

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 11th, 2020
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the March 11th, 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; Patrick Hopkins, MnDOT-District 2; Ryan Riesinger, Airport Authority; Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; and Wayne Zacher, NDDOT-Local Government (Via Conference Call).

Absent: Brad Bail, Steve Emery, Jesse Kadrmas, Jason Peterson, Nancy Graham, MnDOT-District 2, Michael Johnson, Richard Audette, Dustin Lang, Ryan Brooks, Brad Gengler, Ali Rood, Lane Magnuson, Lars Christianson, Nick West, and Rich Sanders.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 12TH, 2020, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Kuharenko referred to Page 10; regarding the T.I.P. Procedural Manual, and said that they requested a redline strike through version of the document, but he doesn't think they have gotten it yet, and he is wondering if he has any idea when they could be seeing it. Haugen responded that he hadn't received all the information he needed, which is why it isn't on the agenda today either.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 12TH, 2020 MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 11th, 2020**

MATTER OF ADOPTION OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN DOCUMENTS

Haugen reported that this may be the last meeting on the Public Participation Plan Family of Documents, adding that we have been going through the last half of 2019 updating the various documents as identified in the staff report. He said that in December at the MPO Executive Policy Board meeting the draft was approved and was put out for public comment for a 45-day period.

Haugen commented that at the request of the NDDOT we developed the appendix, which documents the public participation engagement activities that were done. He said that as noted in the staff report we did receive one formal comments, and that was from MnDOT, and most of it was editorial changes that were easily done, but there was one comment that had to deal with the open records section of the Public Participation Plan, and that was the only section in which we specifically, in the draft, mentioned that in North Dakota this is how things are done, and MnDOT wanted to either have the Minnesota side explored and identify how it might be different, but what we ended up agreeing to do, since they aren't dramatically different from the North Dakota Public Records laws, we just struck out the phrase in North Dakota in that section.

Haugen stated that the 45-day comment period ended February 18th, so we believe we are at the point where we are able to recommend formal adoption of the Updated Public Participation Plan Family of Documents.

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY HALFORD, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FAMILY OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN DOCUMENT, AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Riesinger, Zacher, Kuharenko, Ellis, Halford, Bergman, and Hopkins.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Kadrmas, Rood, Peterson, West, Graham, Bail, Gengler, Brooks, Audette, Magnuson, Sanders, and Christianson.

MATTER OF PROPOSED T.I.P. AMENDMENTS

Haugen reported that this started out as, initially the project being discussed was the 32nd Avenue Safety Project, and the NDDOT was expressing that it was going to be delayed, and through that process we identified several other projects that needed to be addressed with an amendment, so in the end there are four projects being amended.

Haugen said that two projects are resulting in a substantial increase in project cost, thus affecting the financial plan, then there was one project that had a significant decrease in cost, which was also the 32nd Avenue Safety Projects, and the fourth project is another one that is being pushed back from 2019 to 2020. He added that you will recall that our first amendment to the T.I.P. was done between our final approval of the T.I.P. and NDDOT's final approval of their S.T.I.P.,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 11th, 2020**

whereby they delayed a lot of 2019 projects until 2020, so this last project is the most recent one that is being moved back from 2019 to 2020.

Haugen stated that the first of two projects that have substantial increases to their cost is the North 5th Street Project, between DeMers and Gateway Drive. He explained that our T.I.P. amendment policy is that if there is an increase or decrease 25% above or below the T.I.P. dollar amounts it causes a need to revisit how the project fits in our T.I.P. He added that both of these are actual bid awards, so while there may be some change orders, this is an example of where an estimate changes and causes the need to amend the T.I.P.

Haugen said that one thing, on the North Dakota side, that we are still working with is that on the Regional Projects there is no cap, from North Dakota's perspective, on federal participation; however there is, again, only "x" amount of federal dollars available so we have to look at how a project affects our financial plan, and that is why some projects are being delayed from 2019 to 2020, and possibly further in the future.

Haugen stated that the second project is the ADA curb-ramps along Washington Street, between Hammerling and 8th Avenue North. He said that those awards were over threshold.

Haugen commented that for both of these projects the scope of work didn't change so there wasn't a cause of a change in our performance analysis that needed to be reviewed whenever we look at T.I.P. projects.

Haugen stated that the project with a significant decrease in cost was the 32nd Avenue Project. He said that originally it was scoped at \$7.4 million dollars but it is now being scoped at \$4.7 million dollars, roughly. He explained that construction of the project is being moved from 2020 to 2021, but it is still scheduled to be bid this year, so it will still be 2020 dollars and we also had a slight termini change; previously it was Washington Street, but now it is at South 20th Street. He added that these are safety dollars and our financial plan does treat safety different than regional highways, even though this is a regional highway, however this safety amount was an outlier so in our financial plan we didn't count for this large project in our calculation of annual safety dollars, so we are saying that the impact is none.

Haugen commented that the project that is being moved to 2020 is really a couple of small projects that are lumped as one in the T.I.P.; and they are all on North Washington Street, with the first section being 8th Avenue North to just north of Gateway Drive, basically where the divided four lane starts and ends on the north side; and then there is also some work on the English Coulee diversion bridge. He said that they have so far not been informed of any cost changes, just the fact that the project was not done in 2019 therefore the dollars are all coming from 2020. He stated that, again, this is a regional highway so it is hard to address the individual project impacts on our financial plan, but, again, the cost and the scope haven't changed so there is no change to our performance analysis of how the T.I.P. projects are helping us achieve our performance targets.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 11th, 2020**

Haugen stated that we did advertise that a public hearing would be held at this meeting. He said that they did not receive any written comments, nor is there anyone in the audience today, so we can say that we did not receive any public comments on the Draft T.I.P. Amendments.

Haugen referred to the actual project listings and commented that you will see that we do now have identified amended amounts, but we still show the current T.I.P. amounts to give you some idea of how much of a change occurred.

Kuharenko stated that he has a comment; with the 32nd Avenue Safety Project, he has some serious concerns about dropping the dollar amounts from \$7.4 million down to \$4.7 million dollars. He explained that with the other regional projects that they have had come up recently they have been coming in 30% to 40% higher than what the engineers estimated them to be, and so because of that he is really reluctant to move forward with changing that dollar amount. He added that if they do it could result in us making a change now to reduce the dollars and then have to come back and readjust again to increase the dollars just like we are doing on those other projects.

MOVED BY KUHARKENO, SECONDED BY HALFORD, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE PROPOSED T.I.P. AMENDMENTS WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE CHANGES TO THE DOLLAR AMOUNT FOR THE 32ND AVENUE PROJECT.

Haugen commented that from an MPO Staff point of view it gets back to how good are the cost estimates that we have. He added that it seems like the State and the City are comfortable with reporting the \$4.7 as the cost estimate to move forward with, and we do have a 25% buffer, if we make the T.I.P. amendment there is still 25% leeway either way, so it seems like we would be better off to keep consistent reporting amongst other areas jurisdictions to the various bodies and the public as to what the dollar costs are that we are anticipating for this project.

Bergman asked what the object for the increases to the other two projects were; was it because of low bidding or estimates or something else. Kuharenko responded that that was what the bids came in at for those two projects. He added that that is really the basis of his concern with reducing the estimated cost on the 32nd Project, or reducing the programmed amount for it because if we end up reducing it by \$3 million dollars, and then we have to come back if it comes in 30% above, then we are going to have to come back and readjust again, so we are making a preempted adjustment now and then may have to potentially make another adjustment when it is bid out.

Kuharenko asked Mr. Zacher if he has a projected date on when the 32nd Project will be bid, will it be this fall sometime. Zacher responded that he will check on it. Kuharenko asked if that estimate was done in December. Zacher responded that he believes it was. Kuharenko said that he supposes that with that, just to give the rest of the committee an idea, in the estimate that he has, dated December, just the concrete price was, for 9-inch non-reinforced concrete, \$58; for the North 5th Street Project, which had some reconstruction work in it, the same price of that bid

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 11th, 2020**

item was \$131, so double the price. Zacher commented that as of right now the design complete date is August 21st, and bid opening is October 16th.

Hopkins asked what the quantities were on the two projects. Kuharenko responded that the 32nd Avenue Project has about 2,200 square yards, at \$58 a square yard; and the North 5th Street Project had about 1,200 square yards, so about 1,000 less yards but double the price in cost. He stated that as a point of reference, you do have some changes, but the North 5th Street did include a complete road reconstruct whereas the 32nd Project are just turn lane modifications.

Haugen said he would like to note that he was working with Jason at the NDDOT Grand Forks District, and they are not represented here today, but they are the ones that were advising us to use the \$4.7 million dollar estimate in the T.I.P. amendment.

Riesinger said that he heard Mr. Haugen say that the State and the City concurred, but yet he is hearing from Mr. Kuharenko, who is representing the City, that he is voicing a concern, so he is wondering where the City number would come in; didn't you say the City concurred with that number. Haugen said that the \$4.7 is the number that the City is reporting to their City Council and the public. He added that the State is working with the District Office and that is what they are seeking as an amendment, besides the termini and the construction date changes; it is the lowering of the cost estimate. Ellis asked if this was presented to the Grand Forks City Council as \$4.7. Kuharenko responded that he isn't 100% sure as to which city staff was presenting to the council on that one.

Haugen stated that just as this is being presented to this body as being delayed a year, there is information as to some of the reasons for the delay, which are reflected in the staff report, but why did the cost change; so there is consistency going on among the various staff reports.

Kuharenko commented that this is something that was brought up by the NDDOT Local District, and it is unfortunate they aren't here for it; would there be thought or consideration of tabling this until the next Technical Advisory Committee meeting. Haugen responded that some of these, since there are bid awards, they might be hung up in the federal review of comparing it to what the T.I.P. documents are, but he doesn't know for a fact but that is why we are amending the T.I.P. Halford asked if there was some way that we could vote on it so it tells the Board that you can bring it back for an amendment at the next meeting. Haugen responded that you are making a recommendation, so whatever you do there is a chance to get it changed prior to the Board meeting, and the Board will be presented the two recommendations and they can make a decision as to which they want to approve.

Bergman asked who delayed the two projects that have cost increases. Haugen responded that they weren't delayed; the cost estimates that were in the T.I.P. and S.T.I.P. were 35% less than what the bid awards were and when the bid awards are higher than 25% then our financial plan needs to be revisited to see if we still have a fiscally constrained T.I.P./S.T.I.P. document, so we had to review them, and because of the uniqueness that they are both on the regional system, and the State doesn't have any federal cap so they can move federal dollars around statewide, so we have to be aware of the accumulative effect of the fiscal impact, and then also, assuming it, in

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 11th, 2020**

this case it didn't happen, but sometimes the scope of work changes so we have to then also re-evaluate the performance impact as well; so the two projects that had an increase in cost had the increases because of the actual bid amounts versus the T.I.P. estimated cost. Bergman said, then, that those are actual projects that will be going ahead in 2020. Haugen responded that that is correct, the bids were awarded, and they are now just waiting for all the I's to be dotted and the T's to be crossed. Kuharenko said that he supposes that part of the reason we didn't have to do this for the University Avenue Mill and Overlay project was because the end termini didn't change the internal scope because that reconstruction project on University was removed. Haugen stated that it changed significantly as well but there is a federal cap on the local road projects and the TA projects and most every other project has a cap but Regional Roads in North Dakota doesn't.

Halford asked, if we did approve this at the \$4.7 million, what if the bids do come in higher, would the difference have to be 100% local share or would the percentages change across the board, if it happened that it actually came up higher than the \$4.7 and was closer to say \$6.5 million. Haugen responded that, again, there is that 25% wiggle room, so if it is 26% higher than we would have to revisit, particularly if it involves the 90% federal funds, if it is 24% we don't have to revisit it. Halford so it wouldn't go all 100% local share that difference. Haugen responded that it wouldn't that the NDDOT could make a decision as to whether the money came in 95/5 split on the project or if they will change that formula if we award this bid amount higher. Haugen commented that the DeMers Avenue Project also came in quite different, and there wasn't a straight 80/20/20 on that increase in cost. Kuharenko said that he knows that after the University Avenue Project was bid out the City had to send in a document to the State kind of putting together an explanation as to what our thoughts were on why the bids came in high, and looking at some of the contractors bids versus the engineers estimates, just throughout the Region/State, Grand Forks and Fargo appear to be noticeably higher; Fargo looks like it is about 138% of what the contractor bid and Grand Forks is about 140%, so coming in that extra 38% to 40% in those bids, compared to the engineers estimates, which he believes the engineers estimates are based on DOT average bid prices; could Mr. Zacher confirm that that is actually the case. Zacher responded that usually they are and then they are adjusted accordingly. He explained that the numbers that they sent for the projects that were bid are actual bid costs, they are taken from the abstract for those projects.

Kuharenko stated that another thing on the discussion of this T.I.P. amendment is that there is still time, as Mr. Haugen mentioned, before the Executive Policy Board meets so this could be further discussed before that meeting, so we do have one week to get some information from the DOT Local District Office, and if Mr. Zacher has any other thoughts on this as well. Zacher said that if we are looking at the 32nd Avenue Project yet he thinks Mr. Peterson and himself had a little different opinion; and talking internally at the NDDOT with Mr. Johnson, he suggested that it be at the \$7.3 million as discussed earlier, and then they had a conversation with Mr. Peterson and he came up with the \$4.7 million estimate, the \$4.7 is their cost estimate, but in the end he would be fine either way. Haugen commented that the reason Mr. Peterson isn't here today is because he had to take some leave and he doesn't know if he will be back prior to next Wednesday to go over this with him. Kuharenko said that he also talked with Mr. Noehre about

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 11th, 2020**

this as well so he should have some knowledge of it as well. Zacher stated that according to an email from Mr. Peterson it says that he is back on Monday.

Bergman said that with the increases you've already seen, if you cut this project, then you get the increase in cost, then you have the bids going out in October for a 2021 project, he has a feeling you will see this thing come right back. Kuharenko said that that is the worry. He added that it might not come in at the same amount, it might come in at a lesser amount, but if it comes in at \$6.5 or \$6.7 or \$6.2 million it will be less than that 25% difference that we need to do a T.I.P. amendment, so do we really want to do a T.I.P. amendment now with the likelihood of having to do another T.I.P. amendment when the bid comes in again. He said that he has no issue with changing the termini because that is something that we probably should do and make that right within the document; and Mr. Haugen mentioned that this is already a 2020 project. Haugen stated that it is still scheduled to be funded out of 2020 but we have to show that actual construction is happening in 2021. Kuharenko said then that we still have to make note of that in the T.I.P. as well, and he has no issues making those changes to the T.I.P., for the termini and construction in 2021 but he does have concerns with the costs.

Hopkins commented that his concern would be that if he were someone from the public, and he has a stake in this 32nd Avenue Project, and he asks what the estimate is and was told \$4.6 but in this document we show \$7.3, what is that difference; is it a contingency fund or is that not an accurate representation, if this is the estimate that is being put out there, that would be his concern, but he doesn't know what the local district is saying. Kuharenko responded that that is why he thinks having that conversation with the local district, getting that clarification, and then if need be that can be further discussed at the MPO Executive Policy Board as well, needs to occur.

Hopkins said, then, if we approve the motion that is on the floor right now, do both recommendations go to the MPO Executive Policy Board. Haugen responded that they would, that this is what is being presented to the public, that we are dropping the cost estimate based on more current information, so because that is already the public recommendation that is out for comment, that comment will go forward, but if the Technical Advisory Committee approves something different than that that will go forward to the Board as well. He added that if the Technical Advisory Committee approves the motion as stated, that changes the estimate, it won't cause us to go out for additional public comment because we are only proposing to change it to the lesser amount, but if we say no to that lesser amount we have already informed them what won't change, so the public is aware of the two costs.

Voting Aye: Riesinger, Zacher, Kuharenko, Ellis, Halford, Bergman, and Hopkins.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Kadrmas, Rood, Peterson, West, Graham, Bail, Gengler, Brooks, Audette, Magnuson, Sanders, and Christianson.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 11th, 2020**

MATTER OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT #2 TO FY2020 WORK PROGRAM

Haugen reported that the positive spin in this amendment is that we have available funds to identify and issue to either existing work or to add work to our work program, but on the flip side is that the reason for the additional funds is because of an error to our billing for FY2019. Haugen explained that that error was carried over into our original FY2020 work program, and it deals with how we billed salaries and benefits for MPO Employees against the work program. He stated that the error was discovered during our audit, and although we haven't received our final audit yet this finding was found and we have been working with the NDDOT and Federal Highway on how to solve it, and the bulk of the resolution occurred in our December monthly billing but there is still some residual payback that has to happen and we do have some 2019 dollars to do that, so the payback is identified in a new work activity 100.5, and the spreadsheets and tables show this activity, and we think we have taken the appropriate corrective action to get this cleared/cleaned up.

Haugen stated that this draft work program then freed up about \$67,000 with the difference in the salary and benefit package. He added that there was no change in salary benefits, just how it was being recorded in the documents, and in discussing this with the MPO Chairman, he wanted to put the bulk of the money into the hydraulic study consultant costs, and then we also have encountered some A.T.A.C. costs with our counting programs, essentially identified in the 300.2 category. He explained that most of the work is maintenance that they are doing gratis for us right now; there are times when we have outages that occur and when cameras shift and need to be readjusted, so that is where the extra costs are coming from.

Haugen commented that in the work program the revenue amount doesn't change except for the little cash in/cash out for the payback; but because the salaries are less all of the work program activities, because they are heavily engaged in salary as cost components, all changed.

Halford asked if increasing the consultant fees, is there additional work added to their scope of work. Haugen responded that it includes additional work. He explained that when the work program was originally drafted the Hydraulic Study RFP had not been released, the RFP went out, not looking at just one bridge level, we are looking at three different bridge levels, so the outcome of that study might cause the touch points on either side of the river to be potentially outside of the current flood protection system, so that is the additional work being added into the scope; it is also looking at potentially more than one corridor as well.

Kuharenko asked what the original cost was that was associated with consultants on that project. Haugen responded that it is the difference between \$25,000 and \$67,000; so we added \$42,000. Bergman said, then, that the consultants can do \$40,000 more work. Haugen responded that that is what we are budgeting for. He said that it is a budgeted amount, and if the costs come down; there is the potential that the hydraulic study could say that there is no way to do anything but a high and dry bridge, then we might say that a high and dry is \$100 and some million dollars and there is no way we can fund that, so we don't pursue this, or it might come back and say that two or three of the corridors are viable, it might come back and say there are two height options versus one height option, we don't know.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 11th, 2020**

Zacher asked if Mr. Haugen just said that part of the monies are for a hydraulic study. Haugen responded that he didn't say that, none of it is for a hydraulic study. Zacher said that he just wanted to verify because that is an engineering issue and we can't use these monies for that.

Haugen stated that, going back to the question on the original consultant amount, he wants to say it was \$80,000 for consultant cost. Kuharenko said, then, that we are increasing it by about 50%. Halford asked what the City's share will be with this increase. Haugen responded that the City share will remain the same as the revenue amount didn't change, the only thing that is changing is how the revenue is distributed.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE AMENDMENTS TO THE FY2020 WORK PROGRAM, AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Riesinger, Zacher, Kuharenko, Ellis, Halford, Bergman, and Hopkins.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Kadrmas, Rood, Peterson, West, Graham, Bail, Gengler, Brooks, Audette, Magnuson, Sanders, and Christianson.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Haugen reported that tomorrow evening they are holding a public engagement at Riverwalk Center, or River Cinema 15. He stated that it is a popup type of event in the main corridor where they are putting in a new bar; it won't be in the bar, but will be in front of it.

Haugen pointed out that also identified in the staff report was a new specific website that is dedicated to this study, it can be found at: www.dtforksmobility.com.

Haugen opened the website and explained that the activities that will be held tomorrow at the open house are shown here. He went over this information briefly. He then stated that in addition to those activities the project schedule is shown and the documents that have been produced so far; the draft existing, the draft future, the Steering Committee Meetings 1 & 2 summaries produced by KLJ. He added that most of the steering committee members that were present completed worksheets, and what is there are the worksheets that were turned in at that meeting, and the results. He said that they have since received several more worksheets so the results have changed but he doesn't know what the change resulted in, but you get some sense of what the committee members were discussing. He stated that if desired we can go over the presentation in more detail.

Haugen commented that it is advertised that if you come and engage with us we will give you a voucher for free popcorn, so hopefully that impresses more people to stop by.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 11th, 2020**

MATTER OF TIMELINE OF LAND USE PLANS

Haugen reported that there have been some questions about the timeline for the Land Use Plans, so from the Project Manager for the MPO's point of view on the Grand Forks Land Use Plan, we have been working with their City Planner and Teri Kouba is the Project Manager for East Grand Forks and has been working with their City Planner as well.

Haugen referred to the staff report and pointed out that the update schedule is included for both sides. He said that there is a months difference between the two City's plan so that we aren't inundated with, hopefully, several proposals that we have to review, then interview and negotiate on them, but they are a month apart so we have some ability to focus in on one side at a time. He stated that Grand Forks is the one a month ahead on the schedule, and as you see there is hope that at our April meeting the Technical Advisory Committee will have a review of a draft scope of work, after the Grand Forks Planning and Zoning Commission has given approval of the draft scope of work, and assuming that the Technical Advisory Committee and the MPO Executive Policy Board sign off on it we be involving our State and Federal partners to make sure that everything is eligible. He said that, assuming all of that takes place, in May they will be seeking final approval and release. He added that for Grand Forks the due date will be the end of June and in July they will make a selection and negotiate, and by August we hope to have a consultant on board. He said that this same process will occur on the East Grand Forks side as well, more or less, just a one month difference.

Kuharenko asked when we can expect the 2020 census results. Haugen responded that December 31st, no later than December 31st, but it will be some time before we get all of the spreadsheets, etc., at block levels, but the information is available. He added that you can still also get the American Community Survey has not yet technically still released its annual 12 month collection of data analysis, but again census data is just count numbers, basically, and the ACS gives us characteristics and commuting.

Riesinger said that there was a question that came up a few months back, and he sent it to Mr. Gengler and Mr. Haugen about the Airport's Land Use Compatibility Plan, and it was, as he understands, never formally adopted by the City or County, it has kind of always been referenced from time to time; one of the things from the Airport Authority's standpoint is that they would prefer to have that formally adopted into a plan so that it is understood by everyone, and just kind of looking at this schedule, what would be the appropriate time, or what discussions need to take place in order to accomplish that. Haugen responded that during the rest of March he was thinking that Mr. Gengler and himself will have to engage you on this, and Mr. Gengler will have to lead as to how the City wants to proceed with it. He added that he could envision a request to have the Airport perhaps consider updating or making changes based on the fact that it is an older document, it was done in 2006. Riesinger responded that not much has changed, however looking forward if we are looking at a 2050 Plan they know, according to their current Master Plan, they are posing significant changes, which would impact some of that. Haugen said that they are committed to try to have a draft before the Planning and Zoning Commission at their April meeting, so between now and the end of March you should have some invites to a couple of sit-downs.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 11th, 2020**

Haugen commented that he doesn't know how the Airport would affect the East Grand Forks Land Use Plan. Riesinger responded that it would be minimally, if any, he would think, from a Land Use standpoint, and certainly he wouldn't envision any issues with the height zone, it would have to be a pretty extreme development all the way in East Grand Forks to impact the height zone. Ellis commented that even their cell towers now are going much lower, and the new 5G is going on top of light poles, unless their light poles are too high. Riesinger said he didn't think they would be a problem. Ellis said, though, that their roads are wide enough and have enough lights on them that they have a runway appearance. Riesinger stated that they would like to try to avoid that too. Bergman commented that that is why you put the curbs in. Ellis agreed, joking that someday they are going to land a plane on Bygland, but really she doesn't foresee that affecting their ordinance. Riesinger said that he just knows that it has come up, for example some of the residential by the Walmart on Highway 2, there has been some exchange of information, and it is just important that they stress this because, as you may have heard, they are busy and so even if there no riff-raff, to somebody that may not be aware and they are out to barbeque one night and there is plane after plane after plane there will be some questions asked and they want to make sure that they are involved in that process. Haugen agreed, and added that he is sure that the Planning representative will share that message with Mr. Gengler.

Bergman asked if Mr. Haugen got all the paperwork from Mr. Gengler. Haugen responded that he did, that both Cities have provided their paperwork, so the next step will be an amendment to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan based on the UND/CAT change; there will be a public hearing advertised for the April Technical Advisory Committee with April Executive Policy Board action finalizing that amendment. Neither City felt it reached the top of meeting the City Planning commitments, so that cut the timeline considerably.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2020 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that this is our monthly progress report. Halford pointed out that it has 2020 for the Land Use Plans completion date when it should be 2021. Haugen said he would make that correction.

b. ITS Regional Architecture Update

Haugen commented that the only other significant thing that we haven't discussed is the ITS Regional Architecture update. He stated that the stakeholders met at the end of February and there were different documents to review and comment on by this coming Friday, then they will have a redraft done, if necessary, on the ITS documents, but they are scheduling for April to also get approval of the ITS Regional Architecture.

Halford asked who the stakeholders are for this. Haugen responded that it is Emergency Managers, Bus Operators, Cities, Counties, etc.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 11th, 2020**

c. Paperwork Due

Bergman asked when the paperwork is required, and it should be already in, for their projects. Haugen responded that the due date is April 1st for all projects, so if you got it in you are ahead of schedule. He said that they aren't going to review it too much until after the deadline.

Bergman said he doesn't know how that is going to work because the transit safety plan affects the federal funding. Haugen stated that the problem is that the safety plan isn't due until the end of July, so they can make decisions up to July without having to have a safety plan to consider

Ellis commented that they can approve certificates and assurances right. Ellis said, then, that when she did hers it will switch, but it basically states that you can sign them with the agreement that you will have your safety plan approved by July 1, and then after that you either have to redo a plan again, so they will take another review, that's how they do it so you can't open a grant and you can't down a grant because they automatically remove the approval off the certificates and assurances.

Haugen stated that in the plan amendment they are processing, but didn't have to do a safety plan audit of sort, because there isn't one adopted, but we will have the 180 days afterwards. He said that anytime you want to engage us on a safety planning, target setting and stuff, the sooner the better. Bergman said not until they get it completed and sent back to them again, there are only thirteen issues that they needed fixed, so he is hoping that by next week they can have it sent back to them. Ellis agreed, adding that the descriptions and the paragraphs as to how we are doing, how we are setting up certain things need to be changed first, and then the performance measures and targets won't be too hard to set based on what our current NTD data shows because fatal injuries and those types of things, you want it to be zero, and they are zero, we haven't had a fatality on our bus yet, and we hope we keep it that way, but just based on the targets and based on what she has seen from the other MnDOTs, those won't be too hard to set.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO ADJOURN THE MARCH 11, 2020 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:30 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager