

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 8th, 2021**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the September 8th, 2021, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:33 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Wayne Zacher, NDDOT-Local Government; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; and David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering. The following members were present via Zoom: Ryan Brooks, Grand Forks Planning; Patrick Hopkins, MnDOT-District 2; Jason Peterson, NDDOT-Grand Forks; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; and Ryan Riesinger, Airport Authority.

Absent: Brad Bail, Steve Emery, Stephanie Halford, Jesse Kadrmas, Rich Sanders, Michael Johnson, Nick West, Lane Magnuson, Lars Christianson, and Jon Mason.

Guest(s) present: Anna Pierce, MnDOT-Central Office; Tim Burkhardt, Alliant Engineering; and Mike Kondziolka, Alliant Engineering.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 11TH MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 11TH, 2021 MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON FUTURE BRIDGE TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY

Haugen reported that included in the packet was some information, including a copy of today's presentation. He then turned the screen over to Alliant for a brief update.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 8th, 2021**

Burkhardt stated that they do not have a lot of new information, but are coming back with some recap on traffic analysis comments and on Tech Memo #3-C.

Burkhardt referred to the slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and said that, as usual, he will begin with an update on where we are at with the project schedule. He pointed out that we are getting close to the end of the year, so we have completed quite a bit. He added that the Alternatives Analysis Evaluation is what we will talk about at the next meeting, although he will give a small preview today.

Presentation continued.

Burkhardt commented that they did hold a public open house, on-line, to share the study background and goals, and to share the Draft Purpose and Need and No Build Traffic and Safety information to get input on them.

Burkhardt stated that what they did to get people to participate on-line was to publish a public notice five days prior to the on-line open house, send out e-mails, and place the notice on Facebook and both Cities social media. He added that they also asked the Ad Hoc members to share it with their respective organizations and groups.

Burkhardt said that they hosted the open house on the website using the Social Pinpoint platform and then also did a live presentation on-line as well, so late July early August.

Burkhardt stated that in terms of participation; online not a lot of participation, which was disappointing, but the web traffic has been pretty good, and the survey responses and map comments were good as well, but we would all like to see higher numbers. He added that they do have a reasonable expectation that the next on-line event where they will be showing the alternatives will see more participation, specifically from people that do not see what they like.

Burkhardt said that the comments; they did some analysis, in terms of what they heard, even without much participation on the live events, the questions about methodology; why we are doing what we are doing, which helped explain why we aren't studying Merrifield at this time and then questions about 32nd Avenue in particular, and he would say questions meaning concerns, people concerned about increased traffic on 32nd and what that would mean for their property and or for the schools.

Burkhardt stated that if we look to the on-line open house, we had 253 responses to the question about priority. He referred to the graph showing the respondent priorities and pointed out that the issues shown at the bottom of the graph really are needs. He said that before we talk about the comments, let us focus on the graph; another question was what are your priorities, and six are shown at the bottom of the graph so you can see sort of a smattering along all those different issues such as traffic, safety, bikes and pedestrians, school safety, and environmental impacts. He added that a lot of people wrote in that their priorities were something other than what is listed, including impacts on neighborhood character/quality of life, impact on property values,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 8th, 2021**

added option for flooding, and convenience/access across the river. He stated that there were not really any surprises.

Burkhardt said that the other place that got a lot of comments was specifically on the Purpose and Need. He stated that they asked people if they agree with the purpose and need, and they got 264 responses and 181 provided comments. He referred to the graph for Purpose and Need and pointed out that the biggest chunk was people who said they strongly agree, and that was positive, but we do have some that strongly disagree, which is a lot less but still significant. He added that the comments made by those that strongly agree were that it was an added convenience, it reduced traffic and congestion, especially on other bridges due to redistribution of traffic, and both cities are growing south so it would add an incentive for East Grand Forks to grow more. He said, however, that we also have some that strongly disagree; those comments were that this is a benefit for East Grand Forks only, that it creates negative impacts to neighborhoods around 32nd, they would prefer a bridge further south like Merrifield, and there would be increased traffic around schools.

Burkhardt stated that on the school question, again they had some questions and this map for people to identify their concerns; if you look at the color coding at the top, they tried to frame this up so if this is an issue you are concerned about based on today, you would use blue; if it is an issue related to one of the future options you would use green for Elks and purple for 32nd. He added that they got the most comments on 32nd, which is not surprising, but he thinks it helped to ask people about existing issues just to make the point that as you look to growth in the future without a bridge that also brings concerns.

Burkhardt commented that, from the interpretation of what they heard first, this is a small sample size, thirty-two respondents, it is not a lot, and it certainly self-selects in some ways, but it is still good information. He said that they do have a check to make sure there is not one person making comment after comment after comment; they did not have that but there were a couple that left three comments, nothing that broke the system. He pointed out that there is also a like/dislike feature when someone makes a comment that is helpful for taking a pulse of both who is on the site and the reaction, so it is a measure of activity and even though someone may not make a comment they went on and looked that map and gave a thumbs up or down, so he takes that as a success just in terms of engagement.

Burkhardt stated that if you look at some of the themes, and they do have a full sort of excel dump of comments if anyone wants to look at those, they did provide it to Mr. Haugen. He said that these are concerns about existing conditions or no build; there were concerns about schools and speeding did come up and it is helpful that some people identify that as a concern today as opposed to something that is only linked to an option.

Burkhardt said that the top comment theme for Elks was that it provides convenient access to more parts of Grand Forks, again it is hard to say if that is in relation to 32nd or if it is in relation to existing.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 8th, 2021**

Burkhardt stated that they got the most comments for 32nd, and the comments they got, again, not surprisingly were mostly concerns about increased traffic, and schools in particular. He added that as they know, and probably you are tracking too, Safe Kids Grand Forks certainly has been active in sharing information and asking people to participate on the website and at the same time have been doing their own annual survey of how kids are accessing school on peds and bikes so not surprised to see that both because there has been activity and we do that is a real concern.

Burkhardt commented that, before we leave it there, he is open to questions and comments. He added that the challenge for them is that we continue to go to the public to share the options, it certainly helps him to know where people are coming from and what their concerns are, and doing their best to be transparent, to be objective but he thinks also to educate people on 32nd Avenue in particular and comparisons to traffic today, certainly traffic will increase and we will get into this more when Mr. Kondziolka presents on the Tech memo again; we may say that an intersection performs adequately or traffic volumes are within appropriate levels, that means different things to us certainly than it does to the public so we want to be sensitive to where people are coming from but also keep this study focused on for this higher regional question of a regional bridge.

Haugen said that, just to follow up on Safe Kids Grand Forks, what they are terming a “walk survey”; that will happen the last week of September on both sides of the river at all of the public schools. He stated that it will be comprised of two things, one is the teachers are asking their pupils twice, on a Tuesday and a Thursday, how they arrived at school and how they are going to get home and so the teachers will do a tally of the class and the second part is an actual survey that will be distributed out by the school system to the parents of the students telling them of the on-line survey that they can do and then the school district will provide us and Safe Kids the data. Burkhardt stated that this is both related and unrelated to the study, but if there is anything new at the schools in our study area found with this it will be good to have. Haugen added that the week of October 4th will be walk to school week, so there will be walk to school activities throughout the metro area that week.

Burkhardt said that going on to the Tech Memo, before he turns it over to Mr. Kondziolka to go through some of the comments on our responses, he will just frame it up; they got some questions in the meeting from Ms. Williams and others, and outside the meeting from Mr. Kuharenko and some on just the date of the presentation, the maps, which you will see he thinks they have improved and are heading toward what they will show at the public event when they share sort of the performance information and make sure that is clear. He added that the other comment, which is now imbedded in our approach, which has been tricky to communicate, is as we look at all the intersections and their performance and different alternatives and what mitigation would be needed, within the previous version of the memo we have a new version of the mitigation table and our methodology and both Ms. Williams and Mr. Kuharenko asked questions about specific intersections in Grand Forks and how they should be addressed in terms of should it be signals, a roundabout, all way stop etc., and the summary statement for what we are trying to accomplish in the study and frankly what we have in time and budget available is to keep it at a high level in comparing the three options indicating where an intersection needs

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 8th, 2021**

mitigation under any of those scenarios and try to provide a cost estimate so we can get a comparison ultimately across the alternatives and also anticipate what it would actually take to implement one of them when we are done. He said that what we aren't doing, and he wishes we could, though it comes with challenges, is at any given intersections, particularly the ones around the school as those are the ones that are hot and that people are focused on, really designing that specific solution, and the reasons he says he wishes we could is because that is what people really want to see the reason we can't is frankly each of those could become its own intersection evaluation, and not only do we not have time but as he indicated in his email to Mr. Kuharenko is he knows that is where people will go quickly from the public and he wants to try to stay up a level to say what does this look like regionally, what problem are we trying to solve, and how do these options address that and indicate that any given intersection, the ones that have mitigation proposed will need more work to figure out exactly what that is and he thinks that will be unsatisfying to people who will want to see specific, especially around the school, whatever new treatment that is with pedestrian safety improvements down to the detail, but he thinks that will take us down a rabbit hole that he thinks is better to come back to in the future.

Kondziolka stated that he will not go through everything we discussed at the last meeting but will just address where they made some changes and how they are going to provide some feedback on some of those comments through the updates to the memo.

Kondziolka referred to a slide and pointed out that it shows the figures that we saw for the volume changes between the no build and the build options for the Elks Drive location. He said that the big changes that we discussed were removing line weights to kind of de-emphasize the different thresholds and volume changes, so these are all the same size, but they did change it to show some slightly different coloring, which is just removing the previous black line that covered a reduction of 500 up to an increase of 500 so they just altered that, and so they are showing increases and decreases everywhere. He added that you can see the additional numbers on here are some of the actual volumes, which was one of the discussion points, actually seeing the numbers so we can get kind of an understanding and kind of a percentage-based understanding of what the actual changes were here, so they are showing those now as well as the actual difference on the map. He stated that those are some of the major changes and then there was also a request to kind of clarify in the titles of these what exactly we are showing so we cleaned that up and made it a little bit more clear and easy to understand what these maps are showing, so they just changed the language of the map titles, although it isn't showing here, they did change it in the document itself, just specify these are the changes and the forecasted traffic volumes between the two scenarios. He commented that they have all four of the options, there is not new information here, they have each of the scenarios showing that these are the updates for each.

Burkhardt said that he would add as a commentary that this is a better way to share this; especially with you and a technical audience obviously, but a little busier and not quite so simple as he thinks that was part of the problem before, they were a little oversimplified, so again, as we look to the public these aren't necessarily the best, except for someone who really wants to dig into it so have these available and continue to work on it more for a summary version.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 8th, 2021**

Kondziolka stated that he does not know that there is anything we need to discuss on the next graphic, these are all the same as what we went over, and they did not have any changes to the actual technical information here, so he does not think we need to discuss these graphics. He said that he thinks the next notable point is the Warrants Analysis. He stated that they received a few comments regarding the Warrants Analysis, particularly around 4th and Belmont, so the big change in this table is in the Elks Bridge and 32nd Avenue Bridge scenarios, we did not have any warrants met previously, so no signal warrants and no all-way stop control warrants, there was a good comment about pedestrian volumes are able to be considered for all-way stop control warrants, so they updated this to show that all-way stop is met based on the high pedestrian volume generating location being the school, so that is updated here and that just kind of opens up the options somewhat, but now you can see the green warrants met column for all for these and every one of them are now showing some warrant being met and they added some clarification at the bottom.

Kondziolka referred to the Mitigation Analysis Methodology slide and commented that one touch point is they are just going through the hierarchy here, and they added some clarification and this will become clear when we go through the changes to the mitigation table, but they added some clarifying text just to say that these mitigation options that went through kind of this process, this is the hierarchy, and these were to identify the assumed mitigation for cost estimating purposes, and added some clarification that these were for the cost estimates specifically, but as Mr. Burkhardt was noting, there are multiple options at these locations so they aren't saying this is the final design but these are the assumed mitigations included in the cost estimate.

Kondziolka said that the next table, as you can recall the Mitigation table was a bit bigger than this one, so the changes made to this; they kind of broke this out into two sections in order to clarify exactly what each of these was getting at, so this is the same as what was previously provided, all the content on here is the same with the exception of the updates for warrants met, but really the last column shows the options based on warrants met that would provide adequate traffic operations, so these are the options that could be considered multiple without prescribing a single one, and this is bringing it back a little bit and specifying that these are the options available to address the problems we identified through the analysis.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Kuharenko stated that, first off, he would like to say thank you for adding in those volume numbers into those graphics as well as adding in those pedestrian warrants for those various intersections on the table, it is very helpful, so thank you for that. He said that he does have a couple of quick questions and hopefully some relatively minor comments to incorporate into this.

Kuharenko said that this actually came up at a meeting he had this morning, and it has to do with Table 3-8 and 3-9; one of the observations that was made and brought up was that on the No-build and on the Elks Drive Bridge we don't have 32nd Avenue and Washington, and if we could add those two intersections to those two segments that would be beneficial that way then we are comparing apples to apples; and then also the intersection of DeMers and Washington to the Elks

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 8th, 2021**

Drive Bridge build and the 32nd Avenue Bridge build because we end up identifying that intersection in the no-build; so hopefully that is not a major change for you since you already have some of that information already. Kondziolka responded that he understands the comment and he thinks they can; we can discuss how to add that but the one thing that he would say is that the intersections that are included here are the ones that have unacceptable level of service E or F, and so all the other intersections that operated at level of service D or better were not included in the mitigation table because there isn't any mitigation. Kuharenko said that he understands that but he believes that those two intersections are both signalized, they are going to anticipate remaining signalized, so he isn't anticipating a whole lot of changes there, he thinks it is more just for clarification to be able to have somebody who is looking at this for the first time be able to compare apples to apples between the no-build and the two build alternatives. He stated that that was kind of the comment that was brought up to him this morning, and he thinks it was a fairly reasonable comment for anybody kind of looking at this table. Burkhardt commented that we can do that if it is helpful but he was going to add that the one thing you haven't seen yet is our evaluation matrix where we will specifically compare the no-build and the two build options on a variety of measures including the performance so that may also get at that comment, but we can add those, but they don't go with the mitigation pile, but if it is confusing it is confusing and they will try to fix that.

Kuharenko stated that on Table 3-9, the summary of intersection mitigation assumed cost estimates, he wants to bring up that the 4th and Belmont, under the notes and consideration, that intersection in particular we have very tight right-of-ways in there, we have issues with potentially being able to install turn lanes, and he knows we have brought that up comments on that before so you should probably have a comment in there in your notes and considerations regarding tight right-of-way, may have some issues with that. He said that overall he knows that this is looking at the different mitigation techniques, and some of the overall concerns, and this is supposed to be high level, but he also wants to make sure that whatever we are putting forward as a potential solution for this is actually implementable, he doesn't want to have it say, this is the solution to the problem and then we try to put a project together for and we can't implement it, he does what this plan to be something that is implementable and something we can move forward with. He added that it puts engineering in a bind when somebody points to a plan and says that it says right here in the plan so why cannot you do it, so he wants to make sure we keep that in mind as we move forward with this.

Kuharenko referred to page 24, 2nd paragraph, and said that he knows that they ended up adding the pedestrian warrants, which brought up a number of those schools that we have but the 2nd paragraph in there says the 4th Avenue South and Belmont Road intersection does not meet signal or all-way stop control warrants under the 2045 Elks Drive Bridge option or the 2045 32nd Avenue Bridge option, so he thinks that probably needs to be addressed as well to bring that into matching what the other portion of the document with the pedestrian warrants. Burkhardt asked if this is just an inconsistency in the text that did not match the updated table. Kuharenko responded that this is correct.

Burkhardt stated that the second comment, which started with 4th and Belmont, and generally in terms of not having things in here that are not implementable, is there anything else that jumps

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 8th, 2021**

out at you that raises that same concern as the turn lanes at 4th and Belmont. Kuharenko responded 32nd Avenue and Washington, there was a note for an additional west bound turn lane, but you do have a note in there saying that it might not be feasible due to limited right-of-way so he wanted to make sure that if this is the proposed option, and it is the mitigation technique for it to help alleviate the concerns at this intersection, but if we can't do it because we have to buy out a gas station to make that turn lane happen, that is a problem, so he does appreciate having that note in there but he wants to make sure that if we don't have a practical solution that we address that and if we can't actually implement something that we take that into consideration because that may end up impacting the level of service at these various intersections. Burkhardt agreed, adding that that note is in there, obviously you have to read the details to see all of this stuff. Kondziolka commented that those all make sense so they will update and add some additional notes about right-of-way considerations at 4th and Belmont and will update the text in last one for consistency.

Kondziolka reported that he would just like to introduce the Mitigation Summary table; he does not know how much everyone has seen or digested, but just notes on the changes. He said that it changed a little bit just to specify or clarify that these are some mitigations for processing, but just added some of the additional columns here; kind of changed the one column that was descriptions and notes to be just the description of the control and geometry that is in question and then added these last two columns, the one to consider additional pedestrian accommodations to specifically add the school locations and the other to provide some additional context or consideration for each of these to be considered; those are the big changes and he thinks hopefully help to clarify what the table is getting at and hopefully to break them into separate tables as well to achieve that. Burkhardt stated that he would add that the column about considering additional pedestrian accommodations at the intersections near schools that we envision will translate into a graphic depicting the alternative which isn't going to show intersection design with this mitigation but will indicate that mitigation is required and then also through clearly labeled for those near schools that pedestrian safety, pedestrian crossing, or school children issues are identified to be included in that design solution, so even though we can't come out with the solution we want to make sure people know we are tracking that and, again, City Engineers don't want to tell you that you will do x, y or z, but it will indicate that we understand the concern and it will be part of any future design of an intersection treatment.

Kuharenko stated that he has one more question, and this is kind of a follow-up from a previous conversation several months ago; did you ever get a response back from the School District as to their response, or Safe Kids Grand Forks' response, as to their thoughts on roundabouts, or mini roundabouts near schools. Burkhardt responded that that is a good questions, he does remember talking about that but he did not, maybe Mr. Haugen did, but he did not reach out and ask that question directly, and maybe he was supposed to so he apologizes, but his assumption is that there are multiple points of view on that, so he doesn't know if even the School District speaks with a single voice, so remind him what you had hoped to know on that question. Haugen commented that he did have a conversation with Chris Arnold, who represents the School District on the Ad Hoc Group, and he was neutral to let us see what it would do, he likes roundabouts in general, but he was not ready to commit to a school specific perspective. He added that Safe Kids Grand Forks still has some concerns; he would characterize them as a lot of

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 8th, 2021**

concerns about roundabouts that need a little education and information, and it might appease some of that. Burkhardt asked if Mr. Kuharenko needed any follow up to that. Kuharenko said that that is what he was looking for because he knows you you have a couple of locations up there, potentially a mini roundabout at 4th and Belmont, and that just triggered that thought for him.

Kondziolka said that he has a follow-up quick question on Mr. Kuharenkos' request to add the Washington and DeMers and 32nd intersections to Table 3-8. He said that he understands wanting to add or be able to compare what is needed for each scenario, but he is wondering if it might be appropriate to instead create a new table just showing under these three scenarios is there acceptable or unacceptable, is there a need for mitigation under each of these scenarios, so you can see, by scenario, side-by-side, at each intersection which one would need it rather than adding it to this table. He said that his concern of adding it to this table is that it confuses, if we were to add the intersections that do not have recommended mitigation for a particular scenario, that it might confuse what is being conveyed in this table. Kuharenko responded that he supposes it is similar to your; up in your no-build you have a traffic signal up there, you have an existing traffic signal there, and your traffic control warrants met is for a traffic signal and your acceptable mitigation control options is a signal so he isn't seeing a whole lot of difference in that regard when you're looking at something like that where you have an existing signal, warrants are met for a signal, mitigation control is a signal so he isn't sure he is seeing your side of things on this. Kondziolka referred to the table and commented that, this is one that is kind of land-locked as well, but the CFI is included as a potential mitigation option in the next table, but each intersection shown here in the 2045 Mitigated Level of Service (LOS) has an LOS E or F, has an operational issue so the concern would be to add intersections that don't have an operational issue and then specify that there are no mitigations recommended so this table is meant to summarize every intersection that did have an operational issue and would need some type of mitigation and whether or not that is achievable, so the proposal would be to add a separate table to compare, side-by-side the operations for each intersection under each scenario. Burkhardt added that that would be all of the area intersections, matrixed with the no-build, the Elks Drive and the 32nd Avenue options. Kuharenko said that that could probably work. They will work on clarifying this better.

Haugen commented that the only other thing to mention is that they have scheduled the next Ad Hoc Group meeting for Friday, September 17th from 12:30 to 2:00 p.m. He said that they will be going through the same information we went through today. He added that it will most likely take place in the East Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers again.

Burkhardt asked if there were any other questions or comments either on this material or on how the study is going, what you may be hearing on the street, and feedback you want to give us.

Information only.

Haugen commented that the next two agenda items are on the two Land Use Plan Updates and where we are at with them; hopefully on a monthly summary you have been noticing the website and have been looking there frequently for information. He said that we haven't spent a lot of

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 8th, 2021**

time at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting itself to go over these things, we are relying on you visiting the website, but today we are at a stage where we think there is some information we would like to share; first we will do the East Grand Forks side as they are the furthest along, then we will do the Grand Forks side.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON EAST GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN

Kouba reported that, yes, we are further along with the East Grand Forks Land Use Plan than Grand Forks is with theirs; we are actually heading into the final stages of the plan itself.

Kouba referred to a slide showing the schedule they had for their Steering Committee. She pointed out that in June they held their 3rd Steering Committee, and since then they have been gathering information more about the goals and the implementation aspect.

Kouba stated that there is a Virtual Open House scheduled for September 15th, beginning at 6:00 p.m. to reveal the draft plan and to get feedback from the public and people need to register for it by going to: <https://bit.ly/egfnewplan>. She added that the next Steering Committee meeting is scheduled for September 27th at 3:30 p.m.; the draft plan will then be presented to the Planning Commission on October 17th, and to the City Council Work Session on October 26th to get their feedback. She said that any feedback they receive will be implemented into the draft and a final plan will be presented to the Planning Commission on November 10th and to the City Council on November 16th for final approval.

Kouba referred to a slide and commented that it highlights our population history. She pointed out that we now have our final 2020 population numbers included but added that as she was putting this presentation together some questions popped up that she needs to get answers for about our estimated population, especially using our growth rate of .75% as some numbers were not adding up for her.

Kouba stated that we have employment information, which was based off a combination of the population of East Grand Forks, the aspects of the factors that are in our traffic analysis zones, and acreages that we have been using in order to figure out how much land would be needed for future use and we did come up with total jobs that would be added and the various acreage that we need for each; mostly for commercial, industrial and commercial/industrial combined (CI).

Kouba said that taking a peak of where our future was from our current plan; the highlighted areas are is that we have some down in the south Point area that is more linear, straight down, that is a highlighted change to 2050, there is some removal of the residential area kind of north of Highway 2 and east of the City Limits, just a couple simple things that were being changed into what we are proposing for 2050, as you can see on the north side of town there isn't any additional single family but we do have more mixed commercial and industrial north of Highway 2 and in the Point area it is a more linear east to west residential area growth instead and there is also a small area where Sacred Heart has purchased quite a bit of land adjacent to their main Church.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 8th, 2021**

Kouba commented that the largest focus has been on what the goals and policies are; we are still finalizing implementation of who is doing what that should be available for people to view by the end of today on our website. She said that they mainly have certain focused areas for our goals and policies: housing/residential; economic development; urban expansion (which is mostly that area outside city limits); parks, recreation and open space; and transportation. She added that there can be more than one goal for each area and each goal can have a few objectives that we need to meet.

Kouba stated that for all our State and Federal partners that were concerned about some of our activities with the Land Use Plan she put together the Livability Principles that we are looking at, as well as the Ladders of Opportunity and Transportation Planning Factors and associated them with the goals and what actual objective they are so it is easy to check back on things.

Kouba reiterated that we have our Public Open House on September 15th at 6:00 p.m., it is online, and you can visit our website: www.egfplan.org to register for the meeting.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN

Haugen reported that on the Grand Forks side we are at about the halfway point with the study. He stated that one of the things that drove the presentation today was the recent release of the 2020 Census Data and how that is plugging into the Land Use Plans.

Haugen said that on the Grand Forks side there was a recent Land Use Subcommittee meeting at which two land use scenarios were presented for consideration and there were a lot of comments on them, so we are still working through those.

Haugen referred to a slide showing the annual estimate of population for Grand Forks and stated that there was a lot of concern about what the 2020 Census results would be so this is a draft that we update annually, we do an estimate of population at the local level and we also do it with the estimates that the Census put out; if you aren't familiar there are two estimates that the Census puts out, one is an annual population based on just one year of data, and that is what is labeled here as Census Annual Estimate, and then they also release another that is labeled ACS.

Haugen commented that there is a lot of angst between our local estimates and what the Census does; as you can see as we get further away from the actual census itself it gets a little trickier with the estimates, and our census were both estimating that we were losing population towards the end of the decade, whereas the MPO was still anticipating growth, however when you look at the annual percentage that we did each year, you can see that we had general agreement that there was a higher rate of growth in the earlier part of the decade and it trailed off in the end. He said that just to show the difference towards the tail end, we were showing that we were still growing but slowing down on the growth whereas both census estimates actually crossed the line, one earlier than the other where they are showing decline, so the question was, what would the census result be when it came out and both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks show great

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 8th, 2021**

growth in the community, perhaps not as much as we anticipated but more than what the census had anticipated, and this graphic is kind of showing that even though the result was growth in both communities there were pockets in the communities where decline did occur and it does give an explanation as to how we came up with our population forecasts, which is on the next slide.

Haugen pointed out that Grand Forks itself is just under 60,000, it grew by about 6,300 people in that decade; East Grand Forks is just over 9,100 and it grew by close to six hundred people. He added that outside the city, Grand Forks County actually lost population, and when we separate the city population from the county population; Polk County, despite the growth that took place in East Grand Forks, there was a considerable loss in population in Polk County, so it shows a considerable loss of overall population. He stated that within the two cities, UND area is where we saw the biggest decrease, and that what the census tracks are showing, in and around UND you can see where we lost several hundred people, according to estimates. He said that it is a little bit surprising that along the Washington corridor on either side there was also pockets of loss occurring, and these are fairly developed areas of the community, with what many would consider more affordable type housing. He stated that in East Grand Forks the oddity is on the North End Census Tract which showed a loss of four people, and that is one of the areas of growth in East Grand Forks.

Haugen referred to a slide showing population projections and commented that there was a lot of discussion as to whether UND was able to be counted accurately given the COVID situation and with the removal of people living on campus and them going home. He said that great efforts were taken, however the results are that there was a loss so when we come to look at projections, we were using sort of a carry-over from the 2045 Plan, and these two estimates of annual growth, and you can see the label since 1960, has been around .9% annual growth trend line, if you show all of those census numbers and drew a line the actual 2020 census grew at 1.2% between 2010 and 2020 and the official 2045 projection was 1.2%, but based on the UND concern, and the thought that they were under counting, we have taken into account, as you can see just three of these losses and said that if those were net neutral what would our population have been, and it was 60,543 and that would have equated to 1.5% annual growth and so what the city is settling on for now, preliminarily is to use the 1.5% annual growth and use the 34,000 additional population as the total additional people by 2050.

Haugen referred to a Survey Overview slide and reported that they had some surveying done and held an open house back in May and these are the results that were received - there were 890 responses, they had a great response from our UND student body. He stated that some interesting points were: 1) we had a fairly broad representation on income; 2) tenure in the community is as we would expect with such a large amount of student participation in that there were a lot with tenure of less than a year, but we also had quite a bit of long timers as well; 3) when we look by ward who they represented it was fairly even across the wards; 4) we generally heard that people still feel that Grand Forks is a small town and family friendly; 5) there are still some issues housing wise; 6) they still feel it is important to rethink underutilized aesthetically challenged corridors; 7) agricultural land is important so watch fringe development; and 8) we need to be visionary.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 8th, 2021**

Haugen stated that those were the public comments; what we got from the August Land Use Subcommittee meeting, just the members of that Land Use Subcommittee, based in part on the survey comments were: 1) More recent growth on the fringe has been at higher density than earlier growth; 2) newer developments include smaller lots; 3) greater focus on common outdoor amenities; 4) consider future residential west of the potential 47th Avenue Interchange; 5) future residential south of the Gateway Drive Walmart cannot expand; 6) more coordination with the School District is needed.

Haugen said that ultimately these comments resulted in these Alternative Land Use Maps being presented. He pointed out that the first map is going to be the existing 2045 Plan document, and a lot of the changes you will be seeing will be focused on the south and southwest area and the alternatives.

Haugen went over the maps and changes briefly.

Haugen reported that we do have community engagement scheduled next week; we were going to build off of the French Fry Feed, however that French fry feed has now been changed to a potato chips and hot dog even, as Simplot has decided not to sponsor it due to concerns about COVID and a community wide event, being attached to that, however they are still holding the event and we are still going to set up a booth there and there will still be a lot of activities taking place at University Park so we will try to leverage where the community is to see if we can get them to head to our booth. He stated that tomorrow we will have a Project Team meeting to finalize exactly what materials will be available at the event at University Park. He added that all of these materials are available on the Grand Forks Land Use Plan website.

Haugen pointed out that the last several sheets of the presentation are just the Draft Summary of all of the public survey and public comments that came in to-date to report on those.

Haugen stated that between both communities we now have the start of our 2050 Population, we will be finalizing the Land Use Plan in East Grand Forks at the end of the year, and on the Grand Forks side we will finalize their Land Use Plan at the end of the next year's first quarter, and with that information we will be starting to develop our Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) information to update our Travel Demand Model and start trying to identify future traffic growth for 2050 to use in our Transportation Plan Update.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS:

Kuharenko referred to Page 3 of the packet and said that it has to do with the survey information, pointing out that one of the items in here is people with disabilities and it is one of the pieces in there that says sidewalks and entrances are not ADA accessible, do we know if there were any specific locations that were identified or is this just a general comment, if it is a specific comment, if it is possible he would like get those locations so they can get those addressed.

Haugen responded that he would have to track back on that. He added that on the website for the plan there is a Wiki Map and on that map there might, which this would not reflect, there might be specific locations for some of these identified, but the survey itself people may have identified

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 8th, 2021**

within the survey specific locations. He said this was a general survey about these conditions so he does not anticipate there will be a lot of specific locations, but we will have to check the details. Kuharenko said that if Mr. Haugen can identify those and email him locations of there are any that would be great. Haugen agreed, adding that if Mr. Kuharenko could look on the online map for those locations, he will look on the survey spread sheet for any other locations.

Kuharenko stated that he believes that there have been some comments on that redevelopment of the railroad, under this is there any possibility of getting a cost estimate or potential impacts if we were to relocate this rail yard, is that something that you might be able to get under this or is that something that the MPO might be able to pick up on another study of some kind in the future. Haugen responded that comments regarding the redevelopment of the rail yard are just focusing on potential frontage of DeMers and not the whole rail yard, so on the map it is showing as just this strip of the rail yard so it wouldn't be contemplating removal of the rail yard or relocating the rail yard so the short answer is since we're not contemplating the relocation of the rail yard, we wouldn't be putting together an estimate of cost. Kuharenko asked if that is something that the MPO might be able to do or incorporation into a future study of some kind, potentially. Haugen responded that we did that after the flood and after the flood it was half a billion, \$500 million; because it isn't just a rail yard that is their main connection to the rest of the State of Minnesota so if you relocate the rail yard with the intent of relocating the rail out of the core of the city then you have to reattach the rail somewhere on the Minnesota side, which usually means south would probably be the preference and that would also mean that you have to do separations of interstate and other highways to reconnect it and it gets pricey pretty fast.

Information only.

**MATTER OF POTENTIAL AMENDMENT TO METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION PLAN (MTP)**

Haugen reported that we had consideration of amending the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). He said that where we are at in that process, if you recall, the MPO Executive Policy Board tabled one of the amendment requests, the other requests are moving forward. He stated that as part of our process we asked each City to consider whether it meets their threshold for amending their City Plan or not; if it did meet the threshold then we would go through the City Plan amendment process which takes up to about 60 days, if not then the MPO can move quicker. He said that both Cities indicated it did not meet their thresholds so in October we will be contemplating a final amendment to the 2045 MTP with the projects that are listed in the staff report.

Haugen commented that for the one project that did not get moved forward, and was tabled, he is not sure exactly where we are at with that, there might be a study done of the Industrial Park area of East Grand Forks, or something else. He stated that basically what we will be seeing in the near future, even though we just adopted a TIP, is we will be doing a TIP amendment, likely to swap the East Grand Forks Sub-Target dollars with a Polk County project from 2023 so Polk County will be getting 2022 dollars and East Grand Forks will get another year for the resolution

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 8th, 2021**

of where to spend those funds; that isn't certain, but that is where things seem to heading down the path.

Information only.

MATTER OF T.I.P. SOLICITATION

Haugen reported that we are about to announce solicitation for the 2023-2026 TIP. He said that typically on the North Dakota side almost all of the candidate projects are due to the MPO the first part of December; on the Minnesota side typically most of them are due the first part of January. He said that he doesn't anticipate too much change in that schedule today, as tried and noted in the staff report the TIP Procedural Manual does give you more guidance and direction but we also are in the midst of a reauthorization that is ending the end of this month, Congress, both chambers have adopted Reauthorization Bills, they need to go to Conference Committee and be reconciled, but there is also discussion of adding a stimulus package as part of the negotiations between the House and Chamber, and the House and Senate, and the two main parties, so if they take action by the end of the month, which they have to do something, either extend the current FAST-ACT or approve the Reauthorization, depending on what happens, we might have to look at a different TIP schedule since the dollar amounts coming from Washington might be significantly increased, it is just a question of how much of an increase it will be. He explained that the reason why that comes into play is because our TIPs are fiscally constrained, some of the projects that are in the first year of the TIP were developed many years ago, and if Congress comes through with more money, we have more availability of looking at projects sooner in the TIP, but then the latter years of the TIP would have more money for us to identify and then that gets back to our Transportation Plan and its fiscal constraint so there might be a lot of stops and goes as we go through the TIP cycle, but just anticipate you will start getting solicitations for the various programs and as of today we are assuming it will be a typical schedule but keep your eyes and ears open.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

- A. 2021 Annual Work Program Project Update
 - 1) Aerial Photo Update
 - 2) Pavement Management Update
 - 3) Transit Development Program Update
 - 4) NDDOT Freight And Rail Plan Update

Haugen reported that probably the only thing to note on the monthly update is that the LIDAR has been distributed to the local agencies, and the Transit Development Program Update is under contract and off and running.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 8th, 2021**

Haugen said that we do note that North Dakota is doing an update of their Freight and Rail Plan. He added that there are a couple of virtual open houses being held in early October for people to participate in and there is a website dedicated to it and if you are on our Constant Contact list you were provided that link already.

Information only

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO ADJOURN THE SEPTEMBER 8TH, 2021 MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:54 P.M.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager