

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 14th, 2023**

CALL TO ORDER

Stephanie Halford, Chairman, called the June 14th, 2023, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:35 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following member(s) were present: Wayne Zacher, NDDOT-Local Government; Ryan Brooks, Grand Forks Planning; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Jon Mason, MnDOT-District 2; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Engineer; and George Palo, NDDOT-Local District.

Absent: Brad Bail, Troy Schroeder, Nick West, Tom Ford, Ryan Riesinger, Dale Bergman, Rich Sanders, Michael Johnson, Lane Magnuson, Nels Christianson, Christian Danielson, and Jason Peterson.

Guest(s) present: Diomo Motuba, ATAC; Jason Carbee, HDR Engineering, John Cock, Bolton and Menk; Raymond Eliot, Bolton and Menk; and Kristen Sperry, FHWA Bismarck; Voni Vegar, MnDOT; Erika Shepard, MnDOT, Barry Wilfahrt, GF/EGF Chamber.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Halford declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MAY 10, 2023, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE THE MAY 10TH, 2023, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 14th, 2023**

ACTION ITEMS:

**MATTER OF PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE BIKE/PEDESTRIAN PLAN
UPDATE**

Halford said that on-line we do have John Cock and Raymond Eliot from Bolton-Menk to give you an overview of where we are at.

Halford commented that just prior to this meeting the plan was presented to the East Grand Forks Planning and Zoning Commission, they did approve it. She added that there weren't really any questions, it was more what we see most times when we go through these approval processes, it kind of stirs up that conversation of what a plan is, which is good, so there was a lot of good discussion.

Halford stated that the plan was also presented to the Grand Forks Planning and Zoning Commission last week, and there was a lot of good discussion there as well however it was a long meeting, so they were good with what has been done with the plan, and they approved it pretty quickly.

Halford said that John and Raymond have a little presentation they would like to give us today.

Cock referred to a power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and gave a brief overview of the plan and the process of what is in it.

Cock referred to the presentation and said that he would start with the vision and some of the current conditions and some of the public input they received, the recommendations.

Cock commented that as part of this process they had a Steering Committee made up of different agencies and groups from the region, some of you here today were part of that, the cities, the DOTs, FHWA, etc. He said that based on the feedback from those individuals as well as the public they came up with this vision statement and these guiding principles, which are sort of the overarching direction for the plan and the recommendations and the performance measures, etc.

Cock stated that being a community where year-round walking and biking are safe, comfortable, convenient, common and enjoyable for people of all ages and abilities; they word smith that a lot and have some guiding principles to go with it, which they detail in the plan, but the big headings are safety, improving mobility, increasing walking and biking rates, replace private vehicle trips, focus on community needs and investing wisely.

Cock commented that the plan began with looking at demographics, and how people are traveling in the region today. He said that the good news is that in this region there are plenty of short trips that could be replaced, from time to time with biking, walking and transit.

Cock said that other demographic features from our review, both of field reviews and looking at demographic data, not unlike most American communities, there are many people living without

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 14th, 2023**

vehicles, or having access or ability to drive, or limited access, including folks that are either physically unable or due to age not able drive, so we have to think about all of those communities, as well as sort of the range of different types of cyclists from those that are comfortable sharing the road with cars to folks that are more comfortable on a quiet street or off-street type of facility. He pointed out that in their surveys about 40% of the folks said that they would do more walking and biking if they felt the network were safer.

Cock stated that they looked at the safety trends for the previous five years and you can see the reported crashes on the map. He said that crash density and location was one of the factors they used in determining their network recommendations as well as their prioritization.

Cock said that they also had very extensive and very positive public engagement, public feedback with lots of different ways for people to get involved; everything from a committee and public ride to look at some of the existing facilities to on-line and in-person engagement, multiple rounds of engagement in person on each side of the river, as well as some detailed engagement around some of the priority corridors, which we will talk about more in a moment.

Cock reported that what they heard from the public, from the survey, a majority of folks want to invest more in walking and biking in the region and would like to live in walkable and bikeable neighborhoods. He said that nearly half of the folks thought that the Grand Forks area was pretty good for biking, but improvements could still be made. He stated that some of the big issues were east/west connections, bridges across the river, more signage and wayfinding in East Grand Forks today, pavement conditions, railroad crossings, and then making sure that people are following the rules of the road. He said that some other things they heard at the open houses, and again these are big schematic arenas, and they have more of the details identified in the plan, but general safety, congestion, making sure funds are spent responsibly, making sure the network is well planned and connected, that we are planning for future growth in the region, and that we are prioritizing projects and investments wisely with public input reflected.

Cock said that they did do some additional public input around the five priority corridors that they identified through the prioritization process and public input and they got some very good feedback at those meetings that was focused on individual corridors. He stated that he thinks one of the big highlights from those meetings is that additional study and additional public input will be needed to gain some consensus on what kinds of facilities should be implemented on those corridors, given some of the tradeoffs that will need to be made.

Cock stated that as part of the technical analysis they looked at a lot of demographics and analysis of existing conditions. He pointed out that the slides show just a few of the things they looked at in terms of demand for walking and bicycling facilities and where people are that need to walk and bike as well as looking at the existing network and how it serves or what the level of comfort is that might be reflected for people who are walking and biking today in the region.

Cock commented that, again, this is an update to the previous plan, so they started with network recommendations from the last plan. He said that they used public input and input from the committee, and their own analysis to develop the long-range network recommendations map that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 14th, 2023**

is shown on the slide. He said that solid lines are existing facilities, pink lines are multi-use paths, the dashed lines are the recommended network, but overall, 130 miles of various types of walking and biking improvements are shown as well as some crossing improvements, although those are sort of “to be determined” in terms of what the nature of those improvements would be.

Cock said that the recommendations included everything from crossing improvements, filling sidewalk gaps, the full range of bicycling facilities for on-street as well as shared use and bicycling facilities that would be separated from the roadway corridors.

Cock stated that the plan includes design guidelines that can be used in designing facilities, but also used in helping to provide direction to private sector partners who may be developing pieces of the network. He added that they also had a sub-committee of the steering committee, and some additional representatives who looked at recommendations for safe routes to school around the elementary schools in the region. He said that they developed network maps for each of the schools as well as some non-infrastructure recommendations that would apply to all the schools as well.

Cock said that they took all of their analysis, they took the public input and the steering committee input and put it together to develop a list of prioritization factors, and then they used a GIS analysis to come up with, out of the universe of all of the range of project types, which were the highest scoring on these features for the region and the result was the list shown on the map. He said that the lines in the darker purple are the higher priority needs, and you can see a lot of east/west connections on the Grand Forks side and a mixture of connections on the East Grand Forks side, in terms of prioritization, and then from that and from the public input they came up with a list of five projects, priority corridors, to look at further, in terms of some very preliminary feasibility, and those are the corridors they took to the public to get additional feedback on.

Cock stated that they also included in the plan some high-level planning cost estimates for facility design, construction, and maintenance, which communities and partners can use for developing capital plans. He said that they also developed a set of recommendations that are non-infrastructure in nature in the areas of education, encouragement, equity, and evaluation, which is another way to say additional planning and evaluation of the recommendations in this plan. He stated that they had policy recommendations as well as recommendations for each of the communities to adjust their regulatory standards for walking and biking in new development, so these are all things that will be complimentary to the infrastructure investments and to help create a culture of walking and biking in the region and are based on some of the criteria in the Walk Friendly and Bike Friendly community applications.

Cock said that that is the high-level overview, and he thinks that everyone has been presented with a copy of the draft plan, but they would be pleased to take any questions or comments you may have at this time.

Kuharenko said that he has a couple of questions. He said that when he was going through the appendices of the draft plan, he ended up looking at Appendix G, and at the tail end there is a cover sheet for a Sub-Appendix A, regarding the Grandfather Clause, but he didn't see anything

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 14th, 2023**

after that when he looked at the on-line version, are you aware if there is supposed to be something back there or can you tell him any other details on that. Eliot responded that that was going to include a copy of the Grand Forks Grandfather Clause as means of listing out where areas are exempt from sidewalks, and there just must have been an issue of version history or stitching it together so he can get updated version of that out later today.

Kuharenko said that the other comment coming from his department was on Pages 60 and 61, for Tables 2 and 3, which calls out the priority projects for Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, and whether it would be possible to add a column with the approximate cost estimates using the tables you developed on your cost per foot or cost per mile for each of those priority projects. Cock responded that they absolutely could do that.

Cock commented that he would also like to acknowledge that Dave has contributed some really really good input on this plan, and it would not be what it is today without the input, the very detailed, thoughtful, thorough input that he has provided, and many other stakeholders as well, they had a great steering committee, but he wanted to give Dave special kudos.

Halford reported that, just so everyone is up-to-date, recently she gave an MPO 101 update to the full councils on both sides, and that was something she really highlighted, that when we come forward with these plans, it isn't just coming from the MPO, but it is your staff that you've hired that have been part of these conversations, it has been the federal partners and the DOTs that have come forward, all working together so that when we do get these comments back they are very helpful and make the plans that much better.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY GIVE PRELIMINARY APPROVAL TO THE FINAL DRAFT BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PLAN SUBJECT TO INCLUSION OF CHANGES DISCUSSED.

Voting Aye: Brooks, Zacher, Ellis, Mason, Emery, Kuharenko, and Palo.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Schroeder, Sanders, West, Ford, Riesinger, Bergman, Danielson, Bail, Peterson, Johnson, Christianson, and Magnuson.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2023-2026 TIP AMENDMENT #4

Kouba reported that we recently received a request for an update of our T.I.P. from MnDOT. She said that it is for a cost change between the project that we have listed in our T.I.P. and the project that is currently needed to, what is available.

Kouba stated that they are reducing the cost mostly because part of the cost estimate included parts of the project that have already been done, so they are eliminating those elements and just moving forward with the signal replacement, so it is a reduced cost that is more than 25% change so we are just looking for the approval to amend the T.I.P.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 14th, 2023**

Kouba said that we have not had any public input, and there isn't anyone from the public currently here, so if anyone has any questions feel free to ask them now, otherwise we are looking for approval of the T.I.P. Amendment #4.

Kuharenko asked what year this project is programmed in. Kouba responded that she believes it is in 2024, but they will be letting bids in 2023.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE 2023-2026 T.I.P. AMENDMENT #4, AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Brooks, Zacher, Ellis, Mason, Emery, Kuharenko, and Palo.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Schroeder, Sanders, West, Ford, Riesinger, Bergman, Danielson, Bail, Peterson, Johnson, Christianson, and Magnuson.

NON-ACTION ITEMS:

MATTER OF PROTECT GRANT SOLICITATION

Kouba reported that Minnesota has come up with, has looked at how they are going to do a formula for dividing out their formula funds throughout their districts and District 2 has presented what they are looking at and their scoring and their application process for these funds.

Kouba stated that there is \$500,000 available in 2024 and in 2025, and they are looking for applications for both years. She said that the funding split will be 80% Federal and 20% Local match.

Kouba said that it is kind of a joint application, and we have the same deadline as the ATPs, so the MPO needs to have applications from within the MPO study area to the ATP by August 18th. She stated that this is just the solicitation of projects and is just on the Minnesota side, so we will be letting our Executive Policy Board now about this solicitation as well, and if you need any assistance with the application, please contact herself, Jon Mason or Troy Schroeder with MnDOT.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON STREET/HIGHWAY PLAN WITH MODELING

Kouba reported that, as you know, we are basically looking at where we are at in this process, we look at this plan every five years. She stated that she knows that most of the committee has had a lot of information already about where we are at but now that we recently received our traffic demand modeling data, we have some additional information that Jason Carbee, with HDR, will share with us today.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 14th, 2023**

Carbee said that today we are going to talk about progress and, we have spoken a few times with you about this, but essentially they have really worked through the goals and objectives, identified kind of framework and approach for how we are going to tackle the Street and Highway Plan and the overall Metropolitan Transportation Plan, but really focused on reviewing previous plans, taking the data that is available not only from other plans but from other data sources and really going through it and kind of identifying where we are with the system today.

Carbee stated that they looked at federal guidance, making sure, again this all about how we prioritize some of the federal spending in the MPO area and really focusing on doing that federally compliantly, and then we did have the public meeting in November, and again they have probably given a quick update on this, but they had a separate stakeholder discussion with a lot of different interests in the region and then they had a public open house at the East Grand Forks Library, and the things they really heard from both those groups is that this plan really ought to focus on safety, efficiency and reliability, having good connections in the metro area, and then kind of reinforcing what we just heard on the action item, reinforcing how the street plan can really get bicycle and pedestrian connections worked into the whole system.

Carbee said that he won't go into a whole lot of detail on each of the goals, but we do have five goal areas, and with each of those goal areas they worked on measurable objectives, and essentially they are a combination of things that were identified locally through discussions with the stakeholders and the public and with some of the existing plans in the area, and also making sure we are checking all the boxes on the federal performance measures that we need to report to each DOT, but again the five goal areas are efficient and reliable, safe, connected and accessible, making sure we take care of the assets we currently have so preserve and maintain, and then consistent with the last item, talking about the Protect funding, making sure we have a sustainable and resilient system. He added that, again, there are objectives associated with each of those, and they will help us identify which of the strategies and projects that come out of the next phase of the study, and how we are going to rank them.

Carbee stated that, again we have talked about a lot of this, the current safety, we looked at five years of crash records and identified some of those hot spots, how the system is operating, reliability and traffic operations congestion, pavement and bridge, looking at connectivity of the network, and the environmental baseline, kind of where we are at with some of the floodplains, wetlands, and things like that.

Carbee said that in draft form what they are working through is the future conditions, and next Diomo will discuss the travel model, but that is the basis for some of the preliminary baseline traffic forecasts they have started to put together.

Kouba commented that since Diomo has finished the traffic model we wanted to make sure we forwarded it to the committee, to bring it forward so he can explain what he saw and what went into the model itself.

Motuba, A.T.A.C., was present for a brief presentation on the Grand Forks-East Grand Forks 2020 Travel Demand Model.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 14th, 2023**

Motuba reported that he has been doing modeling work, so developing travel demand models, for the past twenty years, and every five years we update it. He said that this time was a bit different because of COVID, so we need to take that into consideration, so normally the base year would have been 2020 but we are using 2021 as the base year.

Motuba referred to a slide and stated that it is an outline of what he is going to talk about, and he likes to talk, he is a teacher, so he will try to keep it short, he has only ten minutes.

Motuba said that he will talk about how we updated the process, what goes into the model, how they calibrated and validated the model.

Motuba stated that the model is a computer simulation model that tries to replicate real world travel, how many trips people are making, where they are going, what model choices, what choices they are making when they are making their route, and it also tries to look at how congestion is considered when making those trips. He said that the output is a model that shows you the amount of traffic using our functionally classified roadways in the area, and so to update that model we use socioeconomic data, the number of households, how many people in a household, network data, employment data, etc, so we do a trip generation where we go in and say how many trips are generated on average per household per day, and then we look at where the trips go, so on average where do trips from one zone go for maybe work, most people have a fixed area where they go to work, and then we do a model to see what modes of travel are people using, are they riding bikes, driving a car, taking the bus, etc.; in the model we don't explicitly include walk or bike, and then they do a traffic assignment, which is how many trips and what routes are they using to go from their origin to their destination and finally they do a calibration and validation, which is to input the parameters that go into the simulation model and validation is comparing it to real world data and trying to figure out things like traffic counts, vehicle miles traveled, and things like that.

Motuba said that for the input that goes into the model they developed a model that reflects 2021 jobs and households, again the reason being that 2020 was a COVID year, and if they had tried to calibrate a model to 2020, they would not get the right amount of traffic because of all the things that were going on that year. He added that they look at school enrollments, household sizes, UND campus students, airport enplanements, and they also look at special generators like malls, the hospital, and they also found out that in our area Walmart generates more traffic compared to other big box stores. He said that they also look at ADT traffic counts that are done within the region, and then they updated the network to reflect 2021 conditions.

Motuba stated that this is what goes into the model, and there are four main steps, they do a model that is called a "trip based" model. He added that there is another model, an "activity based" model, that offers more in-depth information, but they don't do that model, it would take a lot of additional data and a lot of time and cost, but from what they have seen it is a model that can help with more policy questions, for example things that have to do with environmental justice and things like that, but for our purposes for transportation planning it might not be as helpful, and from what they have seen from conferences they don't necessarily improve the predictability of a base model.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 14th, 2023**

Motuba reported that the first step, Trip Generations, is the number of trips that each household will produce on average, and they use trips rates they look at nationally, regionally, and from North Dakota. He said that that is what they used for this, and they also adjust them to maybe reflect the total trips that originated in Grand Forks, to reflect the traffic that is assigned on the roadway network so they do a comprehensive look into that. He added that the only regional model that he used where a survey has been done has been from Fargo/Moorehead so they looked at that and then compared it nationally, and this will be a good match for the MPO because it cost quite a bit of money, and he knows that when Fargo did it in 2012 they put out an RFP for about \$300,000 and they had to increase that amount before they could get a consultant to do it.

Motuba stated that they look at three main trip purposes, work from home, shopping and other non-work purposes from home, and trips that don't originate from home. He said that after they generate those trips they distribute them and then they look at what mode they are using and then they assign it to the network, so those are the steps they are using, and this year is just an update process, but they go through different things, testing the model, checking the model to see if it is representing ground truths, and so they do adjust the model several times before they get the final model.

Motuba commented that for each of the steps they have different outcomes; the first steps they develop trips at each zone that will produce and attract. He added that they use North Dakota and Minnesota averages and compare them to national rates and then they are compared to MPO models or cities of similar sizes, because we don't have local trip generation data but even if we did have it we would still would be adjusting them, and we also evaluate how COVID has changed the number of trips we are making, and how it will continue to impact traffic. He said that trips were down about 13% in 2021 compared to pre-covid so they adjusted for that. He referred to a slide and pointed out that, for example when they looked at the model from 2015 compared to 2021, this is what they see, and it was also shown by the traffic data that A.T.A.C. collected for Grand Forks. He said that they saw an overall reduction between 12% and 15% in traffic for 2021, so the important question is will this stay the same or will it increase, we are still in that phase where we aren't sure where we are going to land.

Motuba stated that going into how we validate and calibrate the model, they adjust some of the parameters, for example trip generation equations, and also they compare to real world observed data, he is just going to mention a few of them, there is going to be a report that is going to have all of this in it; they compare vehicle mile trips (VMT – vehicle miles traveled) and that is coming from NDDOT; they look at street light crossings, so the amount of trips that are crossing between Grand Forks and East Grand Forks across the river and crossing I-29. He added that previously they used data they got from StreetLight, but he thinks that with the new data source they have gotten they should be able to maybe go back and just look at how the model was matching to the street and then also the traffic counts too.

Motuba referred to a slide showing Model VMT compared to observed VMT for Grand Forks and stated that it shows what they got out of the model compared to VMT for Grand Forks from

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 14th, 2023**

the NDDOT and from MnDOT too, but this is the one from the NDDOT. He stated that they knew that the model was going to have some differences, and they know that on a daily basis any route or road that you take is going to have some variance, but they want to be below or above the second variant, and for all the different functional classification roadways we meet the criteria, the worst performing were the collectors and local streets, which is expected because of the low traffic using those roadways. He stated that for MnDOT, the data provided for you is for U.S. Highways, MN Highways, Municipal State Aid Streets, and Municipal Streets, and they looked at those streets and see whether or not we are generating the same amount of VMT, and for this the Minnesota Highway was the worst performing, at -9.30%, but we were still within where we wanted to be, within 10%.

Motuba referred to a slide showing screenline comparisons. He explained that screenlines are just barriers for travel, like the Red River, BNSF Railroad, I-29. He stated that they wanted to see traffic, the amount of traffic crossing those barriers for traffic, whether we are presenting those numbers, and for the most part we did; BNSF Railroad will be an interesting one, with the new overpass that is going to be built, we will need to check it again since it was just approved, and see how it gets included in the 2040 model.

Motuba stated that they feel that they calibrated the model reasonably. He referred to maps showing how traffic is coming and going at different locations and went over them briefly.

Motuba said that they also compared trip length frequency distribution (shown on the map). He stated that this is the number of trips within the MPO area that occur within a certain amount of time, so how many trips do we have between 10 and 15 minutes, how many trips do we have that are between 15 and 20 minutes, and so on, and they don't expect an exact match, but observed trips is shown in blue and modeled trips are shown in red, so now the trips we are seeing from national data bases, in terms of what Grand Forks is producing is about 12.5 minutes and when they compared them to the model they were quite similar.

Motuba pointed out that they also compared the traffic counts to the model observed volumes and this is pretty much what we want to see, we are going to see some variances, if we had one straight line with all the numbers on the line, if he sees that then he knows there is some cheating going on.

Motuba said that they also compared observed ADT by volume range, so anything greater than 25,000 may be a difference of 500, it isn't that much but if an ADT is less than 1,000 and you have a difference of 500 than that is really a big difference because it is a 50% difference as opposed to maybe a 5% difference. He stated that overall, they saw that the model was replicating what we wanted to see, and they do this just to see that the different volume ranges are doing what we expect them to do. He added that they also do this by functional classification so they can see whether the different functional classes are performing well, sometimes the major might have a have a five mile an hour higher speed compared to a minor roadway and because of the slow condition, most of the traffic will be assigned to a major roadway so we try to make sure that the model is replicating what we found. He said that, again, they aren't going to be 100%, the one that was underperforming was Major Roadways at 75%, so at the end of the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 14th, 2023**

day they do an adjustment to make sure that the 75% becomes 100%, they do some adjustments to these numbers so that in the future when they do the model it will take that into account.

Motuba commented that the next steps they, the MPO has obtained Urban SDK, and Teri can talk to that, but he has looked at it, it is really cool data, so they will be looking at some of that data and see how we can incorporate it with the model to see what it looks like. He said that they will then provide final documentation and the model to the MPO and also participate in developing scenario analysis for the Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

QUESTIONS:

Kuharenko stated that he has a couple of questions regarding the Model VMT. He referred to a slide showing Model VMT Compared to Observed VMT and said that we've got the accepted deviations, and they vary anywhere from 5% to 15%; can you explain a little bit more as to kind of the origin of how an acceptable deviation, in the far-right column, how that is determined. Motuba responded that these are determined by functional classification, what that functional classification is, and so this is overall for all of the highways, so we are looking at the functional classification. He said that, unfortunately it isn't apples to apples, Minnesota reports it differently than how North Dakota reports it, so what they have done is, in the past they looked at how a VMT is changing from the data that they collected over at A.T.A.C., how does that VMT vary on a day to day basis, how does it vary on a year to year basis and they found that on average, for some of the streets, it is about plus or minus 10%, also he can put out that there is a report that FHWA put out that says that when you do modeling this is what is expected or this is what is acceptable from a modeling point, so there are several different sources, and he could read it but it will be in the report.

Kuharenko said that, just one other piece of clarification; he referred to a slide showing screenline comparisons and stated that you said before that this is crossing these various locations, one of his initial questions was when first reading through this packet, was that I-29 has a 10% accepted deviation here, but in previous slides the accepted deviation for an interstate is 5%, but this is a completely different data point that you are looking at, correct. Motumba responded that this is totally different, it is crossing across I-29, not on I-29. Kuharenko said that the other question he has on this slide in particular is, looking at I-29 and seeing that there is a 10% difference, and that accepted deviation is plus or minus 10% it kind of looks like it is right on the line, do you have any concerns regarding that particular data point. Motumba responded that he does have some concerns and, referring to the maps, stated that that is why he did the Traffic Crossing I-94 on University Avenue map, because most of that traffic is what is crossing on University Avenue. He referred back to the screenline comparison table and pointed out that there is a 7,000 difference, though he thinks it is one that they are going to go in and look at again and try to figure out where the traffic is going to, but he thinks mostly the contributors are the Walmart on the west side of town and also US Highway 2 West, that is where the traffic is going, so that Walmart is attracting quite a bit of traffic so they will probably have to go back into the model and look at the attraction trips are for that area.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 14th, 2023**

Kouba commented that basically all of that information has given us some additional information; it gives us a lot of information as to where we want to go in the future. She referred to the slides showing household and employment information and commented that, just for reference, this is kind of what the MPO was giving Diomo for that household as well as the employment information. She continued with the slide presentation and stated that this is the first flush of information that we've gotten from the model itself.

Carbee referred to the slide presentation and pointed out that we are seeing a lot of household growth on the south side of Grand Forks, and some growth on the north side of East Grand Forks. He said that employment is kind of spread-out all-over kind of that western periphery, and in the north and in the south, so you can see that that leads to this, which is overall forecasted growth, and you can see the darkest and widest lines are over 25,000 ADT. He added that you can see today that that amount of ADT really starts to stretch further to the south and a little bit further to the west too, particularly on the Grand Forks side and so here is a map/picture of what they call a Delta map, it is basically the difference between the base year of 2021 and future year 2050, and you can see we have a lot of places where we are growing over 10,000 average daily traffic, including that 47th Avenue Interchange and the 47th Avenue Corridor, but you know all the way down to Merrifield Road we are seeing some growth and traffic, and that really matches up actually really well with what we showed for that growth concept on the land use side, and this doesn't show up great at this scale, but they are starting to see a lot of congestion on the current two-way rural sections of Columbia and Washington, south of 47th. He said that they continue to see issues pretty much all the way down to Merrifield. He added that they are assuming that 47th Avenue South is just a two-lane road to start with the new interchange; they are seeing volumes of about 20,000 so at some point it will probably need to be a four lane.

Carbee stated that in the more mature parts of the city they are starting to see issues, pretty much from Washington over to the East Grand Forks side, DeMers has got some operational issues and he thinks that we see some of that today already, but even Columbia and Washington we start seeing volume to capacity ratios indicating that we will have some peak hour congestion, and then we see, again to the west, on Gateway and DeMers we also start to see some of those issues where we have four lanes on Gateway and two and three lanes on that section of DeMers so there may be some potential future widenings. He stated that one of the things they are transitioning to after this is kind of developing, after our public meeting coming up next week, is to start coming up with a project list and talking about priorities, and so we will probably have two different sets of options for the mature corridors like Gateway, Washington, Columbia, he knows there have been historical plans for six lanes on some of those; right-of-way constraints, frontage roads, that is going to be pretty impactful; do we talk about maybe some management strategies, could be combinations of signals, other strategies, he knows there has been a long discussion of the bridge crossing, obviously, so a southern bridge crossing or a northern bridge crossing could help alleviate some of that congestion to those corridors, so those are the types of alternatives that we will start looking at, and they will be looking for some input on this in the short-term.

Kouba referred to said that in the Belmont area, and Cherry, as well as 24th, 17th, 13th, you see a lot of increase in traffic, and those are all roads that are going to be connected to traveling back and forth, making traffic decisions like should I go on DeMers to get to Washington, or should I

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 14th, 2023**

go down Belmont to get to Washington or even further south to 32nd, and that is one of the reasons why when we present information to the public there will be a strategy of using a bridge as mitigating some of those issues. Carbee added that that will be one of the alternatives in the plan to discuss.

Carbee stated that looking at Diomo's presentation again, it is kind of an outside perspective and all the validation statistics looked kind of like a good model, and, again, looking at what we gave it for land use and everything else this is what I expect to see, and again, travel models are tools, and it is best estimates and ability to look at options and make decisions, and what he is seeing so far seems to make sense and can help support them through their alternatives analysis.

Carbee referred to the 2050 Street and Highway Plan Schedule and stated that the public open house will be on Wednesday, July 21st from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. at the Empire. He added that for the next couple of months they will be working through the alternatives analysis; we talked about those objectives, what they will do is use those objectives to help them work through what strategies make the most sense. He said that they have talked to both DOTs about funding, so they will kind of wrap up the financial plan by late-summer, and in August and September they will start developing that framework for recommendations, go to an open house, and then start working on the draft plan this fall with the adoption at the end of the year.

Kouba said that with the alternatives, the biggest question is will we be able to bring some of that information to the Technical Advisory Committee to get eyes on it by our July meetings. Carbee responded that they will start developing project lists and then we will see how quick Diomo can turn around travel model runs, he hopes we can talk about that in more substance next month, but they are going to wait for input next week and then his goal will be to have some project lists and then we can talk about alternatives by the end of the month. Kouba said that we will be running pretty fast the next couple of months.

MATTER OF NDDOT CONTRACT AMENDMENT

Halford reported that this is just an amendment to the contract so instead of a two-year contract they want to move to a year-by-year contract. She said that we currently just started the first year of a two-year contract, FY2023 and FY2024, but the amended contract will be just for FY2023 and then closer to the end of the year we will start looking at FY2024.

Halford stated that this will go to the MPO Executive Policy Board for a formal approval process, but she just wanted to give the Technical Advisory Committee a head up as well.

Kuharenko asked, we are still on the two-year Unified Planning Work Program, DOT is shifting to a one-year, has there been any thought as to, kind of similar to what we have for our T.I.P. where we are looking out four or five years, instead of having a two-year plan we have a four-year plan, or something along those lines. Halford responded that we will keep our work program as two years and we will probably, her thought is a transition where instead of just looking at it every two years and doing amendments, after a year as gone by, just like we do for our T.I.P., so we will continue to do that with our work program, she has no intention of

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 14th, 2023**

changing that, that will be at least two-year increments, but probably more like our T.I.P. model, this is just our contract that is changing to a year. She added that on the Minnesota side we are currently doing it year by year, so this is nothing new to us, so as of now it will be the same.

MATTER OF ATAC CONTRACT AMENDMENT

Halford reported that this is a similar item to which we would normally just bring to our Executive Policy Board but, again, she wanted the Technical Advisory Committee to be aware of it.

Halford explained that with the delay for the modeling and getting that going, we made an amendment to this contract to extend it to the beginning of the year, but we really should have extended it to the end of year. She said that we want Diomo to be part of the conversations until we are done with the Street and Highway Plan, so really this is just an amendment to the contract date as well, and the cost is not changing, and she wanted the Technical Advisory Committee to be aware of that. She stated that the current end date has ended, and we want to extend it to the end of the year.

Kuharenko said that he has a question that isn't exactly related to the amendment, but more to the contract that we have with A.T.A.C. He stated that he knows that A.T.A.C. ends up doing a lot of our traffic signals and incorporating them into the traffic counting program, and knows we have seen that in the past, so just at a couple of locations he just wanted to make sure we get on or radar.

Kuharenko stated that there are a couple of signals in town that we should have connected with fiber now, that weren't previously; there is one at the intersection of South 20th Street and 47th Avenue South, he wants to say that that was installed a year or two ago, and they have a signal at South 20th Street and 24th Avenue South, that he believes was connected to fiber also about two years ago, and then they have two signals that will be coming on line, one of them is part of the South Washington Reconstruction Project, where they are reconstructing Washington to a five lane section from the south end drain way down to 57th, and as part of that they are going to be installing a new traffic signal at South Washington and 55th Avenue South, that will probably be installed this winter he would guess just because of lead times, but that is one to get on the radar, and then as part of their Urban Signal Rehabilitation Program Project they have coming up this year, he believes they will also be replacing the signal at South 20th Street and 17th Avenue South, that signal is currently already being counted so he doesn't know if that is just a matter of recalibration, but those are just a couple of signals that he knows are either not currently on the counting program, or might be getting tweaked in the future, so just a couple of things to keep on the radar.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 14th, 2023**

OTHER BUSINESS

A. 2022/2023 Annual Work Program Project Update

- 1) Bicycle/Pedestrian Element Update: Halford said that she doesn't need to go through this item as we already discussed it, but she would like to mention that we are in the preliminary approval process and should be completed with that by the end of June, and then we will begin the final approval process in July, so hopefully we will have this wrapped up in August.
- 2) Street/Highway Element Update: Halford said that, again, she doesn't need to go through this item as we already discussed it.
- 3) Aerial Imagery – Halford reported that this is moving along, and they are expecting to get the final information to us at the beginning of August.

B. MPO Updates

- 1) MPO 2023 Audit – Halford reported that we did have an audit preformed in May, and the Final Audit Report will be presented to the MPO Executive Policy Board at their meeting next Wednesday, but we just wanted the Technical Advisory Committee to know that the audit went very well.
- 2) MPO 101 Update – Halford reported that she gave an MPO 101 Update to both City Councils. She said that they both appreciated what we are doing and there were no big questions, just that we are doing great work, which is always good to hear, sometimes it is nice to get a little bit of feedback.
- 3) Mid-Year Review – Halford reported that we will be having our Mid-Year Review on June 26th, on Monday. She said that the review is done with some of our Federal and State partners, on-line and in the room, coming together for half a day, telling them how well we've been doing. She explained that it is nice to have that open conversation to kind of go over some things.
- 4) Safe Street For All (SS4A) Grant – Halford reported that she has been having conversations with Kristen and Sandy and they have gone back and forth with a draft agreement; where it is sitting right now is where she just needs to schedule a meeting with David and Nancy and get their eyes on it and work out the bugs and get it signed and maybe get an RFP out late summer early fall.
- 5) Transportation Planner Position – Halford reported that we have posted for a Transportation Planner/Senior Planner. She stated that we received around eight applicants, so she will be going through those to start the first round of interviews, hopefully there are a few in there that we can interview, and even

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 14th, 2023**

better maybe hire one from that group, so if you know anyone that might be interested and might be a good fit, push them our way.

- 6) Bridge Update – Halford reported that we hadn’t heard from the consultants for a while, but either today or yesterday she got an email from them, and they did mention that, hey we are still here, they are reviewing documents and doing some funding research and are looking at setting up a meeting with both DOTs, having us set up that meeting. She added that they are also excited to be using the Urban SDK Software as well, so we’ll give them access to that.

Kouba commented that she knows that the consultants have requested information from Diomo as well.

C. Agency Updates

- 1) Kuharenko reported that the City of Grand Forks received funding for the 42nd Street Underpass last Monday. Halford said that that is a big win for the City of Grand Forks.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO ADJOURN THE JUNE 14TH, 2023 MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:37 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager