

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2020  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2020, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:30p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; Patrick Hopkins, MnDOT-District 2; Nancy Graham, MnDOT-District 2; Ryan Riesinger, Airport Authority; Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning; Jason Peterson, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Engineer; Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Local Government; and Wayne Zacher, NDDOT-Local Government.

Absent: Brad Bail, Jesse Kadrmas, Richard Audette, Dustin Lang, Ryan Brooks, Brad Gengler, Lane Magnuson, Lars Christianson, and Rich Sanders.

Guest(s) present: Jim Mertz, Bolton and Menk.

Staff: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF Executive Director and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF Office Manager.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

Haugen asked that everyone please state their name and the organization they represent as well.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 11<sup>TH</sup>, 2019, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 11TH, 2019, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2020**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF PROPOSED T.I.P. AMENDMENT**

Haugen reported that MnDOT has asked us to amend our T.I.P. for the project that extends out beyond the MPO study area but does include some portion of the MPO study area. He explained that it is essentially rehab work on U.S.#2, but it does include the intersection of U.S.#2/U.S.Bus#2.

Haugen stated that MnDOT is simply requesting that the Federal Fiscal Year be switched to 2022 instead as currently shown in 2021. He said that the project will still occur in 2021, but the funding will be programmed in 2022.

Haugen opened the public hearing.

There was no one present from the public present to speak on this item. Haugen reported that they did advertise that written comments could be provided up to noon, none were received, nor were any oral comments provided.

Haugen closed the public hearing.

Haugen referred to the packet and pointed out that it does include the project listing. He explained that none of the other financial details changed with the exception of shifting the year into FY2022, but again the project will still be done in FY2021, just the financing timeline is changing.

Haugen referred to a drawing of the project and pointed out where the project is located and explained that it is an improvement that will be done that includes the U.S.#2/U.S.Bus#2 intersection.

Haugen stated that staff is recommending that the Technical Advisory Committee approve forwarding a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board that they approve this proposed T.I.P. amendment, as presented.

***MOVED BY KUHARNEKO, SECONDED BY EMERY, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE PROPOSED T.I.P. AMENDMENT, AS PRESENTED.***

***Voting Aye: Riesinger, Bergman, Zacher, Kuharenko, Emery, Halford, Peterson, and Graham.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Kadrmas, Rood, Bail, Ellis, Gengler, Brooks, Audette, Magnuson, Sanders, and Christianson.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2020**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR 2021-2024 T.I.P.**

a. Minnesota Side

Haugen reported that MnDOT submitted one application for FY2024 project consideration. He explained that the project entails replacing traffic signals on DeMers Avenue at 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>. He stated that originally the project was scoped to include a 3<sup>rd</sup> signal but that has been dropped from this project application, that 3<sup>rd</sup> signal was located out on U.S.Bus#2 and 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, so it is just two signals, and the cost estimate is \$1.12 million with a \$0 dollar federal request as the State of Minnesota is currently considering paying for it with 100% State funds. He added that the construction costs are \$900,000 and then there is some right-of-way purchase costs and design costs and such that brings it up to the \$1.12 total project cost.

Haugen said that staff finds that it is consistent with our plan; the only slight difference is that our plan identified three signals but the project is now just doing two signals; the third signal is still being pursued but it has a little more nuances to it and they didn't want to delay the other two thus they decided to program those now.

Haugen commented that we do note that as this project has been moving through the process we have been discussing with MnDOT that we hope that this will be an opportune time to better coordinate their signals with the Grand Forks signals, to bring the Minnesota signals up to par with the Grand Forks signals and we are hoping that the Downtown Transportation Study that we are doing will help flesh that out a little better to get that accomplished.

Haugen stated that included in the packet was the information provided on the Minnesota forms; and he did strike out the 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue N.E. location on the form just to make it consistent. He pointed out that the detailed cost breakdown is also included as well as the scoring sheet.

Emery said that he is assuming that the local funds are for the City of East Grand Forks, and he is wondering if that is something that MnDOT will be approaching the City Council about, getting a resolution. Graham responded that she thought that the project manager had already talked to the City about this. Emery said that he knows that Matt approached the City about the stop lights on 220 and 14<sup>th</sup>, but he doesn't remember this one coming to the City Council. Hopkins stated that this project isn't technically in the T.I.P. yet, so that request might be coming in the next cycle.

Kuharenko said that he has one question; right now this cost estimate looks like it was developed based on three signals but knowing one was removed, is this cost estimate still valid. Graham responded that the cost estimate was revised so it is correct for the two signals.

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY EMERY, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE MINNESOTA SIDE T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECT FOR THE FY2021-2024 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND GIVE PRIORITY RANKING.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2020**

***Voting Aye: Riesinger, Bergman, Zacher, Kuharenko, Emery, Halford, Peterson, and Graham.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Kadrmas, Rood, Bail, Ellis, Gengler, Brooks, Audette, Magnuson, Sanders, and Christianson.***

b. North Dakota Side

Haugen reported that there are several programs to go over for the North Dakota side candidate projects. He added that we have already addressed the H.S.I.P., the Transportation Alternatives and the General Crossing programs and are now addressing Urban Grant and Urban Road local portion and Urban Road regional portion; in that order.

(1) Urban Grant Program

Haugen stated that as indicated in the staff report we received one application for the Urban Grants from the City of Grand Forks. He explained that the project is to reconstruct North 4<sup>th</sup> Street between DeMers Avenue and 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue. He said that the full application was included in the packet as well, and staff believes the project is consistent with the transportation plan. He added, however, that we do note that we are studying the transportation in the downtown and as part of that there might be some nuances that are recommended and could perhaps become part of the project. He said that they also note that it doesn't really talk about the state of amenities for transit or bike facilities other than bike racks, so that is something that the transportation study is zeroing in on for opportunities in the downtown; and depending on the outcome of the transportation study, this project might have the opportunity to include some of those things.

Haugen commented that, as in the past, even though this is one agenda item we have addressed these programs independently or individually so he would entertain any questions or comments on this application.

Johnson said that he has one point of clarification; you are correct in that most of the programs we are talking about today are 2024, but this one is actually 2022.

***MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE NORTH DAKOTA URBAN GRANT PROJECT FOR THE FY2021-2024 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND GIVE PRIORITY RANKING.***

***Voting Aye: Riesinger, Bergman, Zacher, Kuharenko, Emery, Halford, Peterson, and Graham.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2020**

***Absent: Kadrmias, Rood, Bail, Ellis, Gengler, Brooks, Audette, Magnuson, Sanders, and Christianson.***

(2) Urban Roads – Local Grant

Haugen stated that these are the non-state highways in Grand Forks; and just as last year the Columbia Road Overpass Rehab was submitted again as the project was not awarded funding in the last T.I.P. cycle so the City is attempting to get it funded in this T.I.P. cycle.

Haugen commented that the project description is the same, the information that was attached essentially is the same with the exception of the removal of the word “draft” on the report. He said that the cost estimate was inflated to reflect the Year 2024, since it was not funded in Year 2023 request, so it does have another year of expenditure added to it.

Haugen stated that they are noting that this project is consistent with the MPOs Transportation Plan, and just as we noted last year there is some financial differences between the Transportation Plan’s financial plan and this one if awarded funds, there may have to be some reconciliation worked out on that. He added that another thing they noted is that a purpose and needs statement is missing on the scoping worksheet. Kuharenko commented that maybe Mr. Johnson or Mr. Zacher can speak on this a little bit, but he knows that within the application itself he did include information based on all of the question that were indicated, so he is wondering if that is the information they are looking for or is there more information that is required than that. Johnson responded that in terms of actual information; you provided all of the back-up documentation that had the report data and probably helps feed your purpose and need but do you actually have a written-up detailed purpose and need based off of that information or are you just relying on that information. Kuharenko said that what he is asking is if in the purpose and need section he actually answered a lot of those questions that it is asking for so he has that information in there, what other documentation or information does he need to include. Johnson responded that they just want an overall purpose and needs statement beyond those questions, just a detail on why you are proposing this project today, what are the needs, why are you asking for this money. Grasser said, then, that we aren’t looking at the definition of purpose and need like you would under an EIS or something like that. Johnson responded that it is based on what you know today what is your purpose and need. He added that we can’t go all the way to NEPA yet because we don’t know for sure yet, you haven’t done all of your field work and all of your detailed stuff, you have this report, which probably actually helps you get a lot closer to the NEPA purpose and need than you would normally at this stage but it is more of, for lack of a better word, using the same terminology for purpose and need to get us what they want to know.

Haugen reported that, as Mr. Kuharenko discussed, we actually aren’t submitting these applications to the State until later this month so there is some time to clean up some of these missing things.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2020**

***MOVED BY HALFORD, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE NORTH DAKOTA URBAN ROADS LOCAL GRANT PROJECT APPLICATION FOR THE FY2021-2024 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND GIVE PRIORITY RANKING, SUBJECT TO INCLUSION OF A PURPOSE AND NEEDS STATEMENT.***

***Voting Aye: Riesinger, Bergman, Zacher, Kuharenko, Emery, Halford, Peterson, and Graham.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Kadrmas, Rood, Bail, Ellis, Gengler, Brooks, Audette, Magnuson, Sanders, and Christianson.***

(3) Urban Roads – Regional Grant

Haugen reported that these are the roads in Grand Forks that are on the State system. He said that for this program we received a total of three projects, but are really only acting on one today. He explained that North Dakota always asks, on their submittals, for a plus one-year for the T.I.P. four years, and that is in order to give them a heads up as to what might be coming in the next T.I.P. cycle, so that is why we have it labeled as 2024 and then T.I.P. + 1.

Haugen stated that there is only one project for Year 2024, it is the reconstruction of U.S. Bus#81 or S. Washington Street between Hammerling and 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue South. He said that the estimated cost is just shy of \$6 million, the federal request is just over \$4.5 million.

Haugen commented that we note that this is consistent with our transportation plan; we also noted that a purpose and need statement is also missing from this application and there are not any detailed cost estimates included for the three projects.

Haugen said that they also noted that the stretch of Washington where we did a corridor study a few years ago identified a lot of necessary improvements were needed to address a lot of the deficiencies along the corridor, and the application scoping worksheet doesn't make a direct reference to them; there are some things there that we might consider a part of the total multi-model transportation plan for consideration of the project.

Haugen commented that the last question; you know that there is an ADA project going on this summer but they aren't sure how this reconstruction of the street will interact with the improvement of the sidewalk ADA system along the corridor, so it would nice to identify how the two projects are not conflicting with each other and work together.

Haugen stated that this is the one project that staff is asking the Technical Advisory Committee to take action on today.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2020**

Haugen reported that for the T.I.P. + 1 year there are two candidate projects that were submitted. He said that the first one is continuing reconstruction of South Washington from 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue South further north to include DeMers Avenue. He said, however, that it isn't quite clear if this project is actually going to reconstruct the intersection of DeMers Avenue or because we have to identify logical termini it is just listing DeMers Avenue. He stated that the cost is just shy of \$6 million dollars, with the federal portion being just over \$4.7 million. He added that, just like the other reconstruction on Washington, this scoping worksheet didn't make much reference to the corridor study and how that will be incorporated, and also the DeMers Avenue intersection and the deficient capacity issue is not mentioned in the scoping worksheet either.

Haugen said that the second +1 project is a concrete panel replacement on Gateway Drive between North Columbia Road and the Kennedy Bridge with a total estimated cost of \$1.56 million with a federal request of \$1.25 million. Haugen commented that it is noted that this application does make reference to the current Skewed Intersection Study, and also the Traffic Signal Rehab Project is going on and there are a couple of signals included in this stretch so there will have to be a decision later showing that they meet warrants so as this project moves forward for official submittal maybe we can use some of the higher ranking alternatives as we work through them.

Haugen commented that he failed to mention that they had work sheets for several projects that were already in the T.I.P.; those were kind of follow ups to projects that we already have in the T.I.P. but we didn't have the full applications and/or worksheets so those have all been submitted and they now have a complete package for those projects. He added that there are also two projects that are sort of on a different track through the approval cycle and those are the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Capacity Issue, the NEPA document and a possible interchange.

Haugen reiterated that, again, there is one application for the South Washington Street Reconstruction between Hammerling and 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, and we note that there is a Purpose and Need statement missing and detailed cost estimates missing for that project, and that there are some multi-modal issues that we might like that application to address. Bergman asked if this is the same area that we had a corridor study done on before that had cut-outs. Haugen responded that they looked at access management, intersection guidelines, transit cut-outs, showing how sidewalks could be provided with accessible routes without impediments.

Grasser asked how old that study was. Haugen responded that he believes it was done in early 2010s, somewhere before 2012. Grasser said it is probably older than that. Johnson stated that he thinks it was done in 2011. Haugen agreed that it was done in 2011 and finalized in 2012. Grasser said that it was probably finalized in 2012 but the work was probably done in 2010 and 2011, and we are going to go through another project development phase, how far back do you grab old studies and how much weight do you put on them, is that old study going to circumvent stuff that you are going to discover during the project development phase, he knows it is kind of a rhetorical question, but at some point these studies get kind of dated. Haugen responded that Mr. Kuharenko and himself had that discussion, but from his perspective the conditions on the corridor haven't changed dramatically, the volumes aren't going to be all that radically different from what they were in then, crash reports aren't all that different than what they were in that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2020**

study, so it also goes hand-in-hand with the cost estimating, you know there isn't a detailed cost estimate on this project so the review of what was to be done for the corridor, as part of the application and scope of work sheet, and he thinks that they had a discussion back before we announced the solicitation that there was an issue in North Dakota where you get scoping worksheets that have a cost estimate that isn't refined and then we end up with a federal commitment that is considerably more than what originally goes in the T.I.P., and there is only a certain amount of federal dollars available so projects have to give and take through that process, so there was an attempt this go around to try to refine cost estimates right from the get-go.

Ellis reported present.

Bergman asked if we want to approve this with all of those items missing. Haugen responded that, again, as he stated before there is still time before we officially have to submit them to the State so there is an opportunity to clean this up; the MPO Executive Policy Board is the entity that will actually take the final action from the MPO perspective, and their meeting is still seven days away, and there are a couple days beyond that before the MPO has to give them a complete package.

Bergman asked if seven days is enough time to get all that information together. Grasser stated that they are processing some of the paper work but a lot of the cost estimates are going to have to come through the DOT, and if you are going to ask how to reconcile past and future studies with ADA compliance and construction of this year's project he is probably going to be looking across the table and ask Bismarck to figure that one out, quite frankly. He added that he thinks they are pushing some of the envelope about the information, it is almost getting to be a catch-22, when you need to do a preliminary project development investigation in order to be able to get to this level of detail. He said that he understands the idea of trying to get refinement, that is a valid goal, but when you're putting projects together three and four and five years ahead of an actual construction, they don't even know what federal rules they will be complying with at that point in time compared to where we are at today, they do the best they can but if we are going to try to compare and contrast a study that is eight years old that raises questions.

Johnson commented that the cost information has to come from the applicant, because you are providing that information to us now. He said that in this case, and some of the regional ones you can kind of work with the district to try to come up with the cost. Grasser responded that those are the ones he is talking about, their regional ones, the local ones they are doing studies five years in advance. Johnson stated that he thinks in terms of the studies, sometimes conditions change, sometimes they don't really and that you will determine when you start the project; you'll do a new traffic operations report, you'll collect traffic, use whatever information the MPO has and you will get crash data, and then you can look at that and determine whether or not that differs from what the corridor study said because there were good improvements and data in that corridor study. He added that the correcting of those off-set intersections, the access management especially, was real good in that study, and some of those things still rise to the top regardless of what the conditions are so he thinks those are some of the ties you can tie back to this future project as you are writing up this scope. He said that he also thinks that just in terms of "a study was done and now we want to do a project", there are parallels there either way

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2020**

acknowledging the work, acknowledging the study, everyone was involved, it was completed, it had recommendations in it, it is a starting point, it is a lot of recognition of what has been done. Grasser stated that it is easy just to reference a study in there someplace it isn't always easy to carry that concept. Johnson said that if there is a corridor study that says xyz and you are going to do lmnop, something else probably needs to happen before you even ask for that project because what changed from there to there, so a guess that you are trying to do at the end of the day isn't that far of a stretch from what the original corridor study said, there is probably a way to tie it together. Bergman commented that this is thing is awfully low on cost estimate, you have to do intersection alignments. Johnson responded that they were pretty minor, such as by Paradiso where they are off very slightly. Bergman said, though that you still have to buy land or shift land or whatever, but it adds to the cost.

Johnson commented that the stuff Mr. Haugen is referring to is; they gave a presentation at the last MPO Directors meeting on project costs and how they affected their urban program. He said that he doesn't have those numbers in front of him but he gave four example projects across the state and one was in Fargo where, at this time when the project was applied for the total project cost, including federal, state and local funds, which also included water and sanitary funds was about \$9 million dollars, but by the time they bid it it was at \$23 million, and if you think about the fact that their urban program is \$38 million dollars total, and the impact that that additional \$11 million had on it in one fiscal year, it was enormous. He added that they had another one at the west end of the state in Dickinson as well that went from \$5 million to \$18 million, and that was more of a change in scope and requests from the City and they actually moved it three years out to adjust it, where the Fargo example stayed in the fiscal year it was in. He said there were a couple others as well, and it showed why it is so important to get as close as we can right now to what we think the impact will be because that is the number they have to hold to, they have to hold to something and if it goes crazy then it affects all the other projects and a city might not get a project.

Grasser stated that he recognizes the problems, but it's the resolution of it that he just cannot grasp, some of the detailed comments always can get us through that, but they will work with the local district here and see if they can get some additional language and dollar comments in there.

Halford asked if the meeting you were just talking about, does that information at that meeting ever get shared to the agencies here; are there minutes or anything so that they can get that information too. Johnson responded that they don't really prepare minutes, but actually the MPOs lead the meeting, there is a chair that rotates every two years and they kind of lead the meeting and there are agenda topics provided by the MPOs, DOT, Federal Highway, Federal Transit, and they have discussions. He added that the transit providers are always invited to them but they don't have a lot of heavy transit talks so there hasn't been a lot of attendance from the transit providers, but they continue to include them because of their 3-C process and they are partners to that agreement. Haugen commented that the MPO did relay the message to the TAC; although they didn't hand out the exact examples that the DOT provided them, they did discuss the parameters and did cite an example at the December Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2020**

Halford asked if beside Transit is anybody else allowed or able to attend these meetings. Johnson responded that they never talked about it. He stated that they have another one coming up on March 31<sup>st</sup>, and without just inviting everybody here at the table he wouldn't see any issues with it but they never talked about it, so maybe that it something they talk about at that meeting to see if they want to open it up to others to sit in and listen in. He added that a lot of the discussion is more detailed interaction between the States and the MPOs that may be good information for you but that cost estimate thing is a very detailed thing that they went into that they don't necessarily always get into at these meetings. Grasser commented that there could be an advantage to attending those meetings, more direct contact, project detail processed can mean a whole lot of different things; it's like the conversation on purpose and need, that can mean a number of different things, so seeing what is going on behind those words would sometimes be helpful and he thinks there is a local responsibility.

Johnson explained that what is happening is that they are seeing a pattern of things like: "it is a recon for this amount of distance and it is exactly \$10 million dollars" and they ask; "are you sure about that, is it exactly \$10 million dollars" and then next year it is .2 miles longer so now it is \$12 million, you can tell that the jurisdiction is just throwing a number at it so what they want to see is that you put some kind of effort into determining the estimate; you've got a project, you can lump some traffic control, you can lump some storm sewer, some of those bigger items, but the big ticket items like aggregate base, concrete, asphalt etc., you can look at Google Earth and get some aerial photos, generic quantities and get some numbers going to get you close to where if you do add contingencies in, just to that level, he doesn't want to see every 15-inch pipe or every traffic control, but somewhat of a detail that provides them some certainty that this was just looked at. He explained that they have one jurisdiction that just throws a number at a project and it is an astronomical number that doesn't even make sense with the scope that is provided; and they have done ten projects similar to this one and they weren't even close to that number so how did you get to that number, why is that number being used, and what ends up happening is that those projects never get picked because they can't fund them, the cost is way too big.

***MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY HALFORD, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE NORTH DAKOTA URBAN ROADS REGIONAL GRANT PROJECT APPLICATIONS FOR THE FY2021-2024 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND GIVE PRIORITY RANKING, SUBJECT TO INCLUSION OF A PURPOSE AND NEEDS STATEMENT AND A DETAILED COST ESTIMATE.***

***Voting Aye: Riesinger, Bergman, Zacher, Kuharenko, Emery, Halford, Ellis, Peterson, and Graham.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Kadrmas, Rood, Bail, Gengler, Brooks, Audette, Magnuson, Sanders, and Christianson.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2020**

Haugen reported that there is only one program left to solicit and that is the North Dakota Recreational Trails Program. Halford asked if there was a date for when solicitation might be opened for this program. Haugen responded that it is usually in the January timeframe.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

a. 2020 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that our monthly report on progress of the work program scopes. He pointed that it is listed as 2020, most of the activities identified in it are 2019 projects. He said that there are three projects that are being carried over into 2020: ITS Regional Architecture is carrying over; the Skewed Intersection Study is 90% complete but it still needs to go before the City Council and then for approval in February; and the other big study that is being carried over is the Downtown Transportation Study.

Haugen commented that next month you will see some projects drop off and the Future Traffic Impact Bridge Study and the two Land Use Plans, but they aren't scheduled to start until later in the year.

Information only.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY HALFORD, TO ADJOURN THE JANUARY 15<sup>TH</sup>, 2020, TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:13 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager