

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE SPECIAL MEETING
Friday, March 19th, 2021
Zoom Meeting**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the March 19th, 2021, special meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory :Committee to order at 8:33 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present via Zoom: Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineer; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Steve Emery; East Grand Forks Engineering; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Rich Sanders, Polk County Engineer; Jason Peterson, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; Wayne Zacher, NDDOT-Local Government; and Jon Mason, MnDOT-District 2.

Absent: Brad Bail, Ryan Brooks, Stephanie Halford, Jesse Kadrmas, Michael Johnson, Lane Magnuson, Lars Christianson, and Patrick Hopkins.

Guest(s) present: Anna Pierce, MnDOT-St. Paul, Kristen Sperry, FHWA-ND; Tim Burkhardt, Alliant Engineering.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF FUTURE BRIDGE TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY UPDATE

Haugen reported that we are just getting underway with the Future Bridge Traffic Impact Study and we did go through an RFP process and hired Alliant Engineering. He stated that the purpose of this meeting today is to establish the Technical Advisory Committee as our Project Management Team to be a sort of sounding board for the consultant and staff as we prepare materials to release to the Ad Hoc Group, the public, our respective agencies, and ultimately to the MPO Executive Policy Board on the study process.

Haugen introduced Tim Burkhardt, Project Team Lead for Alliant Engineering, who was present for a brief presentation on how the study process will take place, and give an update on where they are at on it.

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

Burkhardt referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request). He thanked everyone for attending the meeting and explained that his goal is to really get to know you a little bit and have you get to know him for the purpose of working together on the study and providing regular updates and making sure he knows where you are coming from; if there are particular issues, questions, hope for outcomes that he doesn't seem to be capturing, he definitely wants to hear that whether today or at subsequent meetings.

Burkhardt stated that he will go through high and/or medium levels on what the study is, the work that we will be doing, and he will go through it fairly quickly and then we can come back if you have specific questions.

Burkhardt went over the agenda for the project, stating that they started work on the project in February, so they are almost six or so weeks in. He referred to the next couple of slides and introduced the project team.

Burkhardt commented that they are using a 3-step approach, sort of an approach to a lot of planning studies whereby he likes to divide it out and right now we are in Phase 1, which he likes to call "Discovery". He explained that with this phase they are learning about things that we knew or didn't know, learning more about traffic operations in particular right now, specifically what we call existing and future conditions which help he will dive into more deeply. He said that this is the foundation for the project where they will look at traffic paths, to make sure they get that all right and that they understand it before they go forth and develop options for river crossings and impacts on the whole system as it relates to a new link in the transportation system.

Burkhardt stated that the next phase is "Development" which is where they will develop and evaluate the alternatives and concepts in more detail and understand how they perform.

Burkhardt said that the last but not least phase is "Documentation" is to build a report, but also the implementation plan will help provide insight and direction as to, okay we've got the conclusion to this study but how do we take it to the next step, whether that is construction phasing or funding or triggers for the NEPA process, etc.

Burkhardt referred to a slide with the Schedule Overview and went over it briefly, pointing out that March is highlighted. He commented that you will also see three little red blobs in the public involvement boxes, which are three public input events, that he will talk about more as well.

Burkhardt referred to the next slide, which discusses Task Status and First Deliverables, and went over it. He stated that he will provide this table each time we meet to just to give you a high level of what they are doing, what they accomplished, and what they are working on. He pointed out that you can see that the first four tasks are underway.

Burkhardt referred to the next slide, Engagement Approach and Tactics, and pointed out that again you will see the three project phases. He stated that the third column gives us further detail of things like what are we going to do to engage the public; things like an interactive comment

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

map and survey, and that is the backbone and is a really good application for this project in that it will provide a map where people can comment; the Ad Hoc Group meetings that he thinks are a really critical part of getting engagement on the project to a cross section of the public and others; public input meeting, and pop-up activities.

Burkhardt commented that some of these next slides he can go through pretty quickly, it is really just acknowledging that, when he thinks about doing this study, who cares about it, and how do we engage them with both agencies staff, which includes all of you and others, and with the public who have sort of overlapping but different interests and priorities, and it should do a good job of engaging both of them and then try to bring those perspectives together if need be, and again the last is the Ad Hoc Group, which hopefully is one of our strategies to integrate the different perspectives as we go along. He stated that part of this is managing and thinking about what information we put out to the public, in particular what are our messages, what are we asking them for input on, just trying to keep that goal focused and thoughtful so it isn't just a scattered shot, so it resonates with people.

Burkhardt referred to the next slide, which is an example of what the social pinpoint map looks like, this one is a mock-up showing what it will look like when we produce this, which they are just setting up in the next week or two. He explained how the map will work and commented that it is one of his favorite tools as it is really easy and is mobile friendly.

Burkhardt referred to the next slide illustrating a pyramid and commented that there is a lot going on here, but from his perspective it is an important tool that describes how he intends, with your help, to make this project work from an engagement standpoint. He stated that looking at the decision structure at the top, one thing he likes to try to be clear about when we involve this board, agency staff, the public is, what are we asking of you, what are you going to do, what are we going to do, and determining who is making the decisions is one way to get at that, so as you will see on the right hand side it indicates that ultimately it is the MPO Executive Policy Board that will make decisions on this study; next the Technical Advisory Committee will make recommendations, taking input and making recommendations to the board; next is the Ad Hoc Group, which we will talk about the composition of, and they are very much intended to understand where the public and others are coming from and to take that input and make recommendations to the Technical Advisory Committee; the General Public will provide input to the Technical Advisory Committee; and at the bottom is the consultant team and the MPO staff will manage and conduct the study.

Burkhardt stated that the Ad Hoc Group is intended to provide balanced representation, which in his experience is a great tool when you have lots of perspectives, and in this case having two sides of the river sets it up well for controversy in terms of, we want this we want that this works for us this doesn't work for us; so rather than fall into that trap of if it's there, the Ad Hoc Group, the intention is to think about what are the issues and interests that should be represented when we talk about this issue, the river crossing; and then try to bring together a group that brings that together. He said that you will see a list of the members coming up in the presentation.

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

Burkhardt commented that in terms of, probably not different from other committees, but he tries to be clear about the expectations, if you are on the group we want you to attend, to engage and connect with the public, and have your ear to the ground as to what the broader community issues and conversation is, and then working for consensus rather than voting; and when it comes down to a decision or recommendation try to work it out before making a decision or recommendation.

Burkhardt referred to the next slide and commented that it shows the three key decisions that we will want to make, ultimately what we represented and the technical reports we produce; we will be asking for input from the public on these as well until we get to that conclusion; so the foundation of purpose and need, why are we doing this, what is the purpose of an additional river crossings, what do we hope it will accomplish for transportation. He added that purpose and need is somewhat already set by the work that has been done and documented in the Long Range Transportation Plan from prior studies, but we will put a bit more meat on the bones of that document. He said that the second decision is the river crossing alternative, and on one hand the MPO is focused on two corridors, as well as a no-build option; so there is the 32nd Avenue location and the Elks Drive location, so on one hand the alternatives that we are looking at in the study have been defined, but obviously the hard work will be, what does that really mean, if we put the connection at 32nd Avenue what other impacts does that have on the transportation system, in terms of improving that intersection. He stated that the third one is recommendation, and this is where we come back to this language of “what is the conclusion of this study”, hopefully it is clarity on these two corridors that one clearly works better, meets the purpose and need better; expectation is that we will document that in the study. He said that as our FHWA and DOT staff know, at this phase of a study what we don’t want to do is to use the language that we have a “preferred” alternative because that gets us in trouble in the NEPA process.

Burkhardt reported that the next two slides show a list of the Ad Hoc Committee “Seats”, but they are actually geographies or issues or organizations that we want represented on the committee. He stated that Mr. Haugen and himself talked about who/what should be represented, and vetted it with others, to come up with a list of eleven representative seats. He referred to the next slide and commented that this one shows the names of the representatives on the Ad Hoc Committee. He stated that the first Ad Hoc Committee meeting is scheduled for the morning of April 6th.

Haugen wanted to emphasize that this group will meet for the first time, and he is wondering if there is another slide that highlights the time and place for this meeting, or should we get into that little detail now. Burkhardt responded that he does not have a slide that shows the time and location, so the first meeting will be held on Tuesday, April 6 at 9:30 a.m. in the Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers. Haugen added that he did send an e-mail to the Technical Advisory Committee, most of the people on this meeting, so they should have that detail, but just wanted to highlight that we do have all 11 members committed to meeting that Tuesday morning. He said that it will be a hybrid type meeting where some people will be available in person but the majority, perhaps most of the people on this Zoom call, will be participating via a Zoom Webinar and he will get that information out. He added that we still have to practice physical distancing and that does limit space within the room; we did get the largest room we

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

could that still allowed webinar technology plus met all of our ADA requirements, etc., but it is still limited to an actual number of people that can be in-person, so we would ask that most Technical Advisory Committee members please participate via the Zoom webinar. Zacher asked for the date and time of the meeting again as he doesn't have it on his calendar. Haugen reiterated that the meeting is Tuesday, April 6th at 9:30 a.m. in the Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers. Haugen responded that an e-mail was sent but a calendar invitation hasn't been sent yet. Kuharenko commented that he was going to mention that he hasn't seen a Zoom invitation yet. Haugen responded that he hasn't sent a Zoom Webinar invite yet, but you should have received the e-mail identifying the date, time, location, participation type, etc. Burkhardt asked if they should send those save the date invites to hold that time on people's calendars. Haugen responded that they can. He added that part of this is that they are working through Public Info at the City of Grand Fork and understanding the possibilities that we have with all of the technology available, and so the full Public Info staff was not available until next week, and that is why you got just a heads-up e-mail and not a full invite at this time as there are still some details being worked on. Burkhardt said that while we are on this topic the Ad Hoc Group is intending to meet a total of five times, so it isn't a monthly meeting, so they will meet at key milestones, so five times between April being the first one and before the end of the year, but he will be holding a monthly time for that, but it will be more like every other month.

Bergman asked if there would be any general public individuals on these committees; you see community and business, but most of the individuals he sees on the list are business owners, so that is why he is kind of curious because that is where you are getting the pushback from on anything, from the general public. Haugen responded that obviously we have two elected officials, and then community numbers three through eight were all selected by a combination of the neighborhood, working with their Alderman (Ward Person), and that is how they were selected so, again, for seats number three through eight are representing that neighborhood and they were selected through a neighborhood selection process, and that selection process was pretty much driven by the councilmembers whose wards they are in, and so he doesn't have all the details of exactly how it was done, but he does know for the Near Southside and 32nd Avenue neighborhoods their recruitment was through several active Facebook Group Pages that were available and other social media means, so he does believe that even though you may know these people because where they work, that isn't how they were selected, they were selected to represent the seats that we identified, they were selected through the process that was used in that individual neighborhood.

Burkhardt referred to the next two slides, Public Involvement Plan, and stated that the point of including them is just to show that, they, as a consultant team really outline what each of the meetings is about, whether it is a public, Technical Advisory Committee, or Ad Hoc Group meeting. He said that the reason for this is for them to be able to think through what they are going to do at the meeting, what are we trying to accomplish, and certainly for the public events how are we advertising it and what are the outcomes, etc., so this is a document that they share with Mr. Haugen in order to ensure we are all on the same page, and then for the Team to use as we go forward. He just wanted you to know that it exists and it is available if you are interested in digging into the details.

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

Burkhardt commented that the next slide is just a work in progress map; as we get into communicating with the public we will be preparing graphics to help people understand all kinds of things, so for now he just wanted to share the proposed alignments in relation to the two cities for bridges, nothing more on there, but there is a lot more that will go on various maps.

Burkhardt stated that we are not coming up on traffic, which is kind of what this is all about, or mission of what we are trying to accomplish and understand. He referred to the next slide, Traffic: Establishing a Baseline, and explained that it really goes through steps that will be familiar to all of you who are in engineering and traffic planning, so he will go through it quickly and just kind of recap the process.

Burkhardt said, starting with understanding existing traffic volumes, establishing that baseline, you will notice the word Covid on here as at this point, for better or for worse we are all pretty familiar with the fact that traffic in the last year is not representative of the recent past or what we expect in the future, so our traffic counts, if we are doing new traffic counts, are adjusted for this.

Burkhardt commented that the traffic volumes; you know intersections, obviously the key issue always, and if we anticipate changes in the network, that will continue to be the case.

Burkhardt stated that safety, again, can relate to traffic volume or not, but it is part of our existing understanding, are there issues that should be addressed, are there issues that were exasperated by the changes that we might purpose.

Burkhardt referred to the Key Intersections and Traffic Counts slide and commented that it lists the intersections that they are examining in detail with traffic counts. He pointed out that in the right-hand column if you see Alliant indicated that was done by their staff when they were here about two weeks ago collecting traffic counts at intersections where we didn't have recent counts from other sources, and they are not working through that data.

Burkhardt stated that also part of establishing that baseline they will be using Streetlight, which a number of you are familiar with, it is an amazing tool that has kind of exploded their ability to understand origin destination, where people are going to and from, using data collected by a smart phone, so they will be doing Streetlight analysis and they are working right now with A.T.A.C. who is collecting that data for them via their license, and then we are putting it together and documenting it and will be displaying it. He added that on the local system, street system, it will help show where people are traveling to and from right now and how does it relate to demand for an additional bridge crossing.

Burkhardt commented that, as he said at the beginning, a lot of this has been looked at before, and there is existing information that they are making use of, updating it obviously and bringing in their own expertise to that, but some of this not brand new information, but hopefully the way they display it and communicate it and use it, is slightly indignant to these two corridors, that should be a new and valuable contribution.

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

Burkhardt stated that as you know both Cities are updating their Land Use Plans right now, and that is important for us as we look to the future, where do we think traffic is going to be in the future, to make sure it reflects where we think the land use is heading, so we are doing that coordination right now as well, and again are working with A.T.A.C. to develop and make any adjustments needed to the traffic forecast they have already done based on some changes in land use that are anticipated as part of the plan update.

Burkhardt said that lots of performance measures that they will use, which you are familiar with; whether it is at intersections, on segments, probably that safety, multi-modal needs like bicycling, pedestrian network and features, certainly anywhere we purpose changes they will be looking for any adverse impact, unintended consequences, and then on the positive side looking to enhance the ability to walk and cycle in the community as is consistent with other plans, certainly that is a base assumption of a new river crossing, that it will include good bicycle and pedestrian facilities at a crossing.

Burkhardt stated that, again, sort of the process, that after we get all the information, then the question is still what; what are the needs, what do they tell us, and how does that translate into a solution, so, again, we build a connection across the river at one of these two location, how it is going to change traffic flow, is it going to bring more traffic in some locations and less in others, and then it is up to us to figure out how to address an issue that raises at an intersection, another key example.

Burkhardt said that communication flows throughout our effort on the project, whether it is directly in the public events, but also just sharing what we have learned; what the issues are, what opportunities are, so the traffic again, things like clear color-coded maps that are easy to read, not too busy and then you can see the videos operating on the right, is a really nice tool.

Burkhardt stated that he has one graphic here, it is more important than one, but as they develop and flesh out the crossing options and what that means to the intersections, on 32nd Avenue, developing easy to understand and transparent, in terms of impacts, graphics is really important; one of them is near to the top image which is a concept layout over an aerial. He added that the other thing which he doesn't have today, but that is really a nice feature is overlaying a project drawing like this on top of Google Earth, which some of you may have seen, and then you can easily animate it and it shows you more of a 3d look, which he thinks is helpful for us as professionals, but also for members of the public.

Burkhardt commented that the next slide is something he hinted at earlier, in terms of the environmental process. He said that this river crossing study is not an environmental document, it comes before the formal NEPA process, but there is something called the PEL process – Planning and Environmental Linkages, that a number of you are familiar with. He stated that his translation of what that means is doing a good planning study, it is not getting ahead of yourself, in terms of the NEPA process, and this slide has a few rules to live by, to actually keep yourself out of trouble. He added that, whether it is a study like this one or others, the transportation planning library is littered with examples of studies that go too far, and then the project advances into the Environmental process, which then says you have to go back and do that alternative

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

analysis over again because you didn't do it in a way that complies with the federal environmental process. He said that what that means to him is the purpose of having a purpose, which we do and will, using that to evaluate options, to have a basis for the technical analysis that we do and then the conclusions that we draw, and involving the public in all of that in the purpose and need, and in the evaluation process and documenting how the public was involved, and then what's important at the end, is not coming to a conclusion that says we looked at everything, or we looked at these things, and this is our recommended alternative, and we are done and this one is moving forward; you can think that, we can have one that clearly meets our evaluation criteria better than others, but we need to keep the door open to flow into a future NEPA process, so he would be glad for any input from those of you who have your additional thoughts and opinions on that, but he just wanted to highlight that that is the key part of what we need to accomplish to be successful.

Burkhardt stated that, just to reinforce this, we are looking at a very high level environmental, in the NEPA sense, which means a sort of natural environment and human environment. He said that they will run through a number of those factors, but a lot of them will not differentiate our alternatives at the level that we will get into here, but we do want to sort of run through them quickly using GIS, and once they are available they can provide us some quick information at a high level on affect, is that a potential impact; so a high level environmental screening is what we plan to with the study.

Haugen referred to the Environmental and NEPA/PEL Process Map and stated, just to talk about the termini of the gold lines, on the North Dakota side we have an established street network that is in place, neighborhoods, etc.; and so those touchdown points or termini on the North Dakota side are kind of set in place; on the Minnesota side we don't have that and so what he thinks would be important for us to keep in mind on the Minnesota side is two things, one is that we are going to touch down within the flood protection system, and that could mean being on top of the dike or, as we show here, a little bit further inside the dike but that is point number one and it will be within the dike system, and then point two is that we are going to be considering a three-legged intersection, and where exactly it will be does not necessarily mean that it will be right at the point we show here, however we do know that we don't anticipate doing a lot of work showing how a roadway would extend further east for this purpose we are touching down on; Rhinehart Drive extended into the flood protection system, it is a three-legged intersection and the exact precise location is still in play, but it will be a three-legged intersection based on our anticipated growth and traffic needs.

Mason asked if Mr. Haugen was more or less saying that the eastern limit of the study area is Rhinehart Drive, and where that gold line terminates or will analysis still occur between the larger red box on the map. Haugen responded that it will still occur between the larger red box plus we will also be looking at some of the intersections that are off the screen here, to the east, 220 and 2 probably is the one that is further east that is part of the traffic and intersections that we will look at. Mason stated that that is what he was kind of indicating, and he was curious because the Minnesota Department of Transportation's perspective is how does this interact further to the east and the impacts to the State Highway System. Haugen added that US Business 2 is also going to be heavily impacted by this study as well.

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

Burkhardt stated that, more or less the conclusion of the study, in terms of evaluating and getting to an understanding of performance and which option might best meet the purpose and need; the point of this is that they will collect a lot of information, again at a screening level, but a lot of different data points in terms of environmental impacts, traffic performance, etc. He said that they will boil those down and focus in on what matters, and he refers to this as the key to their approach, we can talk all day about a certain issue that is maybe an impact that will need to be evaluated in the future, and we need to document that, does it make a difference as to the preference, if it doesn't make a difference between two corridors or two corridors and a no-build, we can acknowledge that and then move on and focus on the things that do matter and that do differentiate in order to understand which one performed better and which one best meets the project objectives.

Burkhardt commented that he has done a lot of studies like this; the evaluation process, the way he sees this is sort of walking a balance between understanding which one performs best to get the criteria that you set, but also not using the process the evaluation as well we plug it into the spreadsheet and whichever one has the most points is the answer; gives you information, tells you how your alternatives, how your option performs, but there is some discussion as to what you do with that information, whether that will be clear and simple or long and difficult we will find out, but that is where we are headed.

Burkhardt stated that that is his formal presentation, a lot in there, and he would definitely love to hear if that raised any questions or concerns, or is there an issue that you didn't hear me talk about and you want to make sure I understand it and hear how we might approach it, he would definitely appreciate hearing from you, you won't hurt his feelings and he would rather hear about it sooner or later.

QUESTIONS/ANSWERS:

Sperry said that she has a comment on the public involvement portion; are you going to reach out to more State and Federal Agencies for their input. Burkhardt responded that right now he would say that it is mostly this group, the Technical Advisory Committee, as well as a couple of environmental agencies that we have talked to, is that what you had in mind. Sperry responded yes, especially if you want to tie it into PEL. She added that she isn't sure on the hydraulic study, if anybody had reached out to the Coast Guard to make sure the elevations that were looked at were okay with what they would approve, but then there is also Minnesota DNR and PCA on the Minnesota side that you may want to contact as well. Burkhardt said that he thinks that all makes sense, so maybe we should talk offline unless you have a quick answer to what level of engagements and involvement do you think is appropriate for those agencies, in terms of, he thinks the Coast Guard is great and we do want to understand the context proposed in that hydraulic study are feasible or acceptable from that elevation standpoint. Haugen commented that the perspective he would provide to this, and we have used this in the past, is a simpler solicitation of view to reach out to all of those environmental agencies and try to engage them early and often in the process. He said that we do know, that experience tells us that until we are saying that we actually have a project programmed, their excitement and enjoyment of participating in a planning study is a little bit lower on their totem poles, so if you can help us

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

spur their engagement that would be awesome. Sperry responded that she can try to help with that. Burkhardt asked if Ms. Sperry thought that copying them on e-mail is adequate, or maybe sharing or asking for feedback; what level do you think is worthwhile or minimal, in terms of accomplishing the PEL study, how would you like to see that engaged. Sperry responded that she thinks they are in the public involvement portion would be important, to show you documented that you contacted and coordinated with some of those. She said that Minnesota has a lot more regulations than North Dakota and so she would hate to choose something and then have something pop up that wasn't thought of. Burkhardt commented that to Mr. Haugen's credit he has been talking about those agencies all along, and he neglected to mention them.

Kuharenko stated that one of the big issues that they have kind of seen with a bridge study is a lot of the public saying that they didn't have a chance to comment on this; you don't want to have a decision be made or a potential of not having their voice heard so public involvement is a huge huge deal on this bridge discussion. He asked if Mr. Burkhardt could talk a little bit more about public engagement, and particularly direct mailings for residents. Burkhardt responded that this is something that has been discussed briefly but his experience with direct mailings are that they can be really effective, but they are expensive, and they did not include that cost in their budget so he would put Mr. Haugen on the spot as to whether that is something he had thoughts of or that the MPO would do or not do. Haugen responded that we have done them in the past, and he knows the Mr. Burkhardt did send an email regarding it but he has not been able to respond to it as he has not physically been in the office so that is something that we can work on next week. He said though that we do know that there are thousands of properties that are in our study area; we did discuss this at a previous Technical Advisory Committee meeting as well and we did hear them suggest we do a mass mailing, so we are working through the logistics, and we don't have a definitive yes or no at this point. Burkhardt commented that that is a good question; we do hear a lot that people didn't hear about something, and sometimes it is actually true, but in addition to or if we aren't able to do a mailing he thinks the way that we will be getting the word out is the channels that the MPO uses already, which would be social media. He added that the Ad Hoc Group has sort of that responsibility to report back to their constituents so the neighborhood is kept in the loop, so that is a channel we have and again it may not get to every last person, but he thinks we do need to make sure we do everything we can, but in any event he is clear on this issue and he doesn't want us to get tagged on it half way through the study.

Kuharenko said that he has one other question or comment; but he did see that in the alternatives that you are looking at round-a-bouts, traffic signals and those sort of things, one of the things that may come up is, particularly with the nearby schools; if memory serves he thinks the last time we installed a round-a-bout there were some concerns from the school district as to their safety, so that might be a point of discussion you may want to be prepared for. Burkhardt thanked him for the heads up and asked if there were any, or many round-a-bouts in the area. Kuharenko responded that we have a couple; we have one over by Discovery Elementary School, which is located at South 34th Street and 40th Avenue South, that is probably the closest one we have to a school; and we have another one that is located at 24th Avenue South and South 34th Street, but it isn't immediately adjacent to a school. He said that the one down by Discovery is probably the most relevant. Burkhardt responded that that helps, and he asked this primarily for familiarity. He added that he understands that for a long time, when you aren't used to them,

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

you have to get through that to help people understand and get over their concerns, and some people might not like them, but when it comes to safety of pedestrians and bicyclists you do need to be careful where you locate it and how you handle that traffic. He said that that is a good heads up and he doesn't know if we will recommend a round-a- bout at a specific location on the east side, but they just haven't gotten there. He added that Mike Anderson has some experience with that in the area as well, so that is good.

Emery said that he doesn't have any additional comments as Mr. Haugen did address the one question he did have by discussing the touchdown points on the East Grand Forks side, so that was the only question he had as he doesn't think they were even in the hydraulic study, it wasn't ever totally determined where they would be so he is glad that that is still being left open. Burkhardt suggested that we may want to generalize the map and start communicating, but for now it is a nice handy summary that doesn't get too detailed about those kinds of options, but it does show two different touchdown points so maybe those need more of a circled general area around them or some kind of note saying that they aren't the final location options.

Zacher said that he has no questions at this time.

Peterson stated that he really doesn't have anything to add; Mr. Kuharenko's questions and comments on public involvement, which he thinks that will be big, covered most of his concerns as well. He said that some of his previous questions were more of a broad scope of the actual project but more on the planning stage when we talk about the infrastructure supporting such a bridge crossing, so he will save his comments for later in the study.

Mason commented that he saw that Rich Sanders put a comment in, and it may be along the same lines that he was thinking; so if the Future Bridge Traffic Impact Study shows that the touchdown point is more or less just on the inside of the dike, maybe this is part of the implementation plan and further analysis, but what will the network look to the east of there, what will the property impacts and different traffic controls at those intersecting roadways look like. He added that east of the dike the roadway system is basically out of the scope of this project, is that fair enough to say. Haugen responded that we are looking at all of the existing intersections that are in place; we are not anticipating any new roadway beyond connecting to Rhinehart, we will likely have to make improvements to the existing road and intersections that connect Rhinehart to the rest of the network, but we aren't anticipating trying to show that because of the bridge we would be building a new east/west roadway connecting all the way over to Bygland Road or County 72. He added that we do know that right now the jurisdiction of Rhinehart ends at a city limit line, and we do know that in the past, and we heard again from and MPO Board members, that when this bridge is being built the city limits will be used to have jurisdiction of the new road, new bridge, upgrade Rhinehart within the City of East Grand Forks to help ease some of the concerns the Township has expressed already. Haugen commented that they are looking at the existing roadway intersections and the furthest east intersection is just north of the Mallory Bridge, US#2 and 220 South and follow the key intersections all the way back to the landing at Elks and Rhinehart or 32nd and Rhinehart.

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

Haugen reported that you do see a Polk County representative on the Ad Hoc Group agency list and we didn't have one from Grand Forks County. He said that the primary reason for this is when they were going through the transportation plan Grand Forks County made it clear that they did not want to weigh in on any City to City bridge location debate discussion, and so because of that input we felt that since this study is looking at just the City to City connection we wouldn't include a Grand Forks County staff as a supporting agency to the Ad Hoc Group, but it certainly doesn't mean that Mr. West isn't able to participate, we just don't anticipate Grand Forks County having a huge involvement in this since they have indicated in the past that they wanted to stay clear.

Sperry asked if they were going to take into consideration in your traffic a new interchange at 47th Avenue South in I-29. Haugen responded that that is still up for debate. He added that they will be relying somewhat on the information that we found and discovered during that I-29 Traffic Operation Study that we did, that there is little in our travel demand model making direct traffic connections between this new bridge location and a new interchange location. He explained that the I-29 Study, that was one of the early questions we asked of the Travel Demand Model on the operation of I-29; how or if the potential future additional river crossings impacted I-29, and the simple answer is that this is not a direct correlation between new river crossings and I-29 operations. Burkhardt asked what Ms. Sperry's reaction to that was. Sperry responded that she hasn't read that document so she would defer to Mr. Haugen or anyone else from the group that participated in that. Burkhardt said that he just wants to make sure that we understand that, and he will certainly bring it back to Mike Anderson and their traffic group to make sure we understand that.

Burkhardt stated that he appreciates the input and time from everyone. He said that typically, as you know, we will be doing this as an update as part of the Technical Advisory Committee's regular meetings, and will be focused on what is going on, opportunities for input, and those kinds of exchanges. He added that for him, as you have your ears to the ground that are tuned into issues that may be percolating up or maybe not, he looks forward to further input.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO ADJOURN THE MARCH 19TH,
SPECIAL TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 9:46 A.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager