVAC and the roof on the transportation facilities.

Kouba said that the bus replacement is part of our plan, and the maintenance items are part of our TDP by association as they were going to be done as part of an expansion and remodel project, but because we do not have the funding to do that project, we are now taking it in two bite-sized pieces instead.

Kouba stated that staff recommends approval of the priority order given.

Rood commented that this was presented to the City Council, and there were no questions and they concurred with the priority listing presented.

***MOVED BY BAIL, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FTA 5339 GRANT REQUEST AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH OUR LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND IN THE PRIORITY IDENTIFIED.***

Grasser asked if he is correct that they are only going to do maintenance to the portion above the offices. Rood responded that that is correct. She explained that they sat down with Bev Collings and the EAPC, and determined that replacing the worst section, which is over the offices, in such a way that it wouldn't be a waste if two years from now we replace the entire roof; and with this dollar amount, as the fourth priority that would be a better chance of getting it funded instead of trying to get the entire project funded. She added that it was a decision that was based on design, and likelihood of getting it funded.

***Voting Aye: Lang, Erickson, Konickson, Johnson, Kuharenko, Bail, Rood, and West.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Ellis, Riesinger, Christianson, Magnuson, and Sanders.***

b. TA Program

Viafara reported that the Grand Forks Engineering Department submitted three projects for consideration; they are: 1) shared use path along 6th Avenue North from North 40<sup>th</sup> Street to the English Coulee; 2) shared use path along 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South from South Columbia Road to South 20<sup>th</sup> Street; and 3) shared use path along South Columbia Road from 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue South to 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Viafara commented that these three shared use paths are all to be included as elements of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan, and if approved will certainly provide a number of benefits to the community, in general. He stated that one of those benefits, particularly for the 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue North path, would be the ability to provide access and mobility to a number of residents located in what we call 'environmental justice' areas, and will afford them opportunities for walking and access to transit and other destination around the City.

Viafara stated that the path on South Columbia Road, again, will afford, in the long range future, land use access to those areas currently being developed; and including some destinations like the Discovery School.

Viafara said that these are the three projects. He stated that he would like to bring your attention to the path on 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, because this also affords an element of connectivity to a number of destinations that are attractors, in terms of trips, like the softball complex, Kings Walk Golf Course, Choice Fitness, and South Middle School.

Viafara stated that in terms of a positive decision; there is the fact that 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue North, for some reason due to designing issues and land use ownership; is limited in terms of basically short and generates kind of a gap in the system so that is a consideration that needs to be addressed in the future to see how we can really provide complete access rather than having a gap that is being, at the moment, suggested.

Grasser asked what gap Mr. Viafara is referring to. Viafara responded that on 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue there is, due to design consideration, the available space between the street pavement and the crossing. Erickson asked if he is talking about the segment before 42<sup>nd</sup>. Kuharenko commented that it is the section between 42<sup>nd</sup> and 44<sup>th</sup> he is talking about. He said that he can actually address this one, and explained that they are currently planning on reconstructing 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue North next summer, and will be looking at trying to widen that area up, and then they can have a shared use path going across 42<sup>nd</sup> to North 40<sup>th</sup> Street. Viafara said that that is a positive commentary on the issue and we appreciate the effort, but on behalf of the community, to try to eliminate those gaps that are there is important, and, a comment as well, is on South Columbia, that has to do with the fact that in the past when the road was scheduled for design, you did this community engagement, and most of the focus was based on the roadway, the motor vehicle access and mobility, now we have you applying for the components for the access of the bicyclists, so this is positive; however he is asking whether we may in the future discuss some impediments through the ordinances that are kind of preventing these facilities from being built at the time when the roadways are being built, so rather than doing them piecemeal we can have the elements built at once. He added that there is apparently a situation with the ordinances, there are situations involving cost, and we are aware of that but let's see how we can, as much as we can eliminate in the future that situation.

Viafara stated that staff is recommending, for consideration, and then approval to forward this to the Executive Policy Board for their approval.

Grasser said that he is still confused, and asked what the problem is with 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, where they aren't doing it properly according to the code. Viafara responded that he meant

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

South Columbia, from 40<sup>th</sup> to 47<sup>th</sup>. Grasser stated that the City Council specifically took action against that, so are you suggesting that we write a code that the City Council can't override this. Viafara responded that he was not aware of that situation. He added that this is based on the federal legislation; the idea is for the city to afford opportunities for mobility and access to all the modes of transportation, including bicycle and pedestrian. Grasser stated that they understand that, but the discussion with the City was that if we did that, put blinders on and just built what you're interpreting, we have a destination that doesn't bring anybody anyplace, and we have facilities of which substantial pieces would end up having to be torn out and replaced because the area wasn't developed in order to identify what the grades and all the terminal points are, so you'd have a substantial investment that would have to be torn out. He said that he is, maybe, taking a little bit of issue with that criticism because that was all discussed and brought to the City Council and they actually ruled on it. Viafara responded that he appreciates that, and added that he was not aware of that ruling; and we abide and respect that ruling, so at least for the record this is clear. He said, though, that what he is trying to tell you is that because we are dealing with federal funding, in the future, as much as we can, we need to coordinate the construction of all the facilities at the time that roadways are being designed and built, if it is possible, as much as we can, this is the recommendation they are suggesting. He commented that they appreciate that there are some constraints. Grasser stated that the problem with that is that it infers that they aren't doing this, and he believes that they already are, so he will just leave it at that.

Kuharenko commented that he was also under the impression that the bike and pedestrian facilities had to be considered, but not necessarily implemented during a federal aid project. Haugen said that he thinks the point that Mr. Viafara is trying to make is, you're asking for federal funds to install a facility that you just decided you needed now. Grasser responded that that is why it is ranked #3, is because it is questionable whether, but again there is a little more growth that is going on there, that was part of the question; and it also looks like there is a question about it now in the CIP whether 47<sup>th</sup> was going to be coming in, and it does look like it is, so we would at least then have a terminus that would move, those were more uncertain two or three years ago when they had those discussions then they are today, so it is a dynamic change, and they need to exercise some judgement with those things.

Viafara stated that they will take that response in good faith, and they understand; but the recommendation that they are bringing to your attention is if it is possible that whenever these facilities need to be built, counting on federal funding, to make every single effort to accommodate all the modes of transportation, if it is possible, or as much as possible. Grasser responded that this feels like it keeps getting thrown at them, and he thought it was properly addressed, and he will just leave it at that. Viafara responded that that is fine, and thanked him.

Kuharenko said that another point he would like to throw out there for 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue North is that that segment was also a segment that the City has gotten comments from the public on in the past, looking for a shared use paths. He stated that he believes, also, that during the Bike/Ped plan public input, Mr. Viafara also received some comments regarding 6<sup>th</sup>. He added that in addition to having the Lake Agassiz Elementary School, as well as the School for the Blind, those were some of the reasons why they ended up having that as a first priority. He explained that it is in an established neighborhood, so getting in there and doing a special assessment

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

project could be a little more difficult as well, so having the federal funding associated with it could prove to be very beneficial.

Kuharenko reported that with the reconstruction project planned for the summer, they would hopefully have their connection connecting to the bike lanes that are currently on 42<sup>nd</sup>, and depending on what the plan is for a reconstruction of 42<sup>nd</sup>, whatever the facilities are once that gets reconstructed.

***MOVED BY ERICKSON, SECONDED BY ROOD, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE TA GRANT REQUEST FOR THE THREE SHARED USE PATHS AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH OUR LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND IN THE PRIORITY IDENTIFIED.***

West asked if it would be beneficial to change any of the language in the report to address the City's concerns. Grasser responded that that would be his preference. He explained that when he reads about 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and again maybe he is just getting sensitive on the connotations, it is a proposed project, constructed shared use path, and it talks about it will likely, the consideration there is that there is going to be a gap; well according to the plan right now there is no gap because what this is going to do is to connect, by the time this is built, it will connect an existing bikepath at the coulee to an existing bikepath that will be terminated, essentially, at 40<sup>th</sup>, and so he thinks that explanation should be expanded because it makes it look like does the application... Haugen asked if the application provide that explanation. Kuharenko responded that he believes it does. Grasser said that it makes it look like they missed something, and he doesn't believe they did miss anything, and they have a plan that is complete, it doesn't leave gaps, those types of things. Kuharenko referred to the application and pointed out that it does state "it is anticipated that when 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue North is reconstructed near this crossing viable options will be explored for widening the existing sidewalk from 42<sup>nd</sup> Street to North 40<sup>th</sup> Street to better accommodate multiple modes and non-motorized transportation". Grasser added that there is no guarantee in life, but that is the plan right now, that there wouldn't be any gaps in the system.

Grasser commented that the reason they are doing this is to try to eliminate the railroad out of the federal process because they are so hard to deal with, if we do need to deal with them, otherwise they might not be able to get this project done within this timeline, so they are trying to deal with that piece at a local level, and the federal component with this. Haugen stated that this is a little different than what was just discussed at this meeting, so is there a reason why you weren't as definitive in the application as you were now, because as this gets looked at the Governor's Task Force will have the statement that it might be addressed in the future as some point, where you guys have a more definitive answer that. Kuharenko responded that he supposed some of that might have come from that fact that that reconstruction project will be a special assessment project and is subject to protest, so he thinks that is where some of that ended up coming from, so they are going to do their best, and it is planned, and they will be doing what they can in that area. Haugen said that he knows that on the North Dakota side they don't allow you to come and make a presentation of your proposal, while Minnesota does allow you to make oral arguments, so it might be worth the consideration of taking a look at how this is worded and try to make it

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

less iffy in that sometime in the future there will be an effort made to close the gap. Grasser asked if they can reword the application because their intention is more than to make an effort, they are going to have some sort of connection through there, and he thinks the only question in their minds is, working with the railroad, of the options is it all going to be ten feet or will they have to squeeze in a seven or eight foot section. Haugen responded that there is the opportunity to make changes as they don't have to be turned in until the end of the month. Grasser asked that the language be changed to reflect what the full intent is.

Rood asked if the motion needs to be changed to include the change in language in the application. Viafara responded that the priority remains, it is a matter of interpretation only, but overall they are pleased with the application and the benefits that the application is bringing to our attention. Lang asked if he is saying, then, that the motion has no effect on what is going to end up being changed. Erickson asked if they need to put it in the motion. Haugen responded that it is up to the Technical Advisory Committee but he thinks that it would become rather a cumbersome motion as the project isn't changing, just the wording in the application.

***Voting Aye: Lang, Erickson, Konickson, Johnson, Kuharenko, Bail, Rood, and West.***  
***Voting Nay: None.***  
***Abstain: None.***  
***Absent: Ellis, Riesinger, Christianson, Magnuson, and Sanders.***

Haugen reported that he will be doing the next three items together. He pointed out that included in the packet is the stuff we always do when we talk about our T.I.P., and that is the areas that we cover, what projects should be in there, the process; and we still have FAST being implemented as well as MAP-21 being implemented, so what we do today is subject to any changes made to them. He said that we do know that this T.I.P. is not subject to full compliance with FAST, and it might be the last one for which we enjoy that benefit.

Haugen commented that North Dakota raised its rate of growth for federal revenue to a 2.2% growth rate; and the rate of expenditure/inflation is still at 4%. He explained that what this meant for the Grand Forks Urban Program portion is, you can see that over three years there is about \$1,000,000 more available funding. He stated that, as we discussed when we solicited, projects can be squeezed in each year, or it can be used as a lump sum at the end.

Haugen stated that he just threw in that Recreational Trails is just being solicited now, and are due at the end of December, and we will look at them in January.

c. HSIP Program

Haugen reported that we received two applications: 1) one from the City which, is a two-phased project on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue; and 2) from the County on Airport Road or County 5.

Haugen explained that there was a safety audit done for the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue project and that is where the recommendations are coming from. He referred to maps of the area and pointed out what is being done in Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the project. He stated that the total cost of the project is just shy of \$7.5 million, with a 90/10 split.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen reported that Grand Forks County 5, the intersections of DeMers Avenue and 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, the County had KLJ do a safety and traffic operation study on that corridor at these intersections. He referred to a slide with a page from KLJ's report and pointed out that it identifies the new geometrics that would go out there. West commented that this report shows signals out there, and they will not be putting signals out there, just turning lanes.

Grasser asked if they can do the widening without doing any earth work and such, would you just widen out the shoulder or do you have to widen the embankment. West responded that they will have to move the ditch out a little bit, and then fill the embankment in.

Haugen stated that he did ask Mr. West, although too late on Friday, but in the local road safety program there was signage and lighting being suggested for these intersections, and he was wondering if that was included in these costs. West responded that signage would be, but lighting would not. Haugen said, then, that the total cost estimate for this project would be \$1.7 million.

Haugen commented that these are the priority order that staff is recommending be approved.

West asked if there is any way to split out urban and rural. Haugen responded that he did ask that question and the answer is no that it cannot be split, it is an HSIP Program that is statewide. He explained that there is a 50/50 share of that, with 50% of the funds on the State System and 50% are shared by the urban rural program, so our direction was that we can't split them out, we have to rank them against each other.

Grasser asked, if we have to rank them in that manner, should we be showing Phase 2 for the City side, because we would only be applying for one; so would our priority be Phase 1 City, that is what Mr. West is asking, right, how do you prioritize that then if they both go in together. West responded that that is correct, it is kind of apples versus oranges, but he isn't going to dispute that 32<sup>nd</sup> is more important than County 5. Haugen asked if they are two separate applications or are they one application with two phases to it. Grasser responded that they are two applications. Haugen said, then, that there are three projects. Grasser responded that they aren't asking for Phase 2 at this point, so really there would only be one from the City, but it would be the \$4.42 million and not dealing with the \$2.9 as it is really a future project, they aren't asking for \$7 million, they are asking for \$5 million. Haugen stated that they would then eventually take out Phase 2 as being listed as a candidate project, so why is Phase 2 being submitted into the process this year. Grasser responded that that is kind of the question, because they aren't looking for it in the same year, does it become priority three, for lack of anything better. Haugen responded that this is an unusual project since the State approached us, essentially, and said they wanted to invest heavily on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue to address safety problems, and they put together the safety report, and said that these are the things we think should be done, so it is already outside of the box as to how it fits the normal HSIP Program, and they're looking for HSIP projects and they also indicated that they were will to invest a large amount on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Grasser commented that these aren't set up in years like the Urban Program is, because primarily the Council's action was to actually ask to prioritize, or somehow advance the first phase of 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, and he doesn't know if that is possible or if it changes the application here at all, but if you are able to get Phase 1 in say 2018, and the County is in 2019, they wouldn't actually be competing with each other in the same manner; these are all questions they have. Haugen responded that they usually don't have a year attached to them, they try to say that it is just for the last year of the T.I.P. and S.T.I.P, but in reality they try to plug it into whatever year they can, especially as both of these are large amounts for the HSIP Program.

Grasser stated that, for whatever it is worth, they did ask to expedite Phase 1 as quickly as we can, as far as the funding piece of it, just because of the accidents we are experiencing.

West asked, at the State level does each project compete against every other project in the State, and the State would prioritize them then. Haugen responded that the State will review all of them, yes, but they will consider the priority order we give them as well.

Haugen commented that his understanding, having worked with the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue audit, it was his thought that it was two 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue phases in one big project instead of pieces of it, they were interested in funding it knowing it would be a large project as the safety audit report came back from them as a large project, they didn't have any cost estimates in the report. Lang agreed, stating that we did the work in 2013 and the goal was to have a major traffic operations project in the early 2020s. Grasser stated that that was and is generally correct, he thinks that the idea when we did the maintenance was that we were going to try to buy five or six years because we are deficient in geometry, and we are also deficient in structure on the pavement, as far as maintaining it, but then what happened with the updated Long Range Transportation Plan was emphasis on maintenance only as opposed to capacity, we are still missing some capacity components, and the HSIP, as he understands it, they kind of put it together as really only addressing the safety component, it's not adding some of the turn lanes and other geometric improvements that really otherwise need to happen, and the catch-22 on all this is that these are needed right away, but from a capacity, he thinks in the Long Range Plan, by 2025 we are talking poor levels of service and things on 32<sup>nd</sup> so we really should probably have, in his opinion, we should have them looking at that reconstruction within that time period, but as we discussed last year trying to push it up to 2021 we couldn't find the projects to take out of the plan to move it up that far so it isn't kind of sitting out there in 2030 or something like that and complicating it further, there probably needs to be a maintenance project put in there somewhere in-between, but the bottom line the HSIP we don't think is giving us the geometric improvements that we need to really reach that original intention.

Kuharenko reported that Phase 1 addresses, he believes 31<sup>st</sup>, 34<sup>th</sup>, and Columbia; mainly realigns the left turns for east bound/west bound traffic; and also a double left on Columbia. He said that all three of those intersections are on the high crash list, which is kind of why we are looking at the large dollar amount associated with it, we kind of wanted to make that our first priority, and they weren't exactly sure because of that large dollar amount what the best way to split this out would be, so having it in two different phases allows the DOT and Selection Committee an opportunity to decide that while they don't have enough money for both of them combined, we can do this one, or it can be stripped down further if needed.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen commented that, as we discussed, and as you heard, you aren't addressing, probably the capacity that they would desire, the County might be termed a flip-flop; the County, he isn't sure the report identified the crash issue, but it is addressing some potential future geometry, some existing and future geometry rates, that will obviously have an impact. He added that they aren't high crash locations, they aren't critical crash rate intersections. He said that the Local Road Safety Program identified some lower cost, roughly \$100,000, improvements at both of these.

West said that you mentioned signage at those locations, and they have done just about everything they can do for signage, other than maybe putting a larger stop sign as a last resort. Haugen commented that they talked about illuminating the intersections, and some advance stop methods. West said that there are rumble strips, there is advance stop, there are strips on the posts, the only thing you can do is illuminate the stop sign and illuminate the intersection. Grasser asked if they were still getting people blowing through the intersections. West responded that they aren't. He added that those projects, by capacity today, turn lanes are warranted, but they do not have a crash problem there today mainly because the movements are parallel. He said, though, that the traffic volumes are predicted to more than double in this area, so they are trying to be proactive and separate out those movements. He added that they do have some capacity issues, some projected capacity issues, but today it is okay.

West reported that from a County standpoint, if this was ranked #3 it wouldn't be all bad. He said that you would probably think that 32<sup>nd</sup> would be a better place to spend \$3 million dollars versus the County's \$1.7 million because today it is functioning okay versus your intersections already have a high rated high crash issue. Grasser responded that this is the problem they are dealing with, is that they do show up on the high crash report year after year.

***MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY WEST, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE HSIP PROGRAM REQUEST AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH OUR LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND IN THE PRIORITY IDENTIFIED.***

***Voting Aye: Lang, Erickson, Konickson, Johnson, Kuharenko, Bail, Rood, and West.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Ellis, Riesinger, Christianson, Magnuson, and Sanders.***

d. Urban Program

Haugen said that this is also an opportune time, if there are any changes for whatever reason to current programmed projects, to identify those. He added that none were submitted so we are just dealing with the new years of the T.I.P. for the Urban Program, and that is North Columbia Road, essentially between the bridge and 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, a complete reconstruction and realignment work. Kuharenko commented that it actually goes a little bit north of University Avenue. He referred to a map and pointed out that you have the overpass, then you have the intersection of 2<sup>nd</sup> and the intersection of University, so it goes almost to the intersection of 4<sup>th</sup>.

Haugen stated that the estimated cost of the project is \$6.24 million; \$5 million on federal funds.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen reported that this is on the NHS System, it is obviously a state of good repair project. He stated that it was not identified in our Long Range Transportation Plan as a significant project; Columbia Road Overpass is a significant project, so the City was asked if this big increase in what this project is going to do, is it going to harm or delay that project, and their answer was that it should not harm it.

Haugen referred to a graphic, and commented that he recalls there was a fencing proposal in this area and he is wondering if that will be looked at with the project development. Kuharenko responded that he wasn't aware of a fencing proposal. Haugen said that the University and the City at one time looked at a proposal to put up fencing to help stop ped traffic in this area. Kuharenko said, again, that he wasn't aware of that. Grasser asked if that needs to be listed somehow in the application, or is that just following the bike/ped facility component. Haugen responded that probably should be looked at with the project development portion.

***MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY WEST, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE URBAN PROGRAM REQUEST AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH OUR LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND IN THE PRIORITY IDENTIFIED.***

***Voting Aye: Lang, Erickson, Konickson, Johnson, Kuharenko, Bail, Rood, and West.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Ellis, Riesinger, Christianson, Magnuson, and Sanders.***

e. Regional Program

Haugen reported that there was one project for the Regional Program, and that is the reconstruction of the Washington Street Underpass. He explained that this is a project that we requested for funding consideration last year, but it was not funded in the S.T.I.P.

Kuharenko commented that the cost estimate should actually be \$17.6, which is what they had in the scoping report.

Haugen referred to slides illustrating the conceptual designs from the corridor study that was done for this.

Grasser commented that if he remembers correctly, on some of this discussion some of the challenges on the cost estimate had to do with what we may have to do keep the railroad functioning during the course of this project. He said that they are running into this more on these regional projects, and we almost need to have a scoping report almost before we can do the estimate to put it on the list. He asked if there is any opportunity for state monies to the MPO, or not through the MPO to do that type of an analysis so that maybe next year or the year after we can update this number because right now this number has a high degree of variability because he isn't sure exactly what was assumed as far as the construction techniques and things that we need to deal with. He added that a shoo-fly can be a million dollar write-in just by itself.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen responded that there is an estimate included for the shoo-fly. He explained that the shoo-fly is, for railroad operations they prefer it on the south side, but for all commercial vehicles there probably isn't the availability to allow them to continue to use the roadway while the shoo-fly is in place, so the preference in terms of traffic operations would be to have it on the north side. He added that there would also be the issue of possible property purchases on the south side of the Xcel facility, while on the north side there aren't any structures impacted. Kuharenko said that he thinks there are actually four buildings impacted on the north side.

Haugen stated that this was done not as a PEL study, so he isn't sure if going the PEL route would allow planning dollars to go into that issue a little more or not, but otherwise a line would most likely be drawn by our federal partners. Johnson agreed that you would probably be crossing a slippery slope with something like that, and he doesn't know if there is any solution to what Mr. Grasser is getting at, but they just did have a railroad grade separation in Devils Lake on North Dakota Highway 20, that was just bid in October and it included similar conditions in that a shoo-fly was constructed and then the structure will be constructed and the shoo-fly removed, and the engineers estimate was around \$15 million.

Grasser commented that another alternative would be to work through these issues during the project development, which is okay, but he is wondering if they should engage the project development a bit earlier than we might otherwise, and catch it that way.

Haugen stated that North Dakota always asked for one year beyond the actual T.I.P. cycle, so this will be a 2022 submittal, and that will be upgrading traffic signals in the City. He said that this will be coordinated with the Urban City request as well. Kuharenko commented that the cost estimate is \$6.2 million, not \$1.8 as shown.

***MOVED BY LANG, SECONDED BY ROOD, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE REGIONAL PROGRAM REQUESTS FOR FY2018-2021 T.I.P., AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH OUR LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND IN THE PRIORITY IDENTIFIED.***

Lang asked if there was a north/south lineage determination made as far as how much of Washington is actually going to be reconstructed with the underpass structure. Haugen responded that in the corridor study there is a delineation. Kuharenko commented that it stops short of DeMers. Lang said that he thought the study had the structure and DeMers as one phase together. Haugen stated that it shows this as an alternative to consider.

***Voting Aye: Lang, Erickson, Konickson, Johnson, Kuharenko, Bail, Rood, and West.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Ellis, Riesinger, Christianson, Magnuson, and Sanders.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO THE 2017-2018 UPWP TO CARRYOVER THE I-29 TRAFFIC OPERATIONS STUDY**

Haugen reported that the I-29 Traffic Operations Study was not identified as being carried over into 2017, so this amendment would allow us to continue uninterrupted with work on the I-29 study that we are currently working on.

***MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY ROOD, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE 2017-2018 UPWP TO CARRYOVER THE I-29 TRAFFIC OPERATIONS STUDY INTO FY2017.***

***Voting Aye: Lang, Erickson, Konickson, Johnson, Kuharenko, Bail, Rood, and West.***  
***Voting Nay: None.***  
***Abstain: None.***  
***Absent: Ellis, Riesinger, Christianson, Magnuson, and Sanders.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF RFP FOR ORIGIN/DESTINATION DATA**

Haugen reported that this item is work on our Travel Demand Forecasting. He explained that the three MPOs along with the NDDOT are, again, working together on an RFP. He said that they worked together for the socio economic data that we purchased, and we are not going to be working together for Origin/Destination data purchase as well.

Haugen explained that the federal funding would come from the consolidated planning grant that was de-obligated a couple of years ago. He said that the three MPOs asked the State if they would consider the use of those dollars to purchase this data rather than having us use our current program planning funds, and they agreed to allow this usage of those dollars.

Haugen stated that Bismarck/Mandan is the lead on the drafting of the RFP, so it is in their RFP format. He referred to the document and reported that the three MPOs and the NDDOT have reviewed it and feel it is ready to be sent out. He explained that there is a bit of a timing issue; because of the three MPOs working together and there being different approval dates, we are asking to allow that instead of having to go back to each MPO Executive Board in January that we are given authorization to go ahead and executive purchase of the contract once a vendor is selected rather than having to go individually to our Boards to do this.

Haugen commented that by doing this jointly we are estimating a savings of at least 30% in total cost to the ND MPOs, and rather than doing a bridge intercept survey we will be getting GPS tracked data of origin destinations. He added that our metropolitan area will also be getting some from our periphery area for sort of a general direction of external trips as well.

Grasser asked if as part of this data we will get a sense of how many people are commuting back and forth to work from outside the area. Haugen responded that we would, however we won't get a sense of where they are actually from, but we will get a sense of how many are coming into the area.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Grasser asked if this would be one day of data. Haugen responded that it will be one month of data, October 2015 data. West asked if they would be accounting for the sugar beet truck traffic during that month. Haugen responded that there would be some accounting for that traffic. He added that, if you will recall, our Travel Demand Model is going to be upgraded to have a freight component in it. He said that MAP-21 created a freight program but didn't fund it, FAST continued the program and funded it and then placed some planning requirements on us to beef up our freight plan, so this is one of the ways we are going to be doing that, adding freight to our travel demand model. West asked, though, if it will subtract that traffic because if you do your counts in October you are going to get an unusually high freight number, and that wouldn't be fair to the rest of the year. Haugen responded that the October tube count is factored for the month it collected in already from a state-wide perspective, so it is factored downward, probably, because of how it compares to, say March, so that is all factored in when that count comes from the NDDOT; seasonal adjustment factors, monthly factors, etc. will all be accounted for.

***MOVED BY ROOD, SECONDED BY WEST, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE RFP FOR ORIGIN/DESTINATION DATA, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Lang, Erickson, Konickson, Johnson, Kuharenko, Bail, Rood, and West.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Ellis, Riesinger, Christianson, Magnuson, and Sanders.***

**MATTER OF MINNESOTA NHS CONNECTORS**

Haugen reported that we discussed the Minnesota NHS Intermodal Connectors at our last meeting and MnDOT asked us to give them something by the end of December.

Haugen referred to a map, and explained that, because of the beet facility here; and the tonnage that it processes, and both the truck and rail movement coming out of it, the existing NHS routes are shown in black on the map, and the proposed connectors are shown in red. He pointed out U.S. Business #2 and 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.E. are being proposed be added.

Haugen stated that, as noted in the staff report, he did have a question for the DOT concerning the truck/rail that was assigned to 4<sup>th</sup>, and what exactly that will that mean; will we need to have a ?? connection to it, or was it just a truck/rail facility with the agricultural product. He said that MnDOT has not replied with an answer to that question, so any motion made today will be cognizant of MnDOT responding to that question.

Haugen referred to a map, and went over the current and proposed NHS connectors.

***MOVED BY BAIL, SECONDED BY KONICKSON, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE PROPOSED MINNESOTA NHS INTERMODAL CONNECTORS, AS SUBMITTED.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

***Voting Aye: Lang, Erickson, Konickson, Johnson, Kuharenko, Bail, Rood, and West.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Ellis, Riesinger, Christianson, Magnuson, and Sanders.***

**MATTER OF TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN UPDATE**

Kouba reported that they are coming into the home stretch. She said that they finished all of the preliminary work and got a lot of ideas and pertinent information and are now bringing forward some of their recommendations.

Kouba commented that one thing they did was to add a few performance measures due to MAP-21 and FAST requirements.

Kouba stated that they looked at different plans that are out there and gathered data from the public, from the transit agencies, and from their Study Review Committee. She added that they then asked the Study Review Committee to prioritize some of the issues discussed, and determined that the main issue was system effectiveness and performance.

Kouba referred to the packet and went over some of the key issues briefly.

Kouba reported that they also come up with some proposed changes to give the system the ability to maintain the main service area. She added that the base routes are fiscally constrained to the current budget with the route timings remaining basically the same. She went over the proposed changes and respective cost estimates briefly.

Rood commented that the BRT (Bus Rapid Transit) System includes a lot of roadway work, in excess of \$100 million. Kouba agreed, adding that the cost that they have proposed in the study was just for the roadway work at a cost of over \$40 million, so it doesn't include the extra buses or the frequency of service, operations, maintenance, stations, collections, etc.

Kouba reported that because of the cost of the BRT System; with Route 4, using the streets that are already in place, to increase the frequency we would only have to purchase three more buses, and operate three more routes, and the cost would be much less so that would probably be one of our recommendations; as in incremental step, to improve our current transit service to the point where you have a lot of ridership that needs only a very few stops in certain areas.

Rood asked when the draft is expected to be completed. Kouba responded that the draft probably won't be available until the March 10<sup>th</sup> timeframe.

Grasser asked if the BRT between downtown and the Student Union, or the Alerus. Erickson responded that it is between downtown and the Alerus Center. Rood explained that the idea that came up a few years back was between downtown and the Alerus, and to maybe aim for UND as a Phase 1 and then try to expand it, but there are things that we can do from now until then to improve the frequency as Teri said, but the grand vision that came up from a few individuals was things like designated roadways, green lights all the way for the buses, a quick few minute trip

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

from here to there, and promote it as a tourism and economic development tool, and it is a very intricate idea. Kouba added that it also includes the development of the warehouse area as well.

Grasser said that he is just wondering if there is a way of getting close to that; and maybe that should be an option on the City Council side, do you want to buy an additional bus, you can just simply run, say Phase 1 from downtown to the Memorial Union or such, and just run that. He added that there is at least one person that is toting the idea pretty hard, and he thinks that some of it may end up in our Long Range Transportation Plan outlook too, but he is wondering if there is a way to try to replicate some of that service, and again you can make it an option for the city to run that extra bus a day and a night shift. In any event he is just trying to figure out how to deal with this issue. Rood commented that they have never received the “go ahead and run a pilot, here’s your funding” because they don’t have access to the federal funding to run a pilot or add a route because that would involve taking away another route, and would involve the public input process, and justification; but she thinks the expectation is that if we put a big plan together we will get 80% of this federally funded, but the programs that most communities are looking to for BRT, they are proving that they’ve got a 5 million ridership per year, and we are nowhere near that.

Grasser commented that there are the same exact issues in engineering on a number of projects; there’s that disconnect, and a lot of times it is not even an official action, but there seems to be an expectation that builds and a disappointment when something doesn’t happen, so he is just wondering if there is a way to try to deal with that. Kouba stated that with Route 4, if you put an extra bus onto it you would get 30 minute headways, and if you put three extra buses on it you would get 15 minute headways; so it gets you that same frequency as that BRT is talking about. Rood added that that is as good as it gets in this area, is 15 minute headways. Kouba said that in reality a 30 minute headway is the golden standard around here. Grasser asked if on Route 4 you took away some of the zig-zagging you could probably cut another five minutes off the route, but he doesn’t know if you could pick it up on some other route, probably not, but that would come closer and then you could actually measure how long it is and with it being straighter, how much time could you gain.

Haugen referred to a slide that explains what a BRT System is, and pointed out that ported that this is the most likely federal program that would fund it, 5309 small starts. He explained that that if you go back to what they fund, you need to have a system that operates in these five ways, so over 50% of your route needs to be a dedicated bus route, the route must have defined stations, the route must provide faster passenger travel times, the route must provide short headway service, and the provider must apply a separate and consistent brand identity to stations and vehicles.

Haugen commented that what we will currently add with UND, and this cost neutral, is a 60-minute headway service; cost plus we are asking for a quarter million dollars for peak period times gets 30-minute headways for UND from downtown. Rood added that she doesn’t see us implementing the cost neutral, which would reduce service to UND, she thinks we will commit to raising the funds or budgeting somehow to implement the cost plus, otherwise we will continue as is, or maybe make partial changes.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Grasser asked if, through this process is there a way that get some of this information into, because he thinks if we try avoid the issue of the BRT it will keep getting pushed. Rood added that engineering keeps being asked why they aren't incorporating some BRT elements into road projects. Grasser agreed, and said that he is just suggesting we should think about how we can somehow address that because he thinks it will consistently keep coming back up. Kouba responded that we need to improve the current system before we can really get into the BRT, so that would be the final statement in the report.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

a. 2016 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen stated that the updated monthly progress table was included for your information.

Grasser commented that he has people asking him about the Long Range Transportation Plan, and we deal with components like land use, which has been going on for a year; and he is wondering if it would be worthwhile to put together almost like a second section that deals with the entire Long Range Transportation Plan, and its different components; those that are going on, and those that will be going on, the timelines for each cell, so that people can be informed because there is a big disconnect between, when we get to the end, between maybe a land use plan that happened maybe three years prior to that, so at least people can kind of see how it comes together, it might be helpful.

b. AMPO Newsletter

Haugen reported that on Friday, AMPO sent out an e-mail saying what they think is going to happen with the performance management systems yet to be promulgated. He said that they were expecting OMB to publish something today on bridge and pavement; and something by the end of the month on the performance measures on the NHS and Interstate system

**ADJOURNMENT**

***THE DECEMBER 14<sup>TH</sup>, 2016, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE ADJOURNED AT 3:24 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:39 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Stephanie Erickson, Grand Forks Planning; Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Bismarck (via conference call); Paul Konickson, MnDOT-District 2; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Dustin Lang, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Ali Rood, Grand Forks Cities Area Transit; Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineer; and Brad Bail, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer.

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

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

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 9<sup>TH</sup>, 2016, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY ROOD, SECONDED BY LANG, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 9<sup>TH</sup>, 2016, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS**

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that there was a meeting held last week on, again, trying to finalize the language of the Decorative Lighting Plan. He said that his understanding is that the initial draft presented allowed for some temporary events to be signed off on by the Mayors from both cities,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

but the Historic Preservation Committee did not approve of that language, so the second draft included their approval as well.

Haugen asked if anyone present had attended the meeting and could give an update on what may have transpired at the end of it. Konickson stated that he believes that both cities are going to make recommendations, via e-mail, to committee members when they want to make changes to the lighting of the bridge, and then there will be a certain time-frame for which responses can be made before the changes are implemented, so there will be some more changes made to the language, and an updated draft will be sent out shortly.

Grasser commented that he likes the concept of “unless you hear otherwise, it’s good to go” otherwise you will be dealing with that trap of not being able to get responses in time, or at all, so he likes that process. Konickson said that he agrees, adding that this is really a local bridge, and the cities will know the local issues, so unless someone has a real issue with a proposed lighting change, it should make it easy to implement any changes either City would like to see done in a timely manner.

Information only.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that he received an e-mail late Friday regarding the project bidding process. He asked that Mr. Konickson give an update on this.

Konickson commented that he believes they received five bids; with Zenith Tech, out of Waukesha, Wisconsin being the low bidder. He stated, however, that nothing has been approved yet, but their bid was somewhere around \$15,600,000 while the others were between \$16,500,000 and \$17,000,000, with one even higher. He said that most of them were a little lower than what was budgeted, so they are reviewing the bids now and will hopefully complete the process in the next month or so.

Kuharenko asked what the Engineer’s estimate was for this project. Konickson responded that he hasn’t seen the final Engineer’s estimate, so he doesn’t know for sure, but he believes it was higher than the bid amounts. Haugen commented that we show the estimate at \$18,000,000 in our work program. Konickson stated that he thinks that is the programmed amount.

Haugen commented that last month we also talked about the traffic timing, was there any advancement on that. Konickson responded that he talked to their traffic engineer, and gave her the contact information for Grand Forks, but he doesn’t know if any conversations have been held on that yet, but if not please let him know and he will pass it on to their contact person. He added that they have talked about getting a consultant contract set up to help work this issue out, and he thinks they have a list that they can pick from, so they want to see this worked out.

Information only.

**MATTER OF 2018-2021 T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS**

a. FTA 5339 Capital Grant Program

Kouba reported that staff is looking for approval of the list that we have from Cities Area Transit. She explained that they are looking to; the first two priority items are replacement buses, the second two are basically maintenance to fix the HVAC and the roof on the transportation facilities.

Kouba said that the bus replacement is part of our plan, and the maintenance items are part of our TDP by association as they were going to be done as part of an expansion and remodel project, but because we do not have the funding to do that project, we are now taking it in two bite-sized pieces instead.

Kouba stated that staff recommends approval of the priority order given.

Rood commented that this was presented to the City Council, and there were no questions and they concurred with the priority listing presented.

***MOVED BY BAIL, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FTA 5339 GRANT REQUEST AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH OUR LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND IN THE PRIORITY IDENTIFIED.***

Grasser asked if he is correct that they are only going to do maintenance to the portion above the offices. Rood responded that that is correct. She explained that they sat down with Bev Collings and the EAPC, and determined that replacing the worst section, which is over the offices, in such a way that it wouldn't be a waste if two years from now we replace the entire roof; and with this dollar amount, as the fourth priority that would be a better chance of getting it funded instead of trying to get the entire project funded. She added that it was a decision that was based on design, and likelihood of getting it funded.

***Voting Aye: Lang, Erickson, Konickson, Johnson, Kuharenko, Bail, Rood, and West.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Ellis, Riesinger, Christianson, Magnuson, and Sanders.***

b. TA Program

Viafara reported that the Grand Forks Engineering Department submitted three projects for consideration; they are: 1) shared use path along 6th Avenue North from North 40<sup>th</sup> Street to the English Coulee; 2) shared use path along 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South from South Columbia Road to South 20<sup>th</sup> Street; and 3) shared use path along South Columbia Road from 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue South to 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Viafara commented that these three shared use paths are all to be included as elements of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan, and if approved will certainly provide a number of benefits to the community, in general. He stated that one of those benefits, particularly for the 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue North path, would be the ability to provide access and mobility to a number of residents located in what we call 'environmental justice' areas, and will afford them opportunities for walking and access to transit and other destination around the City.

Viafara stated that the path on South Columbia Road, again, will afford, in the long range future, land use access to those areas currently being developed; and including some destinations like the Discovery School.

Viafara said that these are the three projects. He stated that he would like to bring your attention to the path on 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, because this also affords an element of connectivity to a number of destinations that are attractors, in terms of trips, like the softball complex, Kings Walk Golf Course, Choice Fitness, and South Middle School.

Viafara stated that in terms of a positive decision; there is the fact that 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue North, for some reason due to designing issues and land use ownership; is limited in terms of basically short and generates kind of a gap in the system so that is a consideration that needs to be addressed in the future to see how we can really provide complete access rather than having a gap that is being, at the moment, suggested.

Grasser asked what gap Mr. Viafara is referring to. Viafara responded that on 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue there is, due to design consideration, the available space between the street pavement and the crossing. Erickson asked if he is talking about the segment before 42<sup>nd</sup>. Kuharenko commented that it is the section between 42<sup>nd</sup> and 44<sup>th</sup> he is talking about. He said that he can actually address this one, and explained that they are currently planning on reconstructing 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue North next summer, and will be looking at trying to widen that area up, and then they can have a shared use path going across 42<sup>nd</sup> to North 40<sup>th</sup> Street. Viafara said that that is a positive commentary on the issue and we appreciate the effort, but on behalf of the community, to try to eliminate those gaps that are there is important, and, a comment as well, is on South Columbia, that has to do with the fact that in the past when the road was scheduled for design, you did this community engagement, and most of the focus was based on the roadway, the motor vehicle access and mobility, now we have you applying for the components for the access of the bicyclists, so this is positive; however he is asking whether we may in the future discuss some impediments through the ordinances that are kind of preventing these facilities from being built at the time when the roadways are being built, so rather than doing them piecemeal we can have the elements built at once. He added that there is apparently a situation with the ordinances, there are situations involving cost, and we are aware of that but let's see how we can, as much as we can eliminate in the future that situation.

Viafara stated that staff is recommending, for consideration, and then approval to forward this to the Executive Policy Board for their approval.

Grasser said that he is still confused, and asked what the problem is with 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, where they aren't doing it properly according to the code. Viafara responded that he meant

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

South Columbia, from 40<sup>th</sup> to 47<sup>th</sup>. Grasser stated that the City Council specifically took action against that, so are you suggesting that we write a code that the City Council can't override this. Viafara responded that he was not aware of that situation. He added that this is based on the federal legislation; the idea is for the city to afford opportunities for mobility and access to all the modes of transportation, including bicycle and pedestrian. Grasser stated that they understand that, but the discussion with the City was that if we did that, put blinders on and just built what you're interpreting, we have a destination that doesn't bring anybody anyplace, and we have facilities of which substantial pieces would end up having to be torn out and replaced because the area wasn't developed in order to identify what the grades and all the terminal points are, so you'd have a substantial investment that would have to be torn out. He said that he is, maybe, taking a little bit of issue with that criticism because that was all discussed and brought to the City Council and they actually ruled on it. Viafara responded that he appreciates that, and added that he was not aware of that ruling; and we abide and respect that ruling, so at least for the record this is clear. He said, though, that what he is trying to tell you is that because we are dealing with federal funding, in the future, as much as we can, we need to coordinate the construction of all the facilities at the time that roadways are being designed and built, if it is possible, as much as we can, this is the recommendation they are suggesting. He commented that they appreciate that there are some constraints. Grasser stated that the problem with that is that it infers that they aren't doing this, and he believes that they already are, so he will just leave it at that.

Kuharenko commented that he was also under the impression that the bike and pedestrian facilities had to be considered, but not necessarily implemented during a federal aid project. Haugen said that he thinks the point that Mr. Viafara is trying to make is, you're asking for federal funds to install a facility that you just decided you needed now. Grasser responded that that is why it is ranked #3, is because it is questionable whether, but again there is a little more growth that is going on there, that was part of the question; and it also looks like there is a question about it now in the CIP whether 47<sup>th</sup> was going to be coming in, and it does look like it is, so we would at least then have a terminus that would move, those were more uncertain two or three years ago when they had those discussions then they are today, so it is a dynamic change, and they need to exercise some judgement with those things.

Viafara stated that they will take that response in good faith, and they understand; but the recommendation that they are bringing to your attention is if it is possible that whenever these facilities need to be built, counting on federal funding, to make every single effort to accommodate all the modes of transportation, if it is possible, or as much as possible. Grasser responded that this feels like it keeps getting thrown at them, and he thought it was properly addressed, and he will just leave it at that. Viafara responded that that is fine, and thanked him.

Kuharenko said that another point he would like to throw out there for 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue North is that that segment was also a segment that the City has gotten comments from the public on in the past, looking for a shared use paths. He stated that he believes, also, that during the Bike/Ped plan public input, Mr. Viafara also received some comments regarding 6<sup>th</sup>. He added that in addition to having the Lake Agassiz Elementary School, as well as the School for the Blind, those were some of the reasons why they ended up having that as a first priority. He explained that it is in an established neighborhood, so getting in there and doing a special assessment

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

project could be a little more difficult as well, so having the federal funding associated with it could prove to be very beneficial.

Kuharenko reported that with the reconstruction project planned for the summer, they would hopefully have their connection connecting to the bike lanes that are currently on 42<sup>nd</sup>, and depending on what the plan is for a reconstruction of 42<sup>nd</sup>, whatever the facilities are once that gets reconstructed.

***MOVED BY ERICKSON, SECONDED BY ROOD, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE TA GRANT REQUEST FOR THE THREE SHARED USE PATHS AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH OUR LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND IN THE PRIORITY IDENTIFIED.***

West asked if it would be beneficial to change any of the language in the report to address the City's concerns. Grasser responded that that would be his preference. He explained that when he reads about 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and again maybe he is just getting sensitive on the connotations, it is a proposed project, constructed shared use path, and it talks about it will likely, the consideration there is that there is going to be a gap; well according to the plan right now there is no gap because what this is going to do is to connect, by the time this is built, it will connect an existing bikepath at the coulee to an existing bikepath that will be terminated, essentially, at 40<sup>th</sup>, and so he thinks that explanation should be expanded because it makes it look like does the application... Haugen asked if the application provide that explanation. Kuharenko responded that he believes it does. Grasser said that it makes it look like they missed something, and he doesn't believe they did miss anything, and they have a plan that is complete, it doesn't leave gaps, those types of things. Kuharenko referred to the application and pointed out that it does state "it is anticipated that when 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue North is reconstructed near this crossing viable options will be explored for widening the existing sidewalk from 42<sup>nd</sup> Street to North 40<sup>th</sup> Street to better accommodate multiple modes and non-motorized transportation". Grasser added that there is no guarantee in life, but that is the plan right now, that there wouldn't be any gaps in the system.

Grasser commented that the reason they are doing this is to try to eliminate the railroad out of the federal process because they are so hard to deal with, if we do need to deal with them, otherwise they might not be able to get this project done within this timeline, so they are trying to deal with that piece at a local level, and the federal component with this. Haugen stated that this is a little different than what was just discussed at this meeting, so is there a reason why you weren't as definitive in the application as you were now, because as this gets looked at the Governor's Task Force will have the statement that it might be addressed in the future as some point, where you guys have a more definitive answer that. Kuharenko responded that he supposed some of that might have come from that fact that that reconstruction project will be a special assessment project and is subject to protest, so he thinks that is where some of that ended up coming from, so they are going to do their best, and it is planned, and they will be doing what they can in that area. Haugen said that he knows that on the North Dakota side they don't allow you to come and make a presentation of your proposal, while Minnesota does allow you to make oral arguments, so it might be worth the consideration of taking a look at how this is worded and try to make it

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

less iffy in that sometime in the future there will be an effort made to close the gap. Grasser asked if they can reword the application because their intention is more than to make an effort, they are going to have some sort of connection through there, and he thinks the only question in their minds is, working with the railroad, of the options is it all going to be ten feet or will they have to squeeze in a seven or eight foot section. Haugen responded that there is the opportunity to make changes as they don't have to be turned in until the end of the month. Grasser asked that the language be changed to reflect what the full intent is.

Rood asked if the motion needs to be changed to include the change in language in the application. Viafara responded that the priority remains, it is a matter of interpretation only, but overall they are pleased with the application and the benefits that the application is bringing to our attention. Lang asked if he is saying, then, that the motion has no effect on what is going to end up being changed. Erickson asked if they need to put it in the motion. Haugen responded that it is up to the Technical Advisory Committee but he thinks that it would become rather a cumbersome motion as the project isn't changing, just the wording in the application.

***Voting Aye: Lang, Erickson, Konickson, Johnson, Kuharenko, Bail, Rood, and West.***  
***Voting Nay: None.***  
***Abstain: None.***  
***Absent: Ellis, Riesinger, Christianson, Magnuson, and Sanders.***

Haugen reported that he will be doing the next three items together. He pointed out that included in the packet is the stuff we always do when we talk about our T.I.P., and that is the areas that we cover, what projects should be in there, the process; and we still have FAST being implemented as well as MAP-21 being implemented, so what we do today is subject to any changes made to them. He said that we do know that this T.I.P. is not subject to full compliance with FAST, and it might be the last one for which we enjoy that benefit.

Haugen commented that North Dakota raised its rate of growth for federal revenue to a 2.2% growth rate; and the rate of expenditure/inflation is still at 4%. He explained that what this meant for the Grand Forks Urban Program portion is, you can see that over three years there is about \$1,000,000 more available funding. He stated that, as we discussed when we solicited, projects can be squeezed in each year, or it can be used as a lump sum at the end.

Haugen stated that he just threw in that Recreational Trails is just being solicited now, and are due at the end of December, and we will look at them in January.

c. HSIP Program

Haugen reported that we received two applications: 1) one from the City which, is a two-phased project on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue; and 2) from the County on Airport Road or County 5.

Haugen explained that there was a safety audit done for the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue project and that is where the recommendations are coming from. He referred to maps of the area and pointed out what is being done in Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the project. He stated that the total cost of the project is just shy of \$7.5 million, with a 90/10 split.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen reported that Grand Forks County 5, the intersections of DeMers Avenue and 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, the County had KLJ do a safety and traffic operation study on that corridor at these intersections. He referred to a slide with a page from KLJ's report and pointed out that it identifies the new geometrics that would go out there. West commented that this report shows signals out there, and they will not be putting signals out there, just turning lanes.

Grasser asked if they can do the widening without doing any earth work and such, would you just widen out the shoulder or do you have to widen the embankment. West responded that they will have to move the ditch out a little bit, and then fill the embankment in.

Haugen stated that he did ask Mr. West, although too late on Friday, but in the local road safety program there was signage and lighting being suggested for these intersections, and he was wondering if that was included in these costs. West responded that signage would be, but lighting would not. Haugen said, then, that the total cost estimate for this project would be \$1.7 million.

Haugen commented that these are the priority order that staff is recommending be approved.

West asked if there is any way to split out urban and rural. Haugen responded that he did ask that question and the answer is no that it cannot be split, it is an HSIP Program that is statewide. He explained that there is a 50/50 share of that, with 50% of the funds on the State System and 50% are shared by the urban rural program, so our direction was that we can't split them out, we have to rank them against each other.

Grasser asked, if we have to rank them in that manner, should we be showing Phase 2 for the City side, because we would only be applying for one; so would our priority be Phase 1 City, that is what Mr. West is asking, right, how do you prioritize that then if they both go in together. West responded that that is correct, it is kind of apples versus oranges, but he isn't going to dispute that 32<sup>nd</sup> is more important than County 5. Haugen asked if they are two separate applications or are they one application with two phases to it. Grasser responded that they are two applications. Haugen said, then, that there are three projects. Grasser responded that they aren't asking for Phase 2 at this point, so really there would only be one from the City, but it would be the \$4.42 million and not dealing with the \$2.9 as it is really a future project, they aren't asking for \$7 million, they are asking for \$5 million. Haugen stated that they would then eventually take out Phase 2 as being listed as a candidate project, so why is Phase 2 being submitted into the process this year. Grasser responded that that is kind of the question, because they aren't looking for it in the same year, does it become priority three, for lack of anything better. Haugen responded that this is an unusual project since the State approached us, essentially, and said they wanted to invest heavily on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue to address safety problems, and they put together the safety report, and said that these are the things we think should be done, so it is already outside of the box as to how it fits the normal HSIP Program, and they're looking for HSIP projects and they also indicated that they were will to invest a large amount on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Grasser commented that these aren't set up in years like the Urban Program is, because primarily the Council's action was to actually ask to prioritize, or somehow advance the first phase of 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, and he doesn't know if that is possible or if it changes the application here at all, but if you are able to get Phase 1 in say 2018, and the County is in 2019, they wouldn't actually be competing with each other in the same manner; these are all questions they have. Haugen responded that they usually don't have a year attached to them, they try to say that it is just for the last year of the T.I.P. and S.T.I.P, but in reality they try to plug it into whatever year they can, especially as both of these are large amounts for the HSIP Program.

Grasser stated that, for whatever it is worth, they did ask to expedite Phase 1 as quickly as we can, as far as the funding piece of it, just because of the accidents we are experiencing.

West asked, at the State level does each project compete against every other project in the State, and the State would prioritize them then. Haugen responded that the State will review all of them, yes, but they will consider the priority order we give them as well.

Haugen commented that his understanding, having worked with the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue audit, it was his thought that it was two 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue phases in one big project instead of pieces of it, they were interested in funding it knowing it would be a large project as the safety audit report came back from them as a large project, they didn't have any cost estimates in the report. Lang agreed, stating that we did the work in 2013 and the goal was to have a major traffic operations project in the early 2020s. Grasser stated that that was and is generally correct, he thinks that the idea when we did the maintenance was that we were going to try to buy five or six years because we are deficient in geometry, and we are also deficient in structure on the pavement, as far as maintaining it, but then what happened with the updated Long Range Transportation Plan was emphasis on maintenance only as opposed to capacity, we are still missing some capacity components, and the HSIP, as he understands it, they kind of put it together as really only addressing the safety component, it's not adding some of the turn lanes and other geometric improvements that really otherwise need to happen, and the catch-22 on all this is that these are needed right away, but from a capacity, he thinks in the Long Range Plan, by 2025 we are talking poor levels of service and things on 32<sup>nd</sup> so we really should probably have, in his opinion, we should have them looking at that reconstruction within that time period, but as we discussed last year trying to push it up to 2021 we couldn't find the projects to take out of the plan to move it up that far so it isn't kind of sitting out there in 2030 or something like that and complicating it further, there probably needs to be a maintenance project put in there somewhere in-between, but the bottom line the HSIP we don't think is giving us the geometric improvements that we need to really reach that original intention.

Kuharenko reported that Phase 1 addresses, he believes 31<sup>st</sup>, 34<sup>th</sup>, and Columbia; mainly realigns the left turns for east bound/west bound traffic; and also a double left on Columbia. He said that all three of those intersections are on the high crash list, which is kind of why we are looking at the large dollar amount associated with it, we kind of wanted to make that our first priority, and they weren't exactly sure because of that large dollar amount what the best way to split this out would be, so having it in two different phases allows the DOT and Selection Committee an opportunity to decide that while they don't have enough money for both of them combined, we can do this one, or it can be stripped down further if needed.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen commented that, as we discussed, and as you heard, you aren't addressing, probably the capacity that they would desire, the County might be termed a flip-flop; the County, he isn't sure the report identified the crash issue, but it is addressing some potential future geometry, some existing and future geometry rates, that will obviously have an impact. He added that they aren't high crash locations, they aren't critical crash rate intersections. He said that the Local Road Safety Program identified some lower cost, roughly \$100,000, improvements at both of these.

West said that you mentioned signage at those locations, and they have done just about everything they can do for signage, other than maybe putting a larger stop sign as a last resort. Haugen commented that they talked about illuminating the intersections, and some advance stop methods. West said that there are rumble strips, there is advance stop, there are strips on the posts, the only thing you can do is illuminate the stop sign and illuminate the intersection. Grasser asked if they were still getting people blowing through the intersections. West responded that they aren't. He added that those projects, by capacity today, turn lanes are warranted, but they do not have a crash problem there today mainly because the movements are parallel. He said, though, that the traffic volumes are predicted to more than double in this area, so they are trying to be proactive and separate out those movements. He added that they do have some capacity issues, some projected capacity issues, but today it is okay.

West reported that from a County standpoint, if this was ranked #3 it wouldn't be all bad. He said that you would probably think that 32<sup>nd</sup> would be a better place to spend \$3 million dollars versus the County's \$1.7 million because today it is functioning okay versus your intersections already have a high rated high crash issue. Grasser responded that this is the problem they are dealing with, is that they do show up on the high crash report year after year.

***MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY WEST, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE HSIP PROGRAM REQUEST AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH OUR LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND IN THE PRIORITY IDENTIFIED.***

***Voting Aye: Lang, Erickson, Konickson, Johnson, Kuharenko, Bail, Rood, and West.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Ellis, Riesinger, Christianson, Magnuson, and Sanders.***

d. Urban Program

Haugen said that this is also an opportune time, if there are any changes for whatever reason to current programmed projects, to identify those. He added that none were submitted so we are just dealing with the new years of the T.I.P. for the Urban Program, and that is North Columbia Road, essentially between the bridge and 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, a complete reconstruction and realignment work. Kuharenko commented that it actually goes a little bit north of University Avenue. He referred to a map and pointed out that you have the overpass, then you have the intersection of 2<sup>nd</sup> and the intersection of University, so it goes almost to the intersection of 4<sup>th</sup>.

Haugen stated that the estimated cost of the project is \$6.24 million; \$5 million on federal funds.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen reported that this is on the NHS System, it is obviously a state of good repair project. He stated that it was not identified in our Long Range Transportation Plan as a significant project; Columbia Road Overpass is a significant project, so the City was asked if this big increase in what this project is going to do, is it going to harm or delay that project, and their answer was that it should not harm it.

Haugen referred to a graphic, and commented that he recalls there was a fencing proposal in this area and he is wondering if that will be looked at with the project development. Kuharenko responded that he wasn't aware of a fencing proposal. Haugen said that the University and the City at one time looked at a proposal to put up fencing to help stop ped traffic in this area. Kuharenko said, again, that he wasn't aware of that. Grasser asked if that needs to be listed somehow in the application, or is that just following the bike/ped facility component. Haugen responded that probably should be looked at with the project development portion.

***MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY WEST, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE URBAN PROGRAM REQUEST AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH OUR LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND IN THE PRIORITY IDENTIFIED.***

***Voting Aye: Lang, Erickson, Konickson, Johnson, Kuharenko, Bail, Rood, and West.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Ellis, Riesinger, Christianson, Magnuson, and Sanders.***

e. Regional Program

Haugen reported that there was one project for the Regional Program, and that is the reconstruction of the Washington Street Underpass. He explained that this is a project that we requested for funding consideration last year, but it was not funded in the S.T.I.P.

Kuharenko commented that the cost estimate should actually be \$17.6, which is what they had in the scoping report.

Haugen referred to slides illustrating the conceptual designs from the corridor study that was done for this.

Grasser commented that if he remembers correctly, on some of this discussion some of the challenges on the cost estimate had to do with what we may have to do keep the railroad functioning during the course of this project. He said that they are running into this more on these regional projects, and we almost need to have a scoping report almost before we can do the estimate to put it on the list. He asked if there is any opportunity for state monies to the MPO, or not through the MPO to do that type of an analysis so that maybe next year or the year after we can update this number because right now this number has a high degree of variability because he isn't sure exactly what was assumed as far as the construction techniques and things that we need to deal with. He added that a shoo-fly can be a million dollar write-in just by itself.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen responded that there is an estimate included for the shoo-fly. He explained that the shoo-fly is, for railroad operations they prefer it on the south side, but for all commercial vehicles there probably isn't the availability to allow them to continue to use the roadway while the shoo-fly is in place, so the preference in terms of traffic operations would be to have it on the north side. He added that there would also be the issue of possible property purchases on the south side of the Xcel facility, while on the north side there aren't any structures impacted. Kuharenko said that he thinks there are actually four buildings impacted on the north side.

Haugen stated that this was done not as a PEL study, so he isn't sure if going the PEL route would allow planning dollars to go into that issue a little more or not, but otherwise a line would most likely be drawn by our federal partners. Johnson agreed that you would probably be crossing a slippery slope with something like that, and he doesn't know if there is any solution to what Mr. Grasser is getting at, but they just did have a railroad grade separation in Devils Lake on North Dakota Highway 20, that was just bid in October and it included similar conditions in that a shoo-fly was constructed and then the structure will be constructed and the shoo-fly removed, and the engineers estimate was around \$15 million.

Grasser commented that another alternative would be to work through these issues during the project development, which is okay, but he is wondering if they should engage the project development a bit earlier than we might otherwise, and catch it that way.

Haugen stated that North Dakota always asked for one year beyond the actual T.I.P. cycle, so this will be a 2022 submittal, and that will be upgrading traffic signals in the City. He said that this will be coordinated with the Urban City request as well. Kuharenko commented that the cost estimate is \$6.2 million, not \$1.8 as shown.

***MOVED BY LANG, SECONDED BY ROOD, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE REGIONAL PROGRAM REQUESTS FOR FY2018-2021 T.I.P., AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH OUR LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND IN THE PRIORITY IDENTIFIED.***

Lang asked if there was a north/south lineage determination made as far as how much of Washington is actually going to be reconstructed with the underpass structure. Haugen responded that in the corridor study there is a delineation. Kuharenko commented that it stops short of DeMers. Lang said that he thought the study had the structure and DeMers as one phase together. Haugen stated that it shows this as an alternative to consider.

***Voting Aye: Lang, Erickson, Konickson, Johnson, Kuharenko, Bail, Rood, and West.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Ellis, Riesinger, Christianson, Magnuson, and Sanders.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO THE 2017-2018 UPWP TO CARRYOVER THE I-29 TRAFFIC OPERATIONS STUDY**

Haugen reported that the I-29 Traffic Operations Study was not identified as being carried over into 2017, so this amendment would allow us to continue uninterrupted with work on the I-29 study that we are currently working on.

***MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY ROOD, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE 2017-2018 UPWP TO CARRYOVER THE I-29 TRAFFIC OPERATIONS STUDY INTO FY2017.***

***Voting Aye: Lang, Erickson, Konickson, Johnson, Kuharenko, Bail, Rood, and West.***  
***Voting Nay: None.***  
***Abstain: None.***  
***Absent: Ellis, Riesinger, Christianson, Magnuson, and Sanders.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF RFP FOR ORIGIN/DESTINATION DATA**

Haugen reported that this item is work on our Travel Demand Forecasting. He explained that the three MPOs along with the NDDOT are, again, working together on an RFP. He said that they worked together for the socio economic data that we purchased, and we are not going to be working together for Origin/Destination data purchase as well.

Haugen explained that the federal funding would come from the consolidated planning grant that was de-obligated a couple of years ago. He said that the three MPOs asked the State if they would consider the use of those dollars to purchase this data rather than having us use our current program planning funds, and they agreed to allow this usage of those dollars.

Haugen stated that Bismarck/Mandan is the lead on the drafting of the RFP, so it is in their RFP format. He referred to the document and reported that the three MPOs and the NDDOT have reviewed it and feel it is ready to be sent out. He explained that there is a bit of a timing issue; because of the three MPOs working together and there being different approval dates, we are asking to allow that instead of having to go back to each MPO Executive Board in January that we are given authorization to go ahead and executive purchase of the contract once a vendor is selected rather than having to go individually to our Boards to do this.

Haugen commented that by doing this jointly we are estimating a savings of at least 30% in total cost to the ND MPOs, and rather than doing a bridge intercept survey we will be getting GPS tracked data of origin destinations. He added that our metropolitan area will also be getting some from our periphery area for sort of a general direction of external trips as well.

Grasser asked if as part of this data we will get a sense of how many people are commuting back and forth to work from outside the area. Haugen responded that we would, however we won't get a sense of where they are actually from, but we will get a sense of how many are coming into the area.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Grasser asked if this would be one day of data. Haugen responded that it will be one month of data, October 2015 data. West asked if they would be accounting for the sugar beet truck traffic during that month. Haugen responded that there would be some accounting for that traffic. He added that, if you will recall, our Travel Demand Model is going to be upgraded to have a freight component in it. He said that MAP-21 created a freight program but didn't fund it, FAST continued the program and funded it and then placed some planning requirements on us to beef up our freight plan, so this is one of the ways we are going to be doing that, adding freight to our travel demand model. West asked, though, if it will subtract that traffic because if you do your counts in October you are going to get an unusually high freight number, and that wouldn't be fair to the rest of the year. Haugen responded that the October tube count is factored for the month it collected in already from a state-wide perspective, so it is factored downward, probably, because of how it compares to, say March, so that is all factored in when that count comes from the NDDOT; seasonal adjustment factors, monthly factors, etc. will all be accounted for.

***MOVED BY ROOD, SECONDED BY WEST, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE RFP FOR ORIGIN/DESTINATION DATA, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Lang, Erickson, Konickson, Johnson, Kuharenko, Bail, Rood, and West.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Ellis, Riesinger, Christianson, Magnuson, and Sanders.***

**MATTER OF MINNESOTA NHS CONNECTORS**

Haugen reported that we discussed the Minnesota NHS Intermodal Connectors at our last meeting and MnDOT asked us to give them something by the end of December.

Haugen referred to a map, and explained that, because of the beet facility here; and the tonnage that it processes, and both the truck and rail movement coming out of it, the existing NHS routes are shown in black on the map, and the proposed connectors are shown in red. He pointed out U.S. Business #2 and 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.E. are being proposed be added.

Haugen stated that, as noted in the staff report, he did have a question for the DOT concerning the truck/rail that was assigned to 4<sup>th</sup>, and what exactly that will that mean; will we need to have a ?? connection to it, or was it just a truck/rail facility with the agricultural product. He said that MnDOT has not replied with an answer to that question, so any motion made today will be cognizant of MnDOT responding to that question.

Haugen referred to a map, and went over the current and proposed NHS connectors.

***MOVED BY BAIL, SECONDED BY KONICKSON, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE PROPOSED MINNESOTA NHS INTERMODAL CONNECTORS, AS SUBMITTED.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

***Voting Aye: Lang, Erickson, Konickson, Johnson, Kuharenko, Bail, Rood, and West.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Ellis, Riesinger, Christianson, Magnuson, and Sanders.***

**MATTER OF TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN UPDATE**

Kouba reported that they are coming into the home stretch. She said that they finished all of the preliminary work and got a lot of ideas and pertinent information and are now bringing forward some of their recommendations.

Kouba commented that one thing they did was to add a few performance measures due to MAP-21 and FAST requirements.

Kouba stated that they looked at different plans that are out there and gathered data from the public, from the transit agencies, and from their Study Review Committee. She added that they then asked the Study Review Committee to prioritize some of the issues discussed, and determined that the main issue was system effectiveness and performance.

Kouba referred to the packet and went over some of the key issues briefly.

Kouba reported that they also come up with some proposed changes to give the system the ability to maintain the main service area. She added that the base routes are fiscally constrained to the current budget with the route timings remaining basically the same. She went over the proposed changes and respective cost estimates briefly.

Rood commented that the BRT (Bus Rapid Transit) System includes a lot of roadway work, in excess of \$100 million. Kouba agreed, adding that the cost that they have proposed in the study was just for the roadway work at a cost of over \$40 million, so it doesn't include the extra buses or the frequency of service, operations, maintenance, stations, collections, etc.

Kouba reported that because of the cost of the BRT System; with Route 4, using the streets that are already in place, to increase the frequency we would only have to purchase three more buses, and operate three more routes, and the cost would be much less so that would probably be one of our recommendations; as in incremental step, to improve our current transit service to the point where you have a lot of ridership that needs only a very few stops in certain areas.

Rood asked when the draft is expected to be completed. Kouba responded that the draft probably won't be available until the March 10<sup>th</sup> timeframe.

Grasser asked if the BRT between downtown and the Student Union, or the Alerus. Erickson responded that it is between downtown and the Alerus Center. Rood explained that the idea that came up a few years back was between downtown and the Alerus, and to maybe aim for UND as a Phase 1 and then try to expand it, but there are things that we can do from now until then to improve the frequency as Teri said, but the grand vision that came up from a few individuals was things like designated roadways, green lights all the way for the buses, a quick few minute trip

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

from here to there, and promote it as a tourism and economic development tool, and it is a very intricate idea. Kouba added that it also includes the development of the warehouse area as well.

Grasser said that he is just wondering if there is a way of getting close to that; and maybe that should be an option on the City Council side, do you want to buy an additional bus, you can just simply run, say Phase 1 from downtown to the Memorial Union or such, and just run that. He added that there is at least one person that is toting the idea pretty hard, and he thinks that some of it may end up in our Long Range Transportation Plan outlook too, but he is wondering if there is a way to try to replicate some of that service, and again you can make it an option for the city to run that extra bus a day and a night shift. In any event he is just trying to figure out how to deal with this issue. Rood commented that they have never received the “go ahead and run a pilot, here’s your funding” because they don’t have access to the federal funding to run a pilot or add a route because that would involve taking away another route, and would involve the public input process, and justification; but she thinks the expectation is that if we put a big plan together we will get 80% of this federally funded, but the programs that most communities are looking to for BRT, they are proving that they’ve got a 5 million ridership per year, and we are nowhere near that.

Grasser commented that there are the same exact issues in engineering on a number of projects; there’s that disconnect, and a lot of times it is not even an official action, but there seems to be an expectation that builds and a disappointment when something doesn’t happen, so he is just wondering if there is a way to try to deal with that. Kouba stated that with Route 4, if you put an extra bus onto it you would get 30 minute headways, and if you put three extra buses on it you would get 15 minute headways; so it gets you that same frequency as that BRT is talking about. Rood added that that is as good as it gets in this area, is 15 minute headways. Kouba said that in reality a 30 minute headway is the golden standard around here. Grasser asked if on Route 4 you took away some of the zig-zagging you could probably cut another five minutes off the route, but he doesn’t know if you could pick it up on some other route, probably not, but that would come closer and then you could actually measure how long it is and with it being straighter, how much time could you gain.

Haugen referred to a slide that explains what a BRT System is, and pointed out that ported that this is the most likely federal program that would fund it, 5309 small starts. He explained that that if you go back to what they fund, you need to have a system that operates in these five ways, so over 50% of your route needs to be a dedicated bus route, the route must have defined stations, the route must provide faster passenger travel times, the route must provide short headway service, and the provider must apply a separate and consistent brand identity to stations and vehicles.

Haugen commented that what we will currently add with UND, and this cost neutral, is a 60-minute headway service; cost plus we are asking for a quarter million dollars for peak period times gets 30-minute headways for UND from downtown. Rood added that she doesn’t see us implementing the cost neutral, which would reduce service to UND, she thinks we will commit to raising the funds or budgeting somehow to implement the cost plus, otherwise we will continue as is, or maybe make partial changes.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Grasser asked if, through this process is there a way that get some of this information into, because he thinks if we try avoid the issue of the BRT it will keep getting pushed. Rood added that engineering keeps being asked why they aren't incorporating some BRT elements into road projects. Grasser agreed, and said that he is just suggesting we should think about how we can somehow address that because he thinks it will consistently keep coming back up. Kouba responded that we need to improve the current system before we can really get into the BRT, so that would be the final statement in the report.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

a. 2016 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen stated that the updated monthly progress table was included for your information.

Grasser commented that he has people asking him about the Long Range Transportation Plan, and we deal with components like land use, which has been going on for a year; and he is wondering if it would be worthwhile to put together almost like a second section that deals with the entire Long Range Transportation Plan, and its different components; those that are going on, and those that will be going on, the timelines for each cell, so that people can be informed because there is a big disconnect between, when we get to the end, between maybe a land use plan that happened maybe three years prior to that, so at least people can kind of see how it comes together, it might be helpful.

b. AMPO Newsletter

Haugen reported that on Friday, AMPO sent out an e-mail saying what they think is going to happen with the performance management systems yet to be promulgated. He said that they were expecting OMB to publish something today on bridge and pavement; and something by the end of the month on the performance measures on the NHS and Interstate system

**ADJOURNMENT**

***THE DECEMBER 14<sup>TH</sup>, 2016, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE ADJOURNED AT 3:24 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager