

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 12th, 2023**

CALL TO ORDER

Stephanie Halford, Chairman, called the July 12th, 2023, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:33 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following member(s) were present: Becky Hanson (Proxy for Wayne Zacher), NDDOT-Local Government; Ryan Brooks, Grand Forks Planning; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Engineer; George Palo, NDDOT-Local District; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; Gracie Lian (Proxy For Tom Ford), Grand Forks County.

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

Guest(s) present: Wayne Zacher, NDDOT-Local Government; Mulugeta Amare, University of North Dakota; Tim Finseth, NWRDC; Bobbi Retzlaff, Minnesota FHWA; Kristen Sperry, North Dakota FHWA; Erika Shepard, MnDOT; Daba Gedafa, University of North Dakota; and Donna Pence

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.

INTRODUCTIONS

Halford asked that, because we have some new faces here today, everyone please state their name and the organization they represent.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 14, 2023, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE THE JUNE 14TH, 2023, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 12th, 2023**

ACTION ITEMS:

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF MPO SELF-CERTIFICATION

Kouba reported that basically what this is is a document that basically states that we are following all the federal regulations and we are doing it in the correct order and all of that. She stated that normally we have done this at the same time as our T.I.P., but just to kind of smooth things through a little bit, and make sure the document is as finished as possible when you guys start looking at the final draft, we thought that we could get this done a little sooner, so that is basically why we are looking for a recommendation to approve forwarding this to the MPO Executive Policy Board for approval.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE MPO SELF-CERTIFICATION, AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Brooks, Hanson, Ellis, Emery, Kuharenko, Palo, Bergman, and Lian.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

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

MATTER OF FINAL APPROVAL OF THE BIKE/PED PLAN UPDATE

Halford reported that we are at the finish line. She said that the only update to the document you saw at your last meeting was a request to add cost estimates to the projects we had along with priority corridors, so Bolton-Menk made those changes and the document has been updated.

Halford stated that the document has been moving through the approval process, so she would open it up for any comments or motions.

Kuharenko said that he would like to say thank you for making those changes that were brought forward last month.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PLAN UPDATE, AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Brooks, Hanson, Ellis, Emery, Kuharenko, Palo, Bergman, and Lian.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

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

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 12th, 2023**

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF 2023-2026 T.I.P. AMENDMENT #5

Kouba reported that a request was made by the NDDOT to make some adjustments to the 2023-2026 T.I.P. She said that one is for the project on 32nd Avenue South that would basically split the project with both using 2023 funding dollars, but only the portion of the project shown in the staff report will be constructed in 2023 while the other portion will be constructed in 2024.

Kouba stated that the other adjustment is for the addition of a new project to do the Preliminary Engineering phase of the 42nd Street and DeMers Avenue Railroad Overpass project.

Kuharenko said that he has one question on the 32nd Avenue Mill and Overlay project, it is showing here that it has a \$1.3 million cost, but the bid they got on it was just under \$1.9 million so is that going to end up causing issues because it is greater than the 25% change that we typically have for a required change. Zacher responded that that is where we end up getting in trouble. He explained that they are doing this T.I.P. amendment just to get a few things rolling, and you're right, the cost did come in higher, so the question is do we change it again later if there is a need for a change order at a later date. He stated that he doesn't really have an answer, just because it is a slippery slope, he thinks, and he isn't sure what ramifications we would have; we can but again, it just becomes troublesome if we end up needing a change order that ends up changing the cost again later on. Kuharenko asked if we wouldn't only have to worry about a change order if it is greater than 25% at that point. Zacher responded that that would be true, so he is fine with whatever the MPO decides to do, so if you want to put in the bid costs that would be fine, but it can become difficult to track later on too. Zacher commented that that is the long way of saying he doesn't have the answer. He added that it has come up before and it just caused a giant mess. Kouba said, then, that it sounds like the recommendation is to stick with the numbers that are presented in the staff report and if there needs to be changes later, we will work them out at that time.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY PALO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE 2023-2026 T.I.P. AMENDMENT #5, AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Brooks, Hanson, Ellis, Emery, Kuharenko, Palo, Bergman, and Lian.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

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

NON-ACTION ITEMS:

MATTER OF UND TRAFFIC SPEED STUDY UPDATE

Halford introduced Daba Gedafa and Mulugeta Amare from UND and said that they are here today to give a brief presentation on where they are at with the UND Traffic Speed Study update.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 12th, 2023**

Amare introduced himself and stated that he is here today to present their update on Traffic Speed, Traffic Calming Techniques, and Safety Implications for Pedestrians and Bicyclists.

Amare referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and gave a brief overview of where they are at with the study.

Presentation continued.

Slide 1: Outline – Amare stated that the outline of the presentation includes Introduction, Objectives and things they have done so far that they divided into three parts; Part I – Literature Review, Part II – Traffic Crash Data Analysis, Part III – Speed Data Analysis; and finally, Conclusions and Future Work.

Slide 2: Introduction – Amare said that as an introduction for the project, traffic safety are any measures that can be used to improve or to minimize the effect of traffic crashes or traffic deaths. He stated that they used traffic signs and traffic speed calming techniques as a safety measure, and the traffic speed was seen in terms of the minimum, maximum, and the 85th percentile speed of the average speed and the traffic speed calming techniques that would be considered for this project are only the engineering traffic speed calming techniques and the other techniques would not be considered.

Slide 3: Objectives – Amare commented that objectives of the project are determining the effects of traffic calming techniques; identifying hot spot areas, this is an analysis of the six-year crash data that they got from the city; and analyzing the effect of yield and stop signs.

Slide 4: Part I – Literature Review – Amare stated that they have picked three of the reviews that they have cited in the report and the first one is the Federal Highway Administration Traffic Calming ePrimer. He said that from this report there is a finding that says that the 85th percentile speed was found to decrease with the use of calming techniques which are speed humps, speed tables, median islands, circles and chokers. He stated that they also found that there was a significant decrease in the crash numbers or crash rate, as well as the crash severity, they have decreased up to 10% and 27% respectively.

Amare said that the second literature that they found was a diagnostic analysis of the effect of weather condition on pedestrian crash severity, and here the authors used some statistical regression modeling to see the effect of weather on the pedestrian crashes, and they found that the weather, like hot weather and the presence of rain, is a major contribution for the severe crashes and in addition the effect of driver inattention and reckless driving are also major contributing factors for severe crashes.

Amare stated that the third literature was a traffic safety fact by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration that has shown that the majority of the crashes that occurred in the USA were due to speeding, and if we see the figures, between 8% of the fatal crashes, 13% of the injuries and 10% of the property damage only crashes were due to speeding, and 87% of the crashes in 2020 were on interstate roadways.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 12th, 2023**

Slide 5: Part II – Traffic Crash Data Analysis - Amare said that for the traffic crash data analysis they have used four techniques, the first two techniques are adopted from the HSIP and they have used the weighting factors that were proposed by the North Dakota Department Of Transportation Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), for the equivalent property damage only technique (EPDO) and the Crash Rate Method uses a crash rate formula; and the last two are used for analysis of the temporal and spatial clustering of the traffic crashes in Grand Forks and East Grand Forks. He added that these are analysis tools.

Slide 6 – Study Area And Crash Data – Amare stated that here we can see the map of the crashes on the Grand Forks map; the lines are roads and the dots are crash locations, and there were around 2,048 crashes reported for the past 6 years from 2017 to 2022.

Slide 7 – Crash Data Summary – Figure 2 Number of crashes per crash factors – Amare said that in this report, they found that 45% of the crashes were speed related. He added that from the Vision Zero website in North Dakota they found that any crash that was related to careless driving, following too close, or driving too fast for conditions can be categorized as a speed related factor, having this definition they found that 45% of the crashes were due to speed and the second most contributing factor was failure to yield to pedestrians as well as drivers.

Slide 8 - Crash Data Summary – Figure 3 Age group and sex of drivers – Amare stated that this figure shows that males were involved in more crashes than females, but only by a small percentage for most age groups, and actually comparable in the 19 and under and 80-84 age groups.

Slide 9 – Crash Data Summary – Table 1 Crashes per road surface and weather conditions – Amare stated that most of the crashes, as we can see on the chart are occurring in clear weather and on dry surface conditions, so from this we can conclude that more than 41% of our crashes here in the city are occurring in a normal condition so the weather-related crashes aren't that much.

Slide 10 – Network Analysis by EPDO and CRM – Amare stated that these are the results from the EPDO and the CRM analysis. He said that the one indicated in the left-hand map is the area with the higher eco-balance property damage only, and these will be used as an input for further analysis of streets for the traffic speed study. He added that the map on the right-hand side is the street heat map for the crash rates results, and the ones indicated with the red dots are areas that have higher crash rates.

Slide 11 – Hotspot Analysis (Emerging Hot Spot Analysis) – Amare said that here they tried to see the temporal distribution of the crashes, if there was any crash, but they found that most of the crashes were not temporally clustered, that means the temporal distribution of the crashes were random. He added that only in the central east part of Grand Forks did they find some temporal relation for 90% of the time step intervals.

Slide 12 – Hotspot Analysis (Getis-Ord Gi*) – Amare stated that here they tried to indicate the hotspot and coldspot areas in Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, and the hotspot areas are the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 12th, 2023**

areas with the higher number of crash rates and the coldspot areas are the areas with the lower number of crash rates, so the hotspot areas were clustered in the northeast part and central parts of Grand Forks and the coldspots were clustered in the southeast and southwest and central parts of Grand Forks.

Slide 13 – Part III – Speed Data Analysis – Amare reported that this shows the three locations they have selected for the Speed Data Analysis; 6th Avenue North, South 34th Street, and South 25th Street. He said that these are the areas that they have done the speed data analysis so far, and the traffic signs that they used for their analysis are the in-crosswalk yield and the stop sign.

Slide 14 – Effect of Yield Sign – Amare stated that when we see the effect of the yield sign, for most cases the Average speed, the 85th Percentile speed, and the Maximum speed for the with condition were less than the without condition for both morning and afternoon as well as for both the east/west bound and the north/south bound movement.

Slide 15 – Effect of Stop Sign – Amare said that the same effect was seen when they applied the stop sign on the streets, and the Average, Maximum, and the 85th Percentile speed for most cases were lower than the without condition, and in most cases the average speed with yield sign or stop sign, was less than the posted speed limit.

Slide 16 – Significant Difference Test For Traffic Speed – Amare stated that here they tried to see if the difference in the average speeds for the with and without condition was significant or not and they have used a 95% confidence interval to check if the variation or if the use of these signs were significant in that area and from the overall analysis, as you can see in the green colored values in the right hand column, 100% of the total cases were statistically significant so the use of the yield and stop signs so far have resulted in significant reductions in the average speed of the vehicles.

Slide 17 – Conclusions – Amare said that their conclusions for the things that have happened so far are the cold spot locations were clustered in the southeast, central, and northwest parts of Grand Forks, while most of the clustered hot spots were found in the northeast and central parts of Grand Forks; there was spatiotemporal clustering in the central-east part of Grand Forks while the other areas did not show any significant temporal cluster patterns, and the average and 85th percentile speeds decreased when the in-crosswalk stop and yield signs were present, which could minimize the risk and probability of speed-related traffic crashes.

Slide 18 – Future Works – Amare stated that they are working on reviewing work related to the traffic speed calming techniques and they are going to do a cross-sectional analysis for those areas that they found are hot spots and the traffic speeds and yield study will continue at other sites and the sites will be selected based on crash hot spot analysis results that they did so far and things that they will do. He added that the analysis for the signal warrants at intersections will be done and the hot spot analysis result will be used as an initial criterion.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 12th, 2023**

QUESTIONS:

Kuharenko said, looking at the data that you collected, how many days' worth of data did you end up collecting with and without the yield pedestrian in crosswalk or stop signs in the crosswalk. Amare responded that at each location, on average they have spent around 7 to 10 days to collect the data. He added that they tried to see the effect of these signs on yielding but so far, due to a low number of pedestrians due to school being out and the areas they selected to study are near schools, they couldn't find a significant number of yielding cases, so they have tried to exclude that from this report. Kuharenko said, then that each with and without, morning and afternoon, for each of these locations you had 7 to 10 days' worth of data for each of those conditions, or in total for each site. Amare responded that it is total for each site, because for the data collection to minimize the effect of data validity within time, they have done the data for the with and without in fifteen-minute intervals every morning and afternoon.

Kuharenko said, then, with the stop yield sign in the pedestrian crosswalks, how long was that sign in place prior to collecting data. Amare responded that it was left on that street just before collecting the data.

Kuharenko stated that you mentioned that, and he thinks you have it in here as well, that in the locations you selected there weren't a whole lot of pedestrians at this time, about how many pedestrians did you end up counting throughout this period. Amare responded that on average there were about 20 to 30 at each site. Kuharenko asked how many hours of counting was done. Amare responded they did it every morning and every afternoon for two to three hours.

Kuharenko said that another question he has, and it might be more of a question for Daba, noted that the objectives that you have listed in here vary significantly from what approved by the MPO Technical Advisory Committee and the MPO Executive Policy Board back in October, do you care to speak a little bit more as to the changes to those objectives, and he isn't sure if that is a good question for Amare or Daba. Daba responded that he is sorry for the confusion, but the objectives included here are mostly what has been done so far, they have not changed any objectives from the original proposal, so at the end of the day they have to meet at least those objectives when they submit the report.

Kuharenko asked if he had any luck getting the speeding ticket data from the Grand Forks Police Department. Daba responded that they did. Kuharenko said, then, that that just hasn't made its way into the report yet. Amare responded that they have found that but he has tried to see some of the literature that was done on the traffic safety analysis and the speeding tickets are subjective to the time that the specific traffic departments are standing in that location and citing those drivers who are speeding above that specific value, so he didn't include that one into this traffic crash analysis but hopefully that will be used for selection of sites after he completed the traffic crash analysis. Kuharenko said that for him, he is looking at what we approved, this is what we have in here and seeing those differences, so he just wants to make sure that we bring that back in.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 12th, 2023**

Kuharenko said, kind of comparing what else he has in here, looking at recommended approaches to address traffic safety concerns, beyond the yield to pedestrians in crosswalk and the stop to pedestrians in crosswalks, what other approaches are you looking at. Amare responded that he also got some recommendation from his supervisor and they are trying to find some economical ways to use and semi-economical traffic calming techniques that they can apply on the street, but for the time being they are focusing on the yield signs, the stop sign, and the traffic calming techniques and hopefully they will add some more after they review some of the literatures.

Kuharenko explained that some of the main reasons he has been asking some of these questions is because he knows that from what they have seen historically is if you end up putting something out there that is brand new, the first couple of days, the first week, even the first month, they have noticed that people have a tendency to react as they may not normally react to something that is brand new, which is why for a lot of the things they have done in the past, they have something in place, have had it in place for a month before we do collect additional data on it; some of the concerns that he can see on this would be if he were to, say, put a delineator drum in a crosswalk, and it is something that isn't expected how would drivers react to that versus something that has been there for a month, and how are drivers going to react to that differently. He asked if they have looked into any information as to how long it takes for traffic to acclimate to a change in traffic control and taking that into consideration as well. Amare responded that he has tried to see a lot of literatures that are published so far, and in most of the studies the time range is from one week to one year, they did those studies or the without and with function, and there is no specific time that the drivers are used to the system or not, so he will try to search more and see if there is any literature on that.

Kuharenko said that he believes it was also mentioned that the speed ratings were taken at the location where those traffic control devices were located, correct. Amare responded they were. Kuharenko stated that that is another thing, too, that they have looked at when they have installed speed tables, somebody is going thirty miles an hour, they go to the speed table they are automatically going to slow down for that, however immediately after that they have noticed that the speed went back up, so things to think about, and like he said, basically just making sure that the objectives that have for the study in here, line those up with what we agreed upon and what was approved by both the Technical Advisory Committee and the Executive Policy Board, those are a couple of things that he wanted to point out. He added that he did notice that, he wants to say, this was brought to the Technical Advisory Committee back in February, does that sound right, and he knows that one of his colleagues made some comments on the age of the data and trying to get something that is newer, and he did see that you did a fair amount of that here as well, so thank you for that.

Daba stated that you mentioned about the state of some speed tables, can you share the information you have with them, just to see the state of those and then decide what we need to do in the future. Kuharenko responded that he will forward that data to him.

Halford thanked Amare and Daba for their hard work, we appreciate the update.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 12th, 2023**

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON URBAN BOUNDARY MAP

Kouba reported that this is just kind of an update for everybody to know that the MPO did turn in the Urban Aid Boundary before the June 1st deadline to the NDDOT. She referred to Map A and stated that is what everybody agreed upon and what was moved forward for approval. She stated the comment was that in some areas, you can see kind of in the airport area and there are a few other areas along as well that were a little too close to the actual census urban area that could create some confusion, so the feedback was to pull them away from that border a little bit more so you can see around the area, especially around the airport and there is a little bit more in the bottom southend area, just to make sure that it is clear that they are beyond. She added that she did also get that update back to the NDDOT before the June 1st deadline as well. She stated that since then she has not heard any comments as to whether or not they have any additional comments, that original comment was more of a first look, making sure that everything was correct before they move forward past their deadline, but she did want to make sure to let people know that it did change a little bit, but the overall intent is still encompassed in what we did change, other than that we are still waiting for comments back from the NDDOT, and as far as she knows we still have a September 1st deadline so we would need to do a final approval of the adjusted urban area as well as our MPO boundary area in August. She asked if either Wayne Zacher or Becky Hanson had heard anything new on this item.

Zacher responded that he doesn't have anything. He added that the timeline sounds about right, and he knows that Michael Johnson has looked at them and he believes they were sent to Erika Shepard as well, so MnDOT is reviewing them as well. Shepard said that they received the boundary maps, and she thinks the version they got was Map A and it looks like their comments were addressed in Map B. She added that she sent comments to Michael so she might just do a follow-up to say that it looks like everything looks good in Map B.

Kouba said that she just wanted to make sure that any additional comments and things like, she has not heard as to, once again this is just the draft from our MPO, it isn't a final version, and we kind of need to get the final approval done next month if we are going to continue to meet the September 1st deadline for a final version of our Adjusted Urban Boundary and MPO Study Area.

Zacher commented that, again, Michael worked on it and will get any comments back to you, and again, he is fine with it and he believes that once they are done with it then it goes to Federal Highway for their approval as well. Kouba asked if that would be after we give our final approval on it or are you assuming that this is the final. Zacher responded that, again, Michael has been running with it, but he believes that what happens after the DOTs give their approval, he believes Federal Highway has to approve it as well. Kouba responded that that is true, but mind you, this is only our draft, and we need to get a final approval from our Technical Advisory Committee and our Executive Policy Board, so if she does that in August to meet the September 1st deadline, because as far as she knows she would be suggesting this Map B in August. Zacher said that he was thinking that you were looking for final approval from them for August. Kouba

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 12th, 2023**

stated that she understands, because as far as she knows the final maps and information deadline was on September 1st so she is trying to keep your deadline, so she will contact Michael Johnson to get a little more information on the status of this item.

Information only.

MATTER OF UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM

Halford reported that she just wanted to start bringing this forward, just like the boundary discussion, it is always good to start talking about it before you see a final draft, so you have a little time to digest everything.

Halford stated that she really wanted to bring this forward to start talking about it, because we just recently had the discussion on changing our NDDOT contract to a single year contract so both MnDOT and NDDOT will have single year contracts, but we are keeping our work program at two-year cycles, so the only change we will do to that is that we are looking at doing it in more of a T.I.P. format where it that rolling two years so we always have that future time in front of us.

Halford said that right now we are working from the 2023-2024 work program, and then in the next month or two we will bring a draft forward to you to look at the 2024-2025 work program. She stated that she just wants everyone to start thinking ahead, looking for any kind of priority projects, they can be small or big, we've seen recently more opportunities for funding come available, so it is kind of good to have what we've had in past plans, those kind of illustrative lists, we never know what might pop up so it is always good to have a couple projects in our back pocket just in case we can fit it in. She stated that we would like to get an idea of projects that you really would like to get done in the next couple of years, so we want to bring those up and then kind of start getting the idea in your head and thoughts of as we are coming to the end of our MTP cycle, how do those timelines work, how did that format work for us in the past so when we start gearing up for the next cycle are you getting what you need out of these plans or should we change things up, should the timelines be different, should things be combined, so she kind of wanted to just throw some of those ideas out so you can start thinking about them, but in the near future, and what we will be discussing in the next month or two is just getting those lists of projects for the next couple of years, but still want you to think about the other stuff as well.

Ellis reported that Jon Mason and herself have been discussing a study on Highway 2 access points on the north/south portion of Highway 2 between Business 2 and the curve because we have new industrial use going on out there, plus there has been some discussion about Crystal Sugar possibly expanding where they store their beets and there is an access point to the south of 10th, because she knows we are studying 10th Street right now, so it would be another half mile south where there is an access that is currently an agricultural access that goes up and over our dike however we have a new asphalt plant going in out there, and that could possibly be another good location for a right in/right out if Transystems wanted to use that to unload, so just with everything going on they think that we would need some sort of study, particularly for safety on and off Highway 2. She added that they would be looking at doing this sooner rather than later,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 12th, 2023**

so if there is some potential funding or something that pops up next year, they would love to grab it for that. Halford said that 2024 would be ideal. Ellis responded that it would if possible, if there are additional fund out there that would be a good way, but they also discussed possibly Safe Streets For All funding as well, they could look at it at that point, but with it being MnDOT specific and with Safe Street For All we kind of want to focus more on local, she would prefer to do a separate study, because they would probably look at that access point and then maybe County Road 17, further down, and then maybe even the access point at Business 2, although that has been looked at quite heavily, but at least this study could maybe pick up on those recommendations, so she thinks they are ready to sit down and discuss it with the MPO, maybe do a conference call and decide how we want to approach, maybe just a narrative that you can have in your back pocket for the new work program.

Kuharenko commented that he thinks from the Grand Forks side, he knows that in the past we have looked at North 3rd Street and North 4th Street one-way pairs, we have discussed that in the past, but that always seems to come up at least once a year, with a couple of times a year discussion, and in particular what all we would need to do with Gateway Drive. He added that he thinks Nancy made a good point on the Safe Street For All in that it is kind of its own animal, and right now we are going through the planning portion of it and hopefully some of the things that come from that maybe we can pursue another Safe Streets For All grant to implement the Phase II portion of it as well.

Kuharenko stated that other things that come to mind, he knows we did our aerial this year so we are two years out for that so we would be looking at that project in 2025; our PCI Analysis and IRI Analysis, he thinks we did our last one in 2021, so we are probably going to be coming up on that again for 2025. He said that we have our continuing A.T.A.C. work, but that is an annual item, and we have the Grand Valley Study that we are starting later this year, correct. Halford responded that we are hopefully starting it later this year. Kuharenko said otherwise it will be in 2024 because that will address the Grand Valley area.

Halford said that, just to address the question on Grand Valley, and she met with a couple of Grand Forks people that had concern about the work load for this year, and being able to tackle that study, and we did reach out to a person and offered them the Planner position this week, but she hasn't heard back from them, so fingers crossed that they accept and then we can easily tackle Grand Valley, she thinks that would be a good one to get their feet wet.

Halford stated that next month she will bring forward a good draft for you to chew on and then we will go from there and hopefully we will get final approval in September.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

- A. 2022/2023 Annual Work Program Project Update

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 12th, 2023**

- 1) Bicycle/Pedestrian Element Update: Halford said that we are really close to the finish line.
- 2) Street/Highway Element Update: Halford said that we are moving right along with this study.
- 3) Aerial Imagery – Halford reported that we are still looking at getting the final product in August.
- 4) Safe Streets For All – Halford reported that we are just buttoning up the contract and looking at getting signatures.

B. MPO Updates

- 1) Mid-Year Review – Halford reported that we had our Mid-Year Review on June 26th at the Hive. She said that that was the first time we had a meeting there and it worked out really well. She explained that we went over our work program, just an update on where things are at and how things are going. She said that we went over our funding balances, and then we found out that we weren't selected for a Title VI Audit next year.
- 2) August TAC Agenda Items – Halford reported that some items for the agenda include the Protect Grant, TIP Amendments, the new TIP, the Work Program and the Adjusted Urban Boundary Map, so just to prepare you for the August agenda.
- 3) Obligated 2023 Project Discussion – Kouba reported that basically just kind of trying to button up all the last-minute things for the final T.I.P. for the 2024-2027 timeframe. She said that she does have a lot of information from East Grand Forks, and she did get that information included in her list as well, and is looking for information from the NDDOT and the City of Grand Forks on where they are at with their projects, just a brief statement, such as the Washington Street Project was bid and then was moved back, and things like that, and she will probably need a little bit more information so if you can get it to her by July 26th she will include it in the spreadsheet and put it into the TIP so it will be part of the full document. Kuharenko said, then, you are looking for a one sentence deal. Kouba responded that would be fine, just where you are at, it will be able to say where the funding is at, basically it has probably been obligated but it is nice to have that note of where the project is at as of July 2023.
- 4) 2023-2026 T.I.P. Amendment #4 Update – Kouba reported that normally we don't update you on the progress of an amendment that has come through already, but we were thrown for a loop at our Executive Policy Board meeting

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 12th, 2023**

when they tabled the amendment until their July meeting, so it will be going back to the board next Wednesday.

Kouba explained that the East Grand Forks City Council representatives were concerned about the cost split on a local level, not necessarily on the funding for the federal amount.

Kuharenko asked for a brief overview of what was in the amendment. Kouba responded that the amendment was for the DeMers at 2nd and 4th Signal Project. She explained that originally the project was for \$1.2 Million but they pulled the signal at Business Highway 2 and 2nd, where East Side Express is located so the cost of the project was reduced to \$700,000, with \$284,970 in federal funding. She said that the States cost was \$630,000 and the city was to cover \$350,000, so there was some questions on the cost split and on some of the work, so we informed our MnDOT Representatives and Steve Emery and they have been discussing this.

Emery stated that he did send an email this morning that he had spoken to Mr. Vetter about this issue, and he thinks it will take some clarification from MnDOT to get this figured out. He said that when you look at the project the City's share went from about 35% to about 50% so the question from Mr. Vetter was why did their share go up, so he told Jon that he needs to be ready to explain why that happened.

Kouba said that hopefully this will all get figured out and we can get the amendment approved next Wednesday.

C. Agency Updates

- 1) Kristen Sperry said that she was just wondering if there were any questions on the Safe Streets For All or did all your questions get answered. Halford responded that she had a conversation with Sandy last week when Kristen was out on vacation, and they discussed some of the dates, when we collected the data, what date should she be putting in and just how she read it, and they got it all cleared up.
- 2) Nancy Ellis stated that they are working on their MOU, which she pulled minutes from last year when we approved writing the grant, and the MOU provided review from the council, and they approved that, but then for some reason she said that when we get a final one she would bring it back to the council, because they already approved it subject to attorney review, so she will have to fill out the dates and take it back to them for approval. She added that there shouldn't be any problem with it because we didn't make any major changes. Halford said that it has been a little while so a little update will probably be good. Ellis agreed, adding that it would be nice, and she would

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 12th, 2023**

hate to push it through and then have them go “hey, whatever happened with that”.

Halford asked if David would be doing the same on the Grand Forks side. Kuharenko responded that he would just assume, on the Grand Forks side, that since they did approve it with City Attorney approval and review, he would just as soon keep it that way and not take it back to them. Ellis said that in the minutes it said that she would bring it back, but they actually approved it, but she is still going to take it back with all of the dates and stuff in it so she will need help so that they have everything the same on both sides.

- 3) Steve Emery said that just an update on East Grand Forks Federal Sub-Target Project – they had a pre-con meeting yesterday with Opp Construction and they will be starting on that project on July 24th and wrapping it up by the middle of October.
- 4) David Kuharenko stated that the DOTs worked with their consultant on the I-29 Interchange, and they will likely be bringing something forward to the City Council on that as well as the 42nd Street Underpass for both of those environmental documents. He said that those projects will continue to move on.

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO ADJOURN THE JULY 12TH, 2023 MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:34 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager