

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 10th, 2021**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the November 10th, 2021, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:47 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering. The following members were present via Zoom: Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Local Government; Ryan Brooks, Grand Forks Planning; Jon Mason, MnDOT-District 2; Jason Peterson, NDDOT-Grand Forks; Rich Sanders, Polk County Engineering; and Ryan Riesinger, Airport Authority.

Absent: Brad Bail, Steve Emery, Stephanie Halford, Jesse Kadrmas, Wayne Zacher, Nick West, Lane Magnuson, Nels Christianson, Dale Bergman, and Patrick Hopkins.

Guest(s) present: Jane Williams, GF Engineering; David Murphy, EGF City Administrator; Kristen Sperry, FHWA-ND; 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 OCTOBER 13TH MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 13TH, 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 were some of the materials we will be going over today. He added that he also sent out an email with an updated presentation, so if you haven't

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 10th, 2021**

seen your e-mail in-box yet, it is there. He pointed out that in the staff report they referred everyone to the website for the updated Tech Memo 3C, so they have it available if you want to go over it in detail, but now he will turn the screen over to the Alliant Team for an update on the Future Bridge Traffic Impact Study.

Burkhardt commented that this should be an interesting meeting, and he hopes that you had a chance to look at the advance packet, and as Mr. Haugen mentioned they added a little bit more information. He referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and went over it briefly.

Burkhardt stated there are a couple of things he would like to mention before we get into the presentation. He referred to a slide showing the project schedule and commented that they are requesting a one-month extension through January 2022 as they are running a little bit behind schedule, and that should allow them to get to the end and get through this evaluation and present it to this group, the Ad Hoc Group, and the public; is really their main tasks with, obviously some details in terms of documentation after that.

Burkhardt referred to a slide and stated that it shows some of the details on how they get from now until the end, thinking in terms of meetings, which is what things revolve around. He stated that it shows what they are doing, assuming a one-month extension; from his perspective sort of the big events are this meeting, Ad Hoc meeting hopefully around the end of this month followed by a public open house and/or online review in December. He added that he knows that December is not the first choice for doing a lot of things; requires more public open house but that is kind of where it falls, and he thinks it should be doable.

Burkhardt pointed out that the next slide is that review of deliverables, which he won't get into, but they are getting mostly to the left side, but there are still a few on the right.

Burkhardt stated that, again, going back to some of our deliverables, one is our Tech Memo 3C, which you have seen maybe more times than you would have liked, but the final version of that is up on the website and the bullets on the screen, in terms of updates, some of you were in the loop but the City of Grand Forks was interested in some additional information; as we looked at intersection mitigation that would be needed by the year 2045; sort of how would the intersections concerning how intersections would operate at in an interim year, and particularly what intersections operate at a Level of Service C, which is what the City of Grand Forks would like to see; so they did answer that question and they added a little bit of text in the Tech Memo to support that and showed that two of the mitigated intersections, 32nd and Belmont (for Elks Drive alternative) and 32nd and Cherry (for 32nd Avenue alternative) would indeed operate at a Level of Service C in that year, and two would not and that is Washington and DeMers (for No Build) and Washington and 32nd (for 32nd Avenue alternative). He said that this isn't surprising because those are the ones that are already big intersections with some issues that are difficult to mitigate.

Burkhardt commented that they are running this study consistent with the PEL (Planning and Environmental Linages) process and one additional piece they did to do that in addition to the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 10th, 2021**

purpose and need document that you have seen in their public involvement and evaluation process; they did do a round of early coordination with agencies that may be interested in this study; and this is very early coordination in that a lot of the resource agencies to really get interested once we have something you are proposing to do as opposed to something you are proposing to study, but they did that process just to raise awareness and they are looking for any information that might change what we are doing right now or influence this stage of the study so they sent out to a large number of agencies in August and only received a handful of responses, which isn't surprising given the early point in the study so they have been made aware, whether or not they wanted to let us know anything, only a few did. He added that what they did was to document that process in the purpose and need and make it clear that we have begun that coordination process so as the study and the project moves forward the consistency is there, in terms of the PEL process. He said that he thinks they did share that memo with you and they will get it online if they haven't already.

Burkhardt referred to the presentation and commented that in terms of Evaluation, you have seen these slides in theory; he has a few caveats as he explains how their team does this evaluation and how it is intended to be used. He said that one bottom line, looking at the right side of the screen there is a lot of little pieces, and they try to capture all of those and do a good job of understanding each item and then apply a process of trying to step back and say okay, what do we have and what does this mean, so there is a lot here and a lot to get through.

Burkhardt stated that there are two purposes to the evaluation; the first thing are these two options, they look like they are going to meet our purpose and needs; are they addressing the needs we identified, and the second is how do they do in comparison to each other, the two build options. He then went over the evaluation results.

Burkhardt said that the next step is, where do we go from here. He stated that you may have questions following the meeting, and then they will be moving on to a similar presentation and review by the Ad Hoc Group and then presenting the results to the public at an open house. He added that there will be a final review by the Technical Advisory Committee after the Ad Hoc and public process.

Burkhardt referred to a slide of a table illustrating evaluation criteria and the measurement ratings for various intersections and went over it briefly.

Burkhardt said the next category, the next need is Multimodal System Linkage, talks about how adding this new link across the river influences travel on the overall system. He said that you will see four measures for the road system and then one for the bike/ped system.

Burkhardt pointed out that the numbers in the first four measures all come from the modeling results, from the travel demand model prepared by ATAC. He stated that the first one is the distance, the total distance on the system, the (VMT) vehicle miles traveled in the future year 2045. He said that the second measure is the total time, the (VHT) vehicle hours of travel on the system. He added that the next pair is the VMT on just the study corridor, so a subset of that whole system; and the VHT on just that subset of that system.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 10th, 2021**

Burkhardt commented that you can see the numbers and you can see the ratings, and he wants to explain why and how they did what they did, because there are different ways to look at these, he went over that information briefly.

Burkhardt stated that the bike/ped connectivity, the idea is another bike/ped crossing is good for bike and pedestrian travel, and the difference between these two is that Elks Drive is closer to the existing bridge at 17th, 32nd is a bit further away so the analysis says that 32nd provides a little bit more value to travel if you look at the overall city boundaries or the region in terms of having a bridge that is further to the south, so similar but slightly different.

Burkhardt said, moving on to the Community and Economic Factors; a lot of which is, again, the traffic as sort of perceived by someone on the block. He pointed out there are two lines highlighted in yellow, and he will blow out and look at those corridors in detail; but otherwise here we have five items, total travel on study corridors, that is the same ones we looked at on the previous slide, so that is a violation of his no double count rule, but the point is to look at the change in traffic, which will come up on the next screen.

Burkhardt pointed out that the five measures are: 1) total travel on study corridors from a perception of change in traffic volume perspective; 2) total change on study corridors adjacent to schools, which is a subset of those; 3) consistency with approved transportation plans; 4) support for economic development; and 5) impact to the greenway. He went over the information briefly.

Burkhardt referred to a slide illustrating detailed information on the study corridors and commented that it is similar to the other list but this time the rating is not level of service or congestion, it is just what is that absolute change in traffic. He stated that if you look at the percentages here you will see some crazy percentages, if there is a segment that has very little traffic on it today, it might have traffic on it in the future, that doesn't necessarily mean, from an engineering perspective, that that is bad it just means that if that is your house or business you will see a change. He added that if you look at the ratings key you will get different results if you use different cut-offs, but we are showing that if you have a decrease greater than 25% that is positive, less than 25% that is a positive, no change is zero, increase greater than 25% is negative and an increase less than 25% is a negative. He stated that there is a lot going on here, and that he will come back with that rolled up version that tries to highlight which ones are different.

Burkhardt commented that there is another level of analysis that we can get into here that would take us back to more of a level of service analysis as opposed to what does this feel like, and that doesn't mean it is bad or potentially even that noticeable to someone adjacent to one of these corridors, but really his point was here knowing that there were some neighborhood concerns, certain blocks, certain schools, he just wanted to have some transparency to say that this is what happens, so if you roll this all up to the system level, which he is trying to stay focused on in terms of the problem that we are trying to solve and the idea that there is no perfect solution, there is no solution here that has no adverse impact to anyone, if we roll that to the system we

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 10th, 2021**

see that both of these options are decreasing traffic on the system, and obviously by this measure, for these segments, we see a greater decrease for 32nd Avenue.

Burkhardt referred to the next slide and commented that this shows similar results for the segments adjacent to schools. He stated that you can see the schools in the study area that we have been discussing, and the method was, though the best we have, a little bit crude and we are just going to look at that block face adjacent to a school. He added that they have known all through the study; they spent a lot of time on the schools, just looking at the circulation on the property itself, but he thinks this is a useful way to look at it. He said that for some schools they included traffic on two sides, so two block faces if that is how the school is situated, and it includes two streets that are study corridors.

Burkhardt stated that, again, if you look at the top row, sort of a rolled-up version, what do we see; we see less traffic sort of rolled up for Elks Drive and a small amount less for 32nd Avenue, and they did show a slight difference in those summary ratings, so Elks, in summary, performing somewhat better than 32nd Avenue. He added that if you look across the rows just from the ratings you will see that a lot of them got the same rating based on the cut-offs down there in the key and then some did not.

Burkhardt reported that the next section is Environmental Impact, which is all qualitative at this level of study, and again this is not about the benefits of either of these options, but really more about what do we think are some negatives, and just because there is a negative here doesn't necessarily mean there is an adverse impact ultimately, we aren't looking at mitigation at this level, but just trying to get a sense of is there a difference, and he thinks that most of them did not show a difference at this level. He pointed out that for the first two measures, they do show potential difference, so impact on the flood protection system that is essentially crossing the levee wall, we showed no change at Elks, assuming that the existing opening probably works well, there is a road there already so we can continue through that opening. He added that 32nd is probably more questionable as to how we would get through there as there isn't currently an opening there so we would have to create one somewhere, either where the trail goes through or somewhere else and then we would have to close the trail but he doesn't perceive that is a major difference but because, as you all know that system is regulated so you can't go messing it up without fixing it up at the same time so they did show a difference there.

Burkhardt commented that soil stability is another one that would need a lot more looking into and may ultimately change and cause you to not do one option, but they do have some data from the Corps of Engineers that shows potentially less stable soils in the area of the Elks Drive crossing and not at the 32nd Avenue crossing so they show a slight difference there.

Burkhardt referred to the next slide and commented that it is a horrible slide, and he apologizes, but he wanted to put all the caveats and assumptions on the same slide as the numbers, so we will just focus on the evaluation table in the middle and then we will qualify it.

Burkhardt referred to the table and stated that there are three lines there; the Bridge Cost, they didn't create those they came from the study from last year with about a \$30 million dollar

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 10th, 2021**

estimate for Elks Drive and a \$36.4 million estimate for 32nd Avenue. He stated that the second line is the cost to do the mitigation at the intersections that we've talked about in the memos, and you will see the intersections listed down below and the assumption as to what that mitigation would be. He said that there are a lot of caveats for this line given where they are in the study and given our methodology which was not to design the intersections, we aren't able to design intersections as part of the planning study, but using our least cost mitigation methodology to say what would it take to mitigate that intersection to a Level of Service D. He pointed out that we see ranges here, again just didn't feel quite right given our planning level to just give you a number so the ranges are the number we got plus or minus 20%.

Burkhardt commented that the table at the top, with other assumptions, is pretty standard for this level of cost estimating but he just wanted you to see those first showing what was included and not included. He stated that the last two bullets regarding 32nd/DeMers (No Build) and 32nd/Washington (32nd Ave) are significant, especially the first one for 32nd/DeMers (No Build), so that number, cost number under intersection mitigation for no-build, the estimate is \$17.2 to \$25.8 million, is a big number to fix 32nd and DeMers, it has an \$18 million dollar line item for it to continuous flow for the intersection, based on a prior study and grown to today's dollars, and a very proximate methodology; he thinks some of you are involved in the current study that is looking at that intersection again so there may be new information forthcoming on that. Haugen commented that he thinks the bullet should be Washington and DeMers. Burkhardt responded that he will make that correction. He continued by saying that the last bullet, 32nd/Washington isn't as large of a number but it is also just an estimate at that intersection as they don't have any design detail for that intersection.

Kuharenko asked about the Washington/DeMers cost estimate, that \$18 million, was that from the previous study or was that inflated. Burkhardt responded that Mr. Kuharenko probably knows that better, there was some back and forth discussion on how to take something from the previous study and making it work for today, so keep going if you have some advice. Kuharenko said that he can't remember where the CFI, if the \$18 million was from that study from however long ago that was. Haugen responded that KLJ did that study and that \$18 million figure is their year of expenditure for the Year 2023. Kuharenko said that his only concern on that is just making sure that if we are going to have that number in the study that we have that year noted in here somehow, because his first thought is was it from way back when the study was done, was it today, or was it some other year. Burkhardt responded that they will probably be looking at that again. Haugen added that you're raising the question, you know the NDDOT is looking at that intersection, looking at that study, looking at that CFI, so we are wondering what estimate they might provide. Kuharenko asked if Mr. Peterson or Mr. Johnson are on the line because he knows that there is a road safety review going on currently, and he isn't 100% sure when that is going to come out, but he would think probably by the end of this year, unless someone has a better idea. Johnson responded that he isn't positive when that will come out, they haven't seen a draft get circulated yet. He added that they did a handful of road safety review around the same time, so he is assuming they are working on all of them in terms of summarizing and creating a report. He said that his recollection is that those may identify a potential mitigating measure alternative, but he doesn't know if we will get much of a cost estimate out of that document, we will have to see when it comes out, but his memory on these in

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 10th, 2021**

the past is that they don't really lay out cost information. Kuharenko cited the 32nd Avenue study that was done recently and commented that he doesn't think it included costs, it just included short-term, mid-term, and long-term options or recommendations. Johnson said that he thinks it has been several years since their traffic operations group, across the board, has moved away from providing cost estimates in their recommendations in everything they do including traffic operations or reports related to a specific project, they are leaving it up to the design engineers to take that information and create a cost estimate from it.

Burkhardt commented that, not that Mr. Kuharenko is the creator of that study, but we can have a little bit of back and forth, he'll pull up what they used for that, just to get some comfort, he doesn't want it to be too far off either way; he thinks if we look at the bottom line here under the no-build there is a big number in there to address that intersection that isn't in there for the two build options so that makes sense in that Elks Drive and 32nd are pulling traffic away from that intersection, but obviously the numbers in there that are in that column right now, that \$17 to \$25 million is a healthy number and he wants to make sure that passes the reasonable check. Kuharenko said that his initial concern was just what year was that \$17 to \$25 million was anticipated to be in, but we can have further follow-up discussion on that too.

Burkhardt stated that the other items, the bottom half of the slide, was information that they presented before in the traffic memo, in terms of the mitigation, and he just wanted to repeat that. He said that it these are intersections that they estimated add up to the totals shown above.

Burkhardt referred to the next slide and said that it talks about something like benefit cost, but he called it considerations and he called it relative benefit cost ratio because it is a little bit of an apples to oranges. He said that there are some transportation benefit numbers calculated in the 2017 Red River Crossing Study, and those are reported here; again, when we are talking about what year those are, they are from the 2017 study so they have not been updated so they would be greater, as in costs have increased and we assume they would go up a bit. He said that the second line in the table are those numbers from the previous page; and then for those of you who like benefit/cost, that is what is in the bottom line in the table, and they reached the conclusion that Elks is a little bit under warranted and 32nd is a little bit over warranted.

Burkhardt stated that, going back to the evaluation results and just trying to boil them down; if you have had a chance to look at the next few slides in the last hour, these are some of the ones that were added. He said that, going back to the starting question, key; do these alternatives address the needs, this is the rolled-up version, showing the breakouts for those earlier segments.

Burkhardt went over the information briefly.

Burkhardt referred to the Summary slide and explained that he did keep the no-build in the table partly to show, again, that if there is an assumption that, gee, this is going to be bad compared to doing nothing, it helps us see what happens if we do nothing, or what is the change compared to doing nothing. He said that visually you can see a lot of red and darker red on Elks compared to 32nd; it doesn't mean that every block, every segment is the same, so that is always something that could merit further discussion. He commented that looking at the schools data on the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 10th, 2021**

bottom of the table, if you are looking to see how many area better or how many are worse, you might say that it is kind of a wash, these are the four that were different from each other, and we give a slight benefit overall to Elks Drive when it comes to school traffic, but seeing the zero for 32nd and zero for no-build you can see there has been an assumption that overall things are worse because we have redistributed traffic; regardless of the option it helps him to say, sort of go back to that starting purpose, what are we trying to accomplish from a community standpoint and are we doing that in terms of the system as a whole.

Johnson said he has a question on the “zero’s”, just to make sure he is understanding them; is it truly a zero change or is it a negligible net zero change because he is concerned the zeros may confuse members of the public and elected leaders if it isn’t truly just a zero. Burkhardt responded that that is a good point. He stated that it is the middle of the rating, which essentially says no change or no significant change. Johnson said that that is what he thought you were trying to say, he is just wondering if from a pictorial display conversation standpoint if zero is the appropriate way to do that, but he doesn’t know if he has a good replacement for you other than maybe “N” for neutral or something like that, it is something for you to consider as you move forward, the zero might not get you the desired understanding. Burkhardt responded that he appreciates that, he agrees he doesn’t have the answer, but he will consider that because especially in this view it is confusing.

Kuharenko referred to the summary table and commented that, just another clarification piece, following up from what Mr. Johnson was saying; when you have Belmont doubled up and Belmont doubled up and Bygland Road doubled up and Bygland Road doubled up, he is guessing those are just different segments of those roadways, but if something like this is presented to the public those could be confusing and could be considered doubling up those roads even though those are different segments of those roads. Burkhardt responded that he hadn’t noticed that but will take a look at it and make the necessary changes.

Burkhardt commented that he would like to go over the last couple of slides on materials, and then open it up for questions/discussion.

Burkhardt stated that the other thing he is thinking about, and he knows you are as well, is sharing this information more broadly with the public, so some communication tools that are in progress; these summary slides will be helpful, they do have maps that show details and are working on one that illustrates what the potential changes at the intersections would be, at least what the results are based on, and the one exciting add today is the illustration of the bridge.

Burkhardt commented that when we began this study, and some of you were probably at our interview, they showed a nice Google slide, which they tried to do here, that showed what this bridge could look like. He said that the hazard with that is that at this point they really don’t those landing locations nailed down, and also the intersection configurations, so ultimately they don’t really want to show that, they can’t just show what the middle of the bridge looks like, that is a little odd, so as much as he loves that tool and it gives people a visualization, it immediately brings us down to okay, exactly what happens here at Elks Drive or at 32nd and where does the bridge land and what happens and we are really at the corridor level here and not at that level.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 10th, 2021**

Burkhardt stated that the things they are able to tell people, and that people want to know, in terms of what is this bridge going to be, what is it going to look like, what is it going to feel like, all of the bullets here, it will be similar in scale to the Point Bridge. He said that it will be a two lane, no trucks, includes bike/ped trail on the bridge, the greenway trail will be routed under the bridge, minimal rise from street system, and will maintain the flood wall closure system.

Burkhardt then referred to a slide that showed an illustration of what the bridge could look like.

Haugen said that in the staff report we did ask people to provide feedback and comments by the 24th of November, two weeks, which has been our traditional timeline for when something is presented to the Technical Advisory Committee to ask for feedback and comments and then we will make those adjustments to the report presentation and then you will see the revision at our December meeting.

Kuharenko asked if all of this information, maybe even a little more detail, will be provided on the website or will it be e-mailed out. Burkhardt responded that the basics of this is this presentation, if you have questions on some of the detail behind it, some of it came from an excel spreadsheet and they can make that available, although he wasn't planning on sending it out. Kuharenko said that his main question was just to make sure which document we are reviewing and where we can find it but it sounds like it was emailed out earlier.

Information only.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2050 EAST GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN

Kouba referred to a presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and said that back in August 2020 we held the kick-off on this plan and now we are at the final part of adoption of the plan. She said that they provided the final changes that were made to the plan earlier today to the East Grand Forks Planning Commission, and they plan on bringing it forward to the City Council on November 16th and to the MPO Executive Policy Board on November 17th.

Kouba referred to the presentation and commented that the structure of the plan includes the introduction, community background, public involvement, goals and policies, future land use plan, and implementation.

Kouba referred to the Community Background slide and stated that they do have the current 2020 Census population information included, as well as in our calculations for everything. She added that they looked at income and employment, as well as demographics and population.

Kouba stated that with our public involvement section, we did a lot of early City and public inclusion. She referred to the Public Involvement slide and pointed out that it gives an example of the questions asked. She said that they had on-line surveys and wiki maps available for people to use to give input. She added that they also held some virtual open houses throughout the process as well. She said that over 100 comments and surveys were done for the public

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 10th, 2021**

involvement and for the virtual open houses they had 25 to 30 views at each of them, so people were participating.

Kouba commented that there are goals and polices, which are broken into five sections; 1) housing and residential, 2) economic development, which is broken into two different goals that are more generalized versus downtown, 3) urban expansion area where we are planning for some logical expansion beyond the city limits, 4) parks and recreation and open space, and 5) transportation, which has three goals.

Kouba referred to the Future Land Use Plan slide and commented that they have the 2045 Land Use Plan, they kept the basic land uses topics that we have, especially when they added the mixed uses residential and commercial, as well as the commercial industrial land uses. She said that they did come up with an amount of land, one of the differences between the 2045 will be that there was a lot of out-planning beyond what was necessary, so they came up with the amounts of acreages that we will need into the future, into 2050, so you will see a lot; in this 2050 map, you will see a lot of reduction in the amount of land that is changing from agricultural uses, so they are also just looking at, there is a little bit more of the commercial/industrial, but in the newer areas you are getting more of that residential/commercial as well.

Kouba reported that in the 2045 they had some additional areas of residential that were not needed, and they felt that there was other growth going on in other areas beyond what was being planned for. She referred to the Growth Phasing Term map and pointed out that it is the draft phasing that they put together, and she will give a better explanation of this a bit later because there was some input that was taken from the City Council between the draft and the final.

Kouba stated that part of this is that they want a development process. She referred to the Development Review Process slide and said that they want this to be able to let developers know what we are looking at, what the City is expecting into the future and what guidelines that we used as well.

Kouba said that they decided to keep the 2045 Concept Plans, just for the simple reason that, while some of those things have changed in land uses, the concept of how they work together has not changed, there are many uses that work together very well, and support each other, especially when you are looking at how transit and walking and biking work into those areas, and connect to the rest of the city.

Kouba stated that the final section is the implementation; and basically they are wanting to look at how that goal that we are setting is going to, and the objectives that we are going to be setting, are going, what kind of work is on-going, what kind of work is needed in the near future and what is needed in the long term, as well as who we are partnering with into the future so if we will need to be working with other entities like economic development or CAT or things of that nature.

Kouba referred to the Feedback for Final slide and went over where the changes were made in regard to near term, mid-term, long term, and future expansion areas. She added that these are

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 10th, 2021**

some little tweaks that were made just to reflect more of what is happening at this time were the only real changes from the draft to the final that we are presenting.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FINAL 2050 EAST GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN, AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Peterson, Ellis, Brooks, Mason, Johnson, Kuharenko, Sanders, and Riesinger.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Kadrmas, Bail, Emery, Halford, Christianson, Hopkins, Zacher, Bergman, West, and Magnuson.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF TRANSIT SAFETY TARGETS

Haugen reported that this is currently the last yet to be acted on performance target by the Forks MPO. He said that it is just regarding transit safety. He added that both Cities Area Transit Operators did do a draft safety plan, a more complete document than just targets. He said that that draft was favorably reviewed by the FTA Resource Center, but as we started to try to actually work on what the targets are there were discrepancies between what the regulations were saying the target should be measuring versus what the draft plan was measuring.

Haugen said that, if you recall, when we adopted the TIP in August, we made reference that there were some things that needed to be addressed; this and the next agenda item on today's agenda, are addressing some of those items. He stated that typically we are all familiar that when targets are set by one of the other agencies the MPO has 180 days to react to those targets; for the transit safety the original target date was many months ago but with COVID 19 FTA kept pushing back the harsh actual timeline. He said that the latest one they did was more of a soft one into July of 2021, but what they didn't do is the original date prior to the July 2021 was a December 2020 date, and at that time that was 180 days, so that put us out somewhere around late July of 2021 for the MPOs to act, and originally in July, or as we were processing our TIP, our typical federal partners do review and comment on the TIP and FTA did remind us, or probably pointed out the fact that we don't have 180 days, that actually our deadline was in July 2021 but they said that they would work with us knowing that we had amendments coming through in November that that would be the time the we would try to address the Transit Safety Targets; since then we have had a couple of meetings, phone conversations with CAT, FTA and NDDOT staff and are finding out that there are some, to the current draft plan, that the CAT had, there was agreed work that needed to be done on that. He said that we also discovered that there was the option of adopting the State Transit Safety Targets; and since we were agreeing to a November deadline to do these things it ends up that we don't have time to go through local data to come up with targets pertaining to just Grand Forks/East Grand Forks so we are recommending that the MPO adopt the North Dakota Safety Targets for Transit.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 10th, 2021**

Haugen referred to a slide with a table that identifies those targets and commented that one issue that CAT had was that they didn't completely separate out by mode, by mode in transit is either fixed route or demand response, we provide both, so we have two modes of transit service. He added that some other issues were the actual measure was not quite the same as FTA regulations were identifying; another little quirk that happens when we looked at the Transit Safety and started to go towards the statewide one was whether East Grand Forks could also join in on the North Dakota targets or not but he thinks that is a separate discussion between FTA and the two Transit Operators to find out exactly how the Transit Operators need to address the safety plan and safety targets. He said that he believes that FTA has given an opinion that since East Grand Forks is in North Dakota's Transit Asset Management already, that just being in North Dakota's Transit Safety should be a similar case and easily done.

Haugen commented that these Transit Safety Targets are different than the Highway Safety Targets; the nuances of options available to the MPO, Bi-State MPO in particular, aren't well fleshed out by FTA as they were as they were in Federal Highway, so given those other factors we are just recommending that we adopt these North Dakota Statewide Targets for Transit Safety Performance.

Haugen said that, as you know, we are currently updating the Transit Development Plan, and this is something that will be revisited during that plan update process, and we will then have time to probably properly vet the local data and make a more informed decision as to what targets we should be adopting.

Haugen commented that staff is recommending that the Forks MPO adopt the North Dakota DOT Transit Safety Targets as identified in the staff report.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE ADOPTING THE NORTH DAKOTA TRANSIT SAFETY TARGETS, AS IDENTIFIED.

Voting Aye: Peterson, Ellis, Brooks, Mason, Johnson, Kuharenko, Sanders, and Riesinger.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Kadrmas, Bail, Emery, Halford, Christianson, Hopkins, Zacher, Bergman, West, and Magnuson.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF 2022-2025 T.I.P. AMENDMENTS

Haugen reported that this item is a proposed amendment to our current TIP document. He stated that included in the staff report, as originally drafted and put on the website, we got an update from the NDDOT, so we had to make a change and that is noted in the yellow highlighted section.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 10th, 2021**

Haugen commented that we did advertise that a public hearing would be held at today's meeting, and we did advertise that people could provide written or oral comments until noon today, and we have not received any comments; however, given that the information was received late that caused further modifications to our TIP Amendment document, and that it is significant enough that we need to continue the public hearing process on this, and working with parliamentarians it was decided that it would be proper for us to recommend a continuation of the public hearing to the MPO Executive Policy Board level so that people still have an opportunity to provide comment, and also to not have to delay action until we repost a new public hearing next month, etc., and timing was an issue on some of these amendments.

Haugen reported that the amendments themselves were discussed previously. He said that the first amendment that we all knew about was these project phasing of groups, and again we went through this last year, but now our TIP document has to show if there are any federal funds involved in the preliminary engineering, right-of-way potential purchases, or utility locates.

Haugen referred to a table and pointed out that for 2022 there were previously none going to be allocated to that, but in the staff report, the highlighted section, the NDDOT is identifying that in 2022 they do have some preliminary engineering that we will need to amend into the TIP table, a total of \$1 million dollars, with roughly \$800,000 federal, \$90,000 state and \$100,000 in city funds. He asked if anyone could identify what project development preliminary engineering that is going towards. Johnson responded that in their continued effort to try to accelerate some of their outer year projects and get them going sooner than in the past for various reasons, just to create potential shelf ready projects and then maybe take advantage of any additional funding sources that may become available they decided to start the preliminary engineering on the FY2024 project, which is the Regional Traffic Signal Rehabilitation Project, which looks at almost every intersection on the State Highway System within Grand Forks and doing rehab work to each of those traffic signals to varying degrees. He said that the other project was a FY2025 project, it is 32nd Avenue from I-29 to Washington Street concrete pavement repair and grinding and a micro-seal. He stated that they decided to start to get those projects going so they needed to authorize preliminary engineering in FY2022 to make that happen. Haugen said that the table shown on the screen right now, they will adjust the total column to reflect the \$1 million dollars, and then the appropriate split is generally 80/10/10 local, and they will put those numbers in for the MPO Board meeting.

Haugen stated that the out years, there are numbers, some cells are still blank, but for preliminary engineering there are typically numbers, so we are amending into the TIP for four years numbers to fill in those group phasing sections.

Haugen referred to the FY2022 table, the project shown in yellow highlight, said that they also have a couple of other more minor things being changed; we did have this project already identified that we would have to amend it into November, but originally we were talking about high-mast lighting at the interchange of I-29 and his understanding now is that the project description is not relating to the high-mast lighting it is to other lighting in and around the interchange so we will simply delete the word "high-mast", is that accurate. Johnson responded that that would work. Haugen added that the cost does not change.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 10th, 2021**

Haugen commented that we also have a high- tension median cable guardrail; again, this is something that is from the Fargo district to Grand Forks, so it is a long segment of I-29 and we are amending that into the TIP, although a small portion of it is in our MPO study area and we don't have it broken out as to how much of the total cost is just within the MPO area.

Haugen said that the last amendment is on the Minnesota side and that is reflecting the one-year delay on the City Sub-target, which was originally set for 2022, it is now showing the TIP being amended to have those funds shifted to reflect 2023.

Haugen stated that staff is recommending that the Technical Advisory Committee forward a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board to continue the public hearing to allow the public to understand these couple of changes occurring since we went out to publication and to ensure we still have public engagement/comment to address these things, but other than that, as noted today in the changes that would be what we recommend as actual amendments.

Murphy said that he had one question. He said that he sees we are moving the potential roundabout out that one year, so the question he would have then is at what point would the potential addition of the 10th project be looked at for changing in the TIP. Haugen responded that we would be amending this again based on the resolution of what is in the Transportation Plan, whether that is changed or not, so as that happens we will keeping on top of when we need to amend the TIP to reflect a different project, or if this project remains the project, so it is simply just taking that and pushing it out one year to allow that process to take place.

MOVED BY JOHNSON, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FISCAL YEAR 2022 T.I.P. AMENDMENTS, AS PRESENTED, AND CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT PERIOD TO THE NOVEMBER 17TH MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD MEETING.

Voting Aye: Peterson, Ellis, Brooks, Mason, Johnson, Kuharenko, Sanders, and Riesinger.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Kadrmas, Bail, Emery, Halford, Christianson, Hopkins, Zacher, Bergman, West, and Magnuson.

OTHER BUSINESS

- A. 2021 Annual Work Program Project Update
- 1) Aerial Photo Update
 - 2) Pavement Management Update
 - 3) Transit Development Program Update
 - 4) Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update
 - 5) East Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 10th, 2021**

Haugen referred to the monthly report, included in the packet, and commented that we have discussed many of the projects already. He added that the website is probably the best place to get updated on where we are at on many of these studies, especially those that don't have a separate agenda item at our Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

Kuharenko stated that you probably need to update the Future Bridge Traffic Impact Study projected completion date as they have requested an extension. Haugen responded that it wasn't changed yet as they have requested the extension, but it hasn't been approved by the MPO Board yet.

Kuharenko asked if we are still on track with the Pavement Management System Update. Kouba responded that we are. She added that she hasn't received an update from the consultant recently though.

Information only.

B. Save The Date For Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan Stakeholder Forums On December 2 and 7 – Info At: www.minnesotago.org

Haugen reported that MnDOT is asking us to save the date for a Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan Stakeholder Forum, either December 2nd or December 7th. He said that you can go to their website if you want additional information.

Information only.

C. Infrastructure Bill

Haugen reported that after this agenda packet was distributed; last Friday, late, Congress acted on adoption of a Infrastructure Bill that contained the Reauthorization of Transportation for another five years, plus added a lot of other programs and new dollars, so other than the big takeaways of more money, some of the things that were in question at some point in time, was whether small MPOs, and the definition of urbanized, and other things were ever going to change, and transportation wise there has been no change, 50,000 is still the threshold for an MPO, with overall more money. He said that he hopes the money trickles down to the Forks MPO for our planning purposes.

Haugen commented that the one thing that is also in play, in North Dakota, there is a possibility that the Minot area might be designated as a place that has an urbanized population of 50,000, the City itself is at 48,000 and some change and the geography of urbanized area does not follow corporate boundaries for city limits, it follows information such as population density, land use coverage, and other things. He said that he doesn't know if Mr. Johnson was able to the

Ask the Department of Commerce of North Dakota to make a judgement or weigh in on whether the hops and jumps and skips of the Census will still result in anything. Johnson responded that he has not had a chance to get in touch with them yet but is on his list to do that to see if they can

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 10th, 2021**

provide any insight. He added that he was on their website digging through the population information that they have collected up to this point to kind of make sure that we are getting the same information that he had dug up on the Census website and it seems to be in line, but he hasn't had a chance to reach out to them directly.

Johnson said that he will note; he just sent an email their management had shared that has some talking points, bullets regarding the Infrastructure Bill that Senator Kramer and Director Panos were going to be discussing at a press conference that took place earlier today. He stated that that email just kind of gives you the bullets that they were going to highlight as it relates to funding, kind of a high level of funding to North Dakota.

Haugen said that as far as the funding, it appears that a lot of it is still formula driven, and a lot of the new money is perhaps from national competitive grant programs of varying types, some of which North Dakota and Minnesota, or in our region, Forks MPO, some of which we won't be good candidate for, others perhaps better, and just remember that these funds are not doled out in one lump sum, they are spread over five years of appropriations that still have to take place, continuing resolutions and all that other fun stuff that goes beyond just authorization of the program. He added that we would assume that it would be a lot of work to try to flesh out all of these changes, if they are significant or not; how to identify projects so that we get in the pipe to allow efficient flow of making sure we have projects fully vetted to get from the plan to the program to the project development as soon as possible.

Haugen commented that he knows that Ms. Pierce stated that she had to leave but does anybody else from MnDOT have something on the Minnesota side, talking points or anything you want to, or could share. Mason responded that he just returned to the office, so he is still catching up on his e-mails and what information that he has been provided so far, in terms of the Minnesota implications of the structure bill.

Johnson said that, while he can't share too much information, but the news is very very good on Mr. Zacher and his status; again, he can't share too much other than that but if any of you were following his Caring Bridge website you probably know what he is referring to, so good news. Haugen said that that is good enough news to share, thank you for doing that and we look forward to having him back in or mix of discussion soon.

Information only

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY SANDERS, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO ADJOURN THE NOVEMBER 10TH, 2021 MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 3:09 P.M.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager