

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 12th, 2022**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the January 12th, 2022, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:35 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present via Zoom: Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Wayne Zacher, NDDOT-Local Government; Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning; Jon Mason, MnDOT-District 2; Jason Peterson, NDDOT-Grand Forks; and Ryan Riesinger, Airport Authority. Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Engineering was present in person.

Absent: Brad Bail, Nick West, Nancy Ellis, David Kuharenko, Ryan Brooks, Jesse Kadrmas, Michael Johnson, Lane Magnuson, Nels Christianson, Dale Bergman, and Patrick Hopkins.

Guest(s) present: Kristen Sperry, FHWA-ND; Anna Pierce, MnDOT-Central Office; Tim Burkhardt, Alliant Engineering; and Hannah Johnson, Alliant Engineering.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 12TH MINUTES OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY EMERY, SECONDED BY PETERSON, TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER
12TH, 2021 MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON FUTURE BRIDGE TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY

Haugen reported that included in the packet is a presentation that Mr. Burkhardt will go through. He stated that it has a lot of information about the open house that was held, as well as other information on the study.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 12th, 2022**

Burkhardt stated that this is the last update on the study from him. He said that they are at the point of having the draft report finished, and their contract ends at the end of the month, however he would be glad to join a meeting at any time in the future for questions or discussion on the draft plan, but this is the last formal presentation.

Burkhardt referred to the information in the packet, and commented that the agenda is fairly simple, and it mostly talks about the public open house from last month, the study report, and next steps.

Burkhardt said that Hannah Johnson is here, and she was heavily involved with the open house, as well as the evaluation work that they did, as an additional source of information as needed.

Burkhardt referred to the slide listing the Tasks and Deliverables status and pointed out that you will see that most have moved to the left-hand column showing they have been completed and that the only things left, including this meeting, is the final meeting of the Ad Hoc Group which will also happen this month, and then the draft report will be finalized by the end of the month and be posted to the website.

Burkhardt referred to the next few slides and commented that they give a recap on the Public Open House; but before we go over that he would like to give a little recap of public involvement overall for the study as they have tallied the figures for the online portion, and there are some good numbers that he wanted to make sure you all saw, just in general to see that, and certainly this study in particular and the history of the bridge study there is a familiar refrain of people saying they didn't know or they weren't involved which is always a hazard of the work we do, but for all of us just to see what we did get, which he thinks is pretty substantial involvement, so you can see the numbers from our project specific website on social pinpoint, the total visits were 15,208, the unique users were 3933, email sign-ups were 89, and document downloads were 462.

Burkhardt said that he is proud of the involvement; and we did more on-line than we would have liked due to covid, however we are seeing that people do like doing things on-line so it is probably here to stay.

Burkhardt referred to slides on the Public Open House and commented that the purpose of them was to share the evaluation results, share an image of what a new bridge could look like, make sure we have a clear message about pedestrian safety and traffic calming strategies around schools, which we knew was a priority and give input on all three alternatives.

Burkhardt referred to a slide that explained what they did in terms of public notification and input opportunities and went over it briefly. He commented that the next slide shows participation statistics, specifically that in person participation had a low attendance, adding that 5 of the 20 people that signed in were Ad Hoc Group members, City Employees, and/or elected officials. He said, however, that on-line showed good attendance with 6,059 visits and 1,769 unique users. He pointed out that we also received 13 in-person and 360 on-line responses on the survey that was offered.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 12th, 2022**

Burkhardt stated that again, the next slide discusses in person versus on-line comments, and we will kind of combine these together; some comments they heard in-person were just wanting more information on our traffic forecasting, how we got the numbers we are sharing; understanding the evaluation criteria; and always a recurring theme of interest in a bridge farther south. He said they did get a couple of comments on economic development, regarding what the benefits were, and, again as you may recall that was very high level and we did not do an economic development study, but more assumed that improved access across the river was supportive of economic development; and then not surprisingly, in terms of a single alternative a lot of comments around 32nd Avenue traffic increases and school crossing safety, as well as concerns from residents about traffic and driveway access. He said that on-line comments, you will see a summary of on the following slides, and, just a note here he will tell you how many respondents they had; most people who got on-line did respond to the survey, but not everybody responded to everything.

Burkhardt referred to the next few slides and stated that they didn't ask people a lot of questions on-line, just kept it simple. He went over the questions and responses (see slide presentation included in file) as follows:

Q1 – How well do you feel each alternative meets the project purpose and need? He pointed out that 64% of respondents feel that the no new bridge option does not meet project purpose and need; responses were split as to how well the Elks Drive corridor meets the purpose and need; and 62% of respondents feel that the 32nd Avenue Bridge alternative meets the project purpose and need well or very well.

Q2 – What would you change, if anything, to improve the performance of each new bridge option? He explained that they asked this question intentionally this way to try to turn people's complaints into something constructive or something concrete. He said that it wasn't surprising that they didn't get a lot of specific answers to those questions, but you will see that for Elks Drive they had about 24 that had a suggestion including improving traffic control at intersections, increasing the elevation of the bridge and some type of modification to the bridge approach as it comes into Grand Forks.

Halford said, you mentioned not all questions got answered, is this one of the questions that didn't get answered, questions like this that ask for suggestions. Burkhardt responded yes; if you look at the numbers; Elks Drive they had 73 responses and 24 gave actual suggestions, and 32nd they had 103 and 37 gave suggestions. He added that the 73 and 103 are out of that roughly 300-360 that participated in the survey at all, so a smaller number responded in detail to this question. Halford said that that answered her question, she was just wondering if this was one of them. Burkhardt stated that he that was kind of a vague thing to say, this is a better answer to that, and again they had just these three questions, so the first one, again, was pretty well answered, the second not so much.

Q3 – Which alternative do you prefer? Burkhardt stated this question had about 368 responses and was a pretty easy question to answer. He pointed out that 56 percent of respondents responded 32nd Avenue, 17 percent said Elks Drive, and 27% said no bridge

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 12th, 2022**

would be the best alternative. He commented that that does mirror what we saw before; pretty clear difference between 32nd and Elks, but not surprisingly we saw in the comments that people aren't signing up for a bridge as 27 percent say no new bridge, but we should probably asterisk that because some mean no new bridge at this location, but they are quick to identify a different location that isn't in their backyard.

Q4 – Do you have any comments or questions on the bridge alternatives or the study? Burkhardt said that this is an open-ended question that asks for other comments or questions. He stated that there were 160 responses to this. He commented that they do have the responses documented in detail in a spreadsheet, and they still have an email or two that are still coming in. He pointed out what that there are “themes” they see from these responses and stated that it is worth taking a minute to read through them. He said that the most common theme was about concerns of increased traffic in neighborhoods, especially around schools, and some questions on what the benefit of a bridge is for Grand Forks, so that has been the theme throughout certainly the traffic in the neighborhoods and they have done their best just to share what that is and that it is an increase, but it is still within traffic engineering standards.

Burkhardt commented that the second theme is a desire for a bridge farther south, and, again that isn't a new theme, and not surprisingly it is easy to want that so it gets out of your neighborhood. He stated that that is balanced by enthusiasm about a new connection across the river, not the most number of responses, but we know there is a certain number of people that say build it now, build it yesterday.

Burkhardt said there were questions about where the money would come from and how does it fall to each city.

Burkhardt stated there were flooding questions, what is the impact to the flood protection system or trying to understand how the bridge height impacts flooding.

Burkhardt said that the last item was concerns about the impacts to the Greenway.

Burkhardt referred to the next slide and commented that they do like to do a word cloud, which is sometimes more revealing than other things, and if you will look at this one the larger the word the more it appeared in comments that we received.

Burkhardt stated that the next slide shows some demographic questions we asked, and he doesn't think there is anything too revealing here.

Burkhardt said that the other question they ask is how people heard about the event, and the table shows the responses received.

Haugen commented that the only thing to note on the in-person event was that the morning of the event the weather wasn't very nice, but by the evening it had improved, however he knows that it

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 12th, 2022**

did have an effect, including that the consultants couldn't attend in person, so that may have been why attendance was lower.

Burkhardt stated that the last slides show that the Draft report will be shared with the Technical Advisory Committee and the Ad Hoc Group for review and comment. He pointed out that most materials have been shared previously in the form of technical memos but there was some new material added including an executive summary, public involvement summary, and evaluation summary. He said that the final report will be posted to the project website by January 31st.

Burkhardt said that the last steps will be to summarize the public open house feedback, hold the final Ad Hoc Group meeting, and then finalize the report and post it to the website.

Haugen stated that we would ask that comments on the draft report be submitted by noon on January 26th, the sooner the better so we can incorporate them into the final document. He added that it is looking like the Ad Hoc Group will be meeting on Monday, January 17th at 11:00.

Halford said that she thinks Mr. Burkhardt did a very good job of presenting the information and she enjoyed his presentations, thank you. Burkhardt thanked her and said that he appreciates her comment. Haugen thanked Mr. Burkhardt, Hanna Johnson, and Mike Kondzielka for their work on this study. Burkhardt thanked everyone and said that he does appreciate your time and feedback in helping make this a good study and good outcome and he looks forward to working with you again, or if you are at the Ad Hoc meeting he will see you next Monday.

Information only.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT RFP FOR BIKE/PED ELEMENT UPDATE

Haugen reported that this item was tabled at last month's meeting. He said that a draft was e-mailed out to the Technical Advisory Committee members earlier than the rest of the agenda packet so that you could see how the comments were incorporated. He added that included in the draft, Anna Pierce in particular, had commented on two drafts, however he only received one of them initially so follow-up he did receive the comments from the earlier draft so those have been incorporated into the document and he know that Ms. Pierce did release some follow-up just to the Technical Advisory Committee yesterday, but the three main issues were sort of fleshing out better the writing of the Advisory Committee to help steer the work, and hopefully you are able to see that in the draft, how that was reshaped; and then there was more discussion about the at-grade railroad crossing, that is particularly a Grand Forks side issue, although it is also germane on the East Grand Forks side as well; and then lastly the neighborhood communication, particularly about direct mailings, which did not change a whole lot from what was in the earlier draft, again the draft contained mention of direct mailings being an option, but it was intending to still leave it up to the consulting firm to identify what methods they thought were best to get engagement on it and not to nail them down to a specific alternative, so that is the way it was drafted. He said that other than that things remained as they were. He added that there was a request to include, from our work program, just a reminder of what the 2050 timeline

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 12th, 2022**

is to achieve all of this, and the bottom line is under current timelines, January 31 of 2024 is when we need to have a 2050 MTP delivered to our State and Federal partners.

Haugen commented that as everyone knows we just finished the East Grand Forks Land Use Plan, we are at the tail-end of the Grand Forks Land Use Plan document, the TDP is underway and scheduled to be concluded at the end of 2022, and now with this Bike/Ped update being tabled from last month this will be adjusted to be completed in the first quarter of 2023.

Haugen stated that the timeline is dependent on the MPO Executive Policy Board approving to release this RFP yet this month, the proposals will be due at the end of February, with interviews and selection taking place the first couple of weeks of March, and then March 16th is when the Board is scheduled to have their regular meeting, that would potentially be the time to agree with a recommended consultant and contract cost and scope of work, and then it normally takes a few days for us to get all the paperwork into NDDOT for concurrence on the process, so the notice to proceed is identified in here as March 22nd, and as you can see the final report submittal would February of 2023.

Haugen commented that the background, scope of work, the most significant change was Ms. Pierce providing a write-up of tasks 1 through 10, so it is pretty much her work being repeated here in the document. He said that the Stakeholders, the advisory roster was reshaped and formed and identified as you see in the draft, with a mixture of people mostly serving from the Greenway Trail and Bike/Ped Advisory User Group that meets on almost a monthly basis, and some other organization throughout the community that represent some strong advocacy for bike/ped movement, and then of course staff supporting it from the various departments and agencies that are partners with the MPO.

Williams referred to the scope of work and commented that they are requesting that #7 the optional facility type guidelines be eliminated. Haugen responded that we had that discussion last month and the agreement last month was to keep it in place, so are you trying again to take it out. Williams responded they were. Haugen stated that, again, he would just point out to you that we have a federal requirement to do something in regard to complete streets, whether it be a policy or not; last month we had agreed that we would leave it up to the process to flesh out how it is. Williams said that one of the problems with it is that it is not just bicycles and pedestrians its buses, trucks, cars, people walking there are all sorts of stuff and if it is limited within your bicycle and pedestrian facilities that won't address everything, that is one concern, there are other concerns, so they are requesting it be eliminated. Haugen asked if this was a motion to that effect. Williams responded that she makes a motion to do that. Haugen asked if this was a motion to approve the RFP with this one elimination or just to start the process of a motion to just eliminate this one part. Williams responded that she doesn't know whether anyone else has any comments, so she is willing to make a motion just to eliminate this on its own and still have another motion for final approval.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY EMERY, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 12th, 2022**

***AMEND THE RFP TO ELIMINATE THE OPTION FOR COMPLETE STREET
LANGUAGE OUT OF TASK #7 IN THE RFP SCOPE OF WORK.***

Haugen asked, if we eliminate this from here then what is the suggested approach that we comply with the requirement. Williams stated that she believes that would be a topic for another time. Haugen asked if it should be put in the RFP for the MTP. Williams responded that she is not suggesting it be put anywhere at this time she believes it is an entire discussion upon itself and not part of the motion. Haugen commented that we are discussing it yes, it is part of the discussion. Halford said it is her understanding that it doesn't have to be on complete streets, it can be something else, that is just one of the options, isn't that the understanding of it. Haugen responded that it has to address either a policy that is a complete street policy or something that addresses what would be a like document of complete streets. Halford asked if the bike and ped plan itself doesn't act as that as an option. Haugen responded that it is possible that the Bike and Ped Plan does act as that option, that is part of what we discussed last month, he thought, to just let the process flesh that out instead of saying absolutely not a discussion point, and that was the decision of the Technical Advisory Committee as he understood it last month, was to let the process determine the outcome instead of us preventing that from being a discussion point through the process.

Halford asked if as we go through the process if the bike and ped plan can be viewed as one of the options we can use instead can it be amended later on if that is something that we want to do. Haugen responded that certainly it can be amended, all documents can be amended, but if we were to actually go through, it might require an amendment of the scope with the consultant then to draft up a complete street policy if that is the result instead of just relying on how the document is, that would be the approach. He added that right now it is basically saying that there is this requirement to somehow address this umbrella of things called complete streets, it has not defined the outcome yet, but it allows the process to define the outcome with the motion that has been made and seconded it would eliminate the verbiage of complete streets.

Halford said, just to clarify, and maybe help the Technical Advisory Committee, she worked with Engineering on drafting their Complete Streets for the Grand Forks side, very much so for the language and everything about Complete Streets, her fear with this is that we aren't ready to do an umbrella for both cities and she would hate if people are still kind of wishy washy, afraid to go down that route, if you push too hard it will take us a couple of steps back and it took them so long to get to where they are now, to get a Complete Streets policy in place, that pushing too hard might take us back when they aren't ready. Haugen said it is probably unfair to ask our State and Federal Partners if the motion is adopted how would you react. Mason responded that he can chime in, and if Ms. Pierce has additional information let him know, but they were just chatting on the side, but we are specifically talking about the optional task to develop MPO planning area Complete Streets Policy, the other part about the guidelines for selecting pedestrainf and bicycle facilities remains, correct. Haugen responded that that is correct. Mason said that Mr. Haugen would probably know more about New Bill and some of the information with the Complete Streets Policy but, and this is where Ms. Pierce can step in, but they are under the understanding that it might be better to treat that as a separate MPO document, or at least begin the conversations to pursue that as a possibility as kind of a stand-alone document and process in itself. Pierce agreed that what Mr. Mason said makes the most sense, if there isn't an

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 12th, 2022**

existing MPO Complete Streets Policy in place to have that as a separate item and then items from that can always be amended into the bike/ped portion of the MTP. Haugen thanked the Minnesota side representatives for their input and asked if the North Dakota side representatives would like to chime in as well. Zacher responded that from his understanding, and he isn't sure on the Bike and Ped side, but from the construction standpoint each of their projects needs to consider going down the Complete Streets and how Complete Streets can be incorporated into a construction project, whether that belongs in this document or considered, he doesn't know but he does know it is coming. Sperry commented that she would agree with what the Minnesota and North Dakota DOTs are saying; they haven't been given any additional guidance for all of the new pots of money, what those requirements will be so she can't say whether taking Complete Streets out would hinder specific pots of money because they haven't received any further guidance on whether you need to have a complete streets plan or a policy in order to use those funds. Halford asked if there was any kind of timeline on when you might hear anything on this. Sperry responded that her guess is as good as hers. Haugen commented that we do have to commit at least 2.5% of our budget towards this umbrella thing called Complete Streets. Halford asked how much money that would be. Haugen responded that it would be 2.5% of roughly \$700,000. He added that you will see under the work program agenda item we've got planning emphasis, and it has an area called Complete Streets so the two buzz words Federal Highway and the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law are using is "Complete Streets" but then there is either a Complete Street Policy or Complete Street Plan, or if the Bike/Ped Plan can serve that roll.

Zacher commented that he is just wondering; if we start talking bike lane as part of the Bike and Ped Plan then you are looking at the streets as well so then to him it would make sense to leave it in there as an option and let the process run its course. Haugen thanked him and asked if there was any further discussion.

Voting Aye: Peterson, Emery, Halford, Mason, Zacher, Williams, and Riesinger.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Kadrmas, Brooks, Bail, Johnson, Christianson, Ellis, Hopkins, Sanders, Bergman, Kuharenko, and Magnuson.

MOVED BY HALFORD, SECONDED BY WILLIAMS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE RFP FOR THE BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN ELEMENT UPDATE SUBJECT TO IMPLEMENTING THE ELIMINATION OF THE OPTION FOR COMPLETE STREET LANGUAGE OUT OF TASK #7 IN THE RFP SCOPE OF WORK.

Halford said that she would also like to go on record to say that she likes the idea that in the future there is a separate document, maybe there is a Complete Streets document, and that is something that gets amended in. Haugen responded that as we get more guidance from our State and Federal Partners of what the 2.5% all means and what the requirements are by the 2050 Adoption timeline we will adjust accordingly.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 12th, 2022**

Voting Aye: Peterson, Emery, Halford, Mason, Zacher, Williams, and Riesinger.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Kadrmas, Brooks, Bail, Johnson, Christianson, Ellis, Hopkins, Sanders, Bergman, Kuharenko, and Magnuson.

Haugen commented that because the RFP talked a lot about railroad crossings; yesterday morning Ms. Kouba participated on a Minnesota Rail Crossing Plan call, and so you will get from us, in an email later this afternoon, a link to the Minnesota study website, and part of what they are talking about is railroad crossings and improvements necessary, and some of the discussion was on bike and ped movement across at grade crossings, and so he forwarded this on to Mr. Zacher and he was wondering if him or Jim Styron had reacted to it on the North Dakota side. Zacher responded that he saw the email and he didn't know if Mr. Styron responded or not but he hasn't heard anything so he will follow up to see if he has a response to it. Haugen stated that this is just alerting everyone that, at least on the Minnesota side, there is an effort on railroad crossings and one of the items is bike/ped movement across those crossings and they said it was a federal requirement to do this document so we assume something on the North Dakota side is in the works already or will be soon so stay tuned on the North Dakota side but later this afternoon you will get an email about the Minnesota work going on and the ways you can comment.

Sperry stated that she did receive an email this morning from Rebecca Geyer that the North Dakota Agency just put out a North Dakota Highway-Rail Grade Crossing State Action Plan and it was sent out in draft form and comments are being accepted until February 8th. She said that the link is: <https://www.dot.nd.gov/dotnet/news/Public/View/9069>. Williams said that she would be interested to see how the situation is addressed when everyone agrees there needs to be a facility and a specific railroad company will not allow you to do it.

Haugen said that under Other Business there is discussion on continued work on the North Dakota side for their freight plan and there is a request for documentation of population and traffic in the MPO area that we just received. He added that he doesn't know if that is related to the same document Ms. Sperry is talking about or not.

MATTER OF TIP CANDIDATE PROJECTS ON MINNESOTA SIDE

Haugen reported that last month we discussed candidate projects on the North Dakota side and moved them forward, this month we are talking about the Minnesota side.

Haugen stated that we did receive one project, and it is no surprise since we have been discussing it as a joint effort with the City of Grand Forks, and that is to do work on the Point Bridge. He added that 2026 is the normal cycle under the existing ATP programs for the City's Subtarget to be available to the MPO in its rotation every fourth year, and in our Transportation Plan and last month, Grand Forks followed through with submitting an application for funding on their 50% share of the cost of the bridge, so East Grand Forks is following up this month with their 50% cost share of the bridge plus some asphalt work on their side.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 12th, 2022**

Haugen commented that in the packet is the ATP application that identifies the Minnesota 50% cost share only, not the total cost because that shows on the North Dakota side. He stated that the map shows where the asphalt work will be done only on the Minnesota side, and it is consistent with our Transportation Plan and since it is the only project it would be given priority ranking so staff recommends that the Technical Advisory Committee also agree it is consistent and give it top priority. He said that we do make note that with the new Infrastructure Bill there is a whole new program dedicated specifically for bridges that perhaps since this is a bridge project, it might be a good project to be funded out of that program instead of the City Subtarget, but we will have to wait to see how it all shakes out but we do want to make everybody aware of the possibility that not only is there a new bridge program distributed by formula but there is also a competitive program as well, but for now we are assuming that those funds are not available and we are identify candidate projects based as if it were last year, same programs same funding amounts.

MOVED BY HALFORD, SECONDED BY EMERY, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE MINNESOTA SIDE CANDIDATE PROJECT FOR THE FY2022-2025 TIP AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING.

Voting Aye: Peterson, Ellis, Bail, Halford, Mason, Zacher, and Kuharenko

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Kadrmas, Bergman, West, Brooks, Emery, Johnson, Christianson, Hopkins, Riesinger, Sanders, and Magnuson.

MATTER OF FY2022 WORK PROGRAM

Haugen reported that included in the packet is the detailed table showing all of the activities we are doing in 2022; we amended this last October to increase the Bike/Ped amount because of some August redistribution of funds that came available on the Minnesota side, and we placed them there, otherwise all of our current identified dollars are attached to a project activity that is either underway or will be underway in the near future. He added that they do note that just as the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law Bill increased funds for construction and transit, etc., it also increases funds for planning and we are anticipating an additional 30% of CPG funds becoming available in 2022 to us, but we are waiting as is everyone else is, to have that amount actually appropriated.

Halford said, then, that the current 2022 work program you have up doesn't include that 30% increase in funding included yet, correct. Haugen responded that this is correct.

Haugen stated that we aren't anticipating doing a Work Program Amendment until we have a better handle on the dollar amounts, and if we are going to get the full 30% then there will be an

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 12th, 2022**

opportunity to have discussions about adding on to the Work Program activities or not, so stay tuned.

Haugen commented that we do have a two year Work Program, 2021-2022, in place and we are just transitioning over to 2022, and things were identified and anticipated already, so we are underway in 2022 Work Program activities.

Haugen stated that as he mentioned earlier, we just received; this used to be something that was an annual routine part of the Federal partnership, and that is that they would announce different emphasis areas, but it has been fairly relaxed the last several years, however it is back on board where they do say here are our planning emphasis areas, and as you can see in the letter there are a number of them. He said that some of these we have discussed at past Technical Advisory Committee meetings so they should be all that new to you. He stated that the one that is the most recent to him would be the emphasis on some strategic highway network, and on the North Dakota side we do have some segments of that, but they are our highest roadway facilities on the North Dakota side to begin with, so they aren't like some remote unique obscure highway, they are Interstate and US#2.

Haugen said that he knows that February 1st we will hear more from the Minnesota side on what these planning emphasis areas mean, and at some point North Dakota may follow suit, or concur, but many of these things we already have been working on and have incorporated them already into our documents and will continue to do so.

Information only.

MATTER OF MPO EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR POSITION

Haugen reported that as many of you are aware he has announced his retirement. He said that his last scheduled work day is February 25th.

Haugen stated that there is an agenda item on next Wednesdays Executive Board meeting regarding the Executive Director position, and the potential is that they will release a job announcement and begin the process of replacement, so stay tuned for further announcements, but as of now he will be here until February 25th, but during the month of February you will see Ms. Kouba taking on more duties, etc. including running the Technical Advisory Committee meeting and staffing the Executive Policy Board meetings, and up until they announce a replacement, or how they fill the vacancy, she will be someone to include on your email communications and start sharing the continuity after February for MPO activities.

Haugen said that he wants to thank the current members of the Technical Advisory Committee as well as the past members, and there have been quite a few through the process; wore out many people he supposes. He stated that he is thankful for the rest that stuck in there for the recent near past. He added that he has no real great plans, still going to stick around as his wife is still continuing to do her job and her work, just maybe more time at the lake, so thank you all.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 12th, 2022**

Congratulations were shared by the Technical Advisory Committee members present.

OTHER BUSINESS

A. 2021 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that the monthly update was included in the packet. He said that we discussed many of these projects; there is a website for the Grand Forks Land Use Plan if you want to get the latest and greatest on that, but the only thing we haven't spent a lot of time discussing, and he will ask Ms. Kouba to just briefly describe where the Pavement Management Update is.

Kouba said that she talked with ICON or GoodPointe and they hit a bit of a snag with the collection as well as being able to process the collection, but they have figured it out and they are now hoping to have everything at least processed and to start to get the PCIs into ICON by the end of the month, so she looks forward to passing on more information in the near future.

Haugen added that you do notice that they do have a contract or obligation to be done by the end of March 2022 so they aren't past due on any project delivery yet.

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY EMERY, SECONDED BY HALFORD, TO ADJOURN THE JANUARY 12TH,
2022 MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:54 P.M.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager