

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 9th, 2022**

CALL TO ORDER

Teri Kouba, Chairman, called the February 9th, 2022, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:34 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Wayne Zacher, NDDOT-Local Government; Jason Peterson, NDDOT-Grand Forks; Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Engineering; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; and Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineer.

Members present via Zoom: Ryan Brooks, Grand Forks Planning; Jon Mason, MnDOT-District 2; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; and Ryan Riesinger, Airport Authority.

Absent: Brad Bail, Jane Williams, Stephanie Halford, Jesse Kadrmas, Michael Johnson, Lane Magnuson, Nels Christianson, and Patrick Hopkins.

Guest(s) present: Kristen Sperry, FHWA-ND; Anna Pierce, MnDOT-Central Office; and George Palo, NDDOT- Grand Forks.

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

Kouba declared a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Kouba asked that since we have some new faces here today, everyone please state their name and the agency they represent.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 12, 2022, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Kuharenko stated that he had a quick clarification on Page 9, first paragraph where it shows the letter “S with questions marks next to the name “Jim”. He asked if he was correct that that should be “Jim Styron”. Haugen responded that that would be correct.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 9th, 2022**

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 12TH, 2022 MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, SUBJECT TO THE CORRECTION DISCUSSED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON FUTURE BRIDGE TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY FINAL REPORT

Kouba reported that this item is just updating the Technical Advisory Committee on what happened at the January 26th MPO Executive Policy Board meeting. She stated that by the time the Executive Policy Board met there had been a final input meeting of the Ad Hoc Group, and the consultant was just inputting those last few comments and had shared them with the Executive Policy Board. She said that after getting that additional information from the Consultant they decided to move forward with approving the Future Bridge Traffic Impact Study Final Report.

Kuharenko asked if he could get a little more information on the upcoming presentations for FHWA and both DOTs at the MPO Executive Policy Board January 26th meeting. Kouba responded that there was discussion at the MPO Executive Policy Board Meeting on January 26th was that they wanted to know what the next steps should be because that would be on the Cities of Grand Forks and East Grands to move forward; any bridge construction or any other studies that they want done, so the Board wanted to talk to FHWA and the DOTs to find out what those things were, so they asked MPO Staff to move that forward and send an invitation to FHWA and the DOTs to attend the March 16th Board meeting, whether in person or via Zoom.

Kouba stated that the Final Report is available to review on the website.

Information only.

MATTER OF FY2022 TO FY2025 TIP AMENDMENT

Haugen reported that the NDDOT published its STIP document, and as frequently happens, there are some projects in the STIP that aren't in our TIP as well as some other difference that appear between the TIP and the STIP on some other things.

Haugen referred to the packet and commented that we are addressing things that needed to be done in 2022 so that bids can still be on schedule. He added that there are some other projects in the latter years of the STIP that we did not have to take immediate action on, so we aren't bringing those forward this month.

Haugen stated that we did publish a notice in the local newspaper and online ten days prior to today's meeting and had the amendments out for review and comment. He said that we did not receive any comments prior to noon today.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 9th, 2022**

Haugen reported that in the first project that we had highlighted, our normal way of designating things is that we use green highlights for administrative modifications, red for text and yellow highlights for amendments.

Haugen referred to the project tables included in the packet and stated that the first project would be to try to reconcile the total cost that is in the STIP versus the total cost that is in the TIP document. He said that in our TIP document we show a combination of construction costs plus what is listed or poised in here preliminary engineering whereas the STIP was just showing construction cost and not the \$90,000, and since then there has been a clarification as to what that PE actually represents, it is actually construction engineering not preliminary engineering so if you roll that back in to the total, and that is what the Feds would be asked to balance against except in this program the TAP is capped at a value so it isn't always true 80% match so in this case the request is to not modify to reflect the STIP but to keep it at the TIP level.

Kuharanko commented that the other reason he is recommending we don't change this project is because the bid opening is this Friday and in case there are additional changes, he wouldn't want to change this once and then possibly have to change it again at a future date. Haugen said that administrative modifications don't need to go through the public hearing process, so it is a little quicker and easier.

Haugen stated that the next ones are amendments. He said that these are projects that again appeared in the STIP and portions of them do touch within the MPA area and so as is normal NDDOT is asking us to put them into our TIP.

Haugen said that the first one is a chip seal out on US#2, it is a very lengthy project, but it does extend in towards 69th Street, so approximately the last three miles are in the metropolitan planning area. He stated that the total cost is not being broken down to just the three miles in the MPO area, but this is the cost that is reflected in the STIP document, so we are amending our TIP to bring this new project in.

Haugen reported that the second one is pavement markings across the district. He said that in the MPO area it is just on I-29 where we are going to have pavement markings. He added that, again, the total project cost is for the full project across the district, and it isn't being separate out.

Haugen said, so, not addressing the modification we do have the two amended projects into the TIP, and these are making our TIP reconciled with projects that are in the STIP already, and the dollar values match, so based on no public comment, staff is recommending that the Technical Advisory Committee also recommend adoption of the amendments to the TIP.

***MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY PETERSON, TO APPROVE FORWARDING
A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY
APPROVE THE FY2022 TIP AMENDMENTS, AS PRESENTED.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 9th, 2022**

Voting Aye: Peterson, Emery, Brooks, Mason, Zacher, Kuharenko, Ellis, and West.
Voting Nay: None.
Abstaining: None.
***Absent: Kadrmas, Halford, Bail, Johnson, Christianson, Hopkins, Sanders, Williams,
Bergman, Riesinger, and Magnuson.***

MATTER OF FY2023 TO FY2026 TRANSIT CANDIDATE PROJECTS

Kouba reported that we have been working with East Grand Forks Transit and MnDOT Office of Transit on what some of their priorities are for the upcoming transit years in our FY2023 to FY2026 TIP.

Kouba referred to the table of projects, included in the packet, and pointed out that it lists the transit projects. She stated that most of those in FY2023 are Operating Assistance projects from MnDOT, Feds and Local Matches.

Kouba stated that there has been a change to FY2024 cost amount for the purchase of a bus, and it may still change one more time, we don't know yet because MnDOT is still in contract negotiations for their bus purchases, but the addition are the annual operational costs in FY2026 as well as a purchase of a bus. She said that the operational costs would be the first and second additions and the bus purchase would be the third addition.

Kouba said that staff is looking for a recommendation to approve the candidate projects in the order given.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE MINNESOTA SIDE CANDIDATE PROJECT FOR THE FY2023-2026 TIP AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING IN THE ORDER GIVEN.

Mason said that he is curious when you anticipate having the cost estimates for the operating systems for 26A and 26B at the bottom. Ellis responded that she has those figures. She said that 26A they have a cost of \$161,070.00; 26B for STIP total they have \$621,945.00 and for FTA they have \$135,000.00. Mason stated that he was just thinking that as the district incorporates the MPOs TIP into their Draft ATIP they will need to have those cost estimates, but we can coordinate more on that later. Ellis stated that she can forward the information to Mr. Mason right now as she has it from Voni Vegar, her Transit Manager.

Voting Aye: Peterson, Emery, Brooks, Mason, Zacher, Kuharenko, Ellis, and West.
Voting Nay: None.
Abstaining: None.
***Absent: Kadrmas, Halford, Bail, Johnson, Christianson, Hopkins, Sanders, Williams,
Bergman, Riesinger and Magnuson.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 9th, 2022**

MATTER OF ADOPTION OF PM1 (SAFETY) TARGETS

Haugen reported that this is the last month of the 180 day we've had for the MPO to take action on the annual targets for safety on the highway side, and this is the staff report format you've seen on an annual basis for several years now.

Haugen stated that on the highway safety side there are two options for the MPO to consider; one is to adopt both States respective to their side of the MPO area as the MPO targets, again we can't adopt North Dakota for the whole MPO area, if we are going to adopt North Dakota we automatically have to adopt Minnesota when it comes to safety targets; the other option is actually what we have been doing and that is to a local MPO target for both sides of the MPO area.

Bergman and Riesinger joined the meeting via Zoom at 1:51 p.m.

Haugen commented that included in the staff report are the adopted State targets, the States had to adopt theirs by August, and then that 180 days kick in, so prior to last August some of these were reported on the NTSHA, three of these were adopted by the State in June.

Haugen pointed out that the table in the staff report show the numbers of fatalities for both Minnesota and North Dakota. He explained that the color scheme, the darker green would be the most current numbers, we have a history of all the past ones. He said that the first targets were adopted in 2018, and between last year and this year fatalities didn't increase on the Minnesota, and it decreased on the North Dakota side, so the trends positive in that way; same with serious injuries.

Haugen said that on the Grand Forks MPO area the color scheme is a little different, the first two years, 2018 and 2019 we adopted targets; in 2020 we also adopted targets, so those three years had targets that were new for that year but last year we had discussion of whether we would adopt what was proposed using the methodology, but ultimately the decision was to maintain the 2020 targets and see how the numbers shook out in subsequent years and so last year the proposed would have been this if we would have followed the previous three years, instead we went back to 2020 but using the same methodology these are the numbers that are coming up in the calculation so the first question for you today is do you want to adopt the State targets, if not then do you want to maintain the 2020 targets, or do you want to utilize the 2022 proposed targets. He pointed out that the 2022 targets are highlighted and show that they are a little different than the 2020 targets.

Peterson said that the 2022 are 1.96 or fewer. Haugen responded that that would be the proposed target based on the data. Peterson said, then, that that is the actual crash data and so forth, that is how the 1.96 was reached. Haugen responded that, again, in the 2020 targets we adopted last year the data stopped, it didn't include 2019 data, and now we are including 2020 data, so that is why the numbers in the 2022 target is different because they used different data sets. He added

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 9th, 2022**

that this is a rolling five-year data set, so in the 2020 target we've already possibly dropped off two years of that data and added two years of that data into the calculations. He said that, again, except for fatalities in our local area, which did increase a little bit, most of the other data showed decreases and we lost, unfortunately, serious injury years as the five years keep rolling, so the numbers are going down. Peterson commented that it is a little bit confusing seeing that it up actually from most previous years even though our data was going down, our total fatalities. Haugen said that the last page in the staff report was the actual data, and for fatalities you can see the last three years we've been maintaining, unfortunately, four fatalities; the previous years we weren't except for one year, back in 2010, did we have that same number so now as we roll out zeros in the data and start adding the fours, then that number rises.

Pierce asked if there was any reduction seen in the VMT data. Haugen responded that the VMT is constant. He said that the only source they are able to get is through our model. He added that Minnesota does provide us with a number, but North Dakota has not been able to.

Haugen referred to the last table and stated that it is a comparison of what our target was for 2020, which we set a couple of years ago, and the actual data for 2020, and that is shown in the table, and then also previous years targets and actuals are shown as well. Kuharenko commented that looking at that table he is wondering if the numbers are accurate because he is looking at the MPO actuals, 2019 versus the MPO actuals 2020. Haugen responded that there is an error with the first number, 2020 should be 4 so that number is wrong. Kuharenko said that in looking at them they look like they are duplicating from 2019 to 2020 for the actuals, so you probably want to get that updated. Haugen responded that he would make those corrections. Peterson asked if those changes would change the projected 2022 target. Haugen responded that it wouldn't. He pointed out that on the first table the 4 for 2020 is factored in, but it isn't shown on the last table. He stated that he will have to check the numbers. He said that he knows there are four fatalities, based just on the next table with all of the individual data sets.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE MAINTAINING THE FY2020 TARGETS FOR THE FY2022 TARGETS.

Voting Aye: Peterson, Emery, Brooks, Mason, Zacher, Kuharenko, Ellis, West, Bergman, and Riesinger.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Kadrmas, Halford, Bail, Johnson, Christianson, Hopkins, Sanders, Williams, and Magnuson.

MATTER OF MPO EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR POSITION

Haugen reported that he is retiring at the end of February, February 25th is his last day. He stated that the Executive Board has established the job advertisement, the vacancy notice is out and about, the job description was modified a little bit, and that information is posted on the website.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 9th, 2022**

Haugen said that the MPO Executive Board decided to utilize the Grand Forks Human Resource staff to assist with the distribution of the notice, for the collection of any applications, to assist with arranging interviews; weaning down to a few select people for interviews, but the one thing they are asking from the Technical Advisory Committee is; they set up a selection committee and they are utilizing the format similar to how we do RFPs and select consultants in that there is a selection committee that reviews and vets, and makes a recommendation and the MPO Board decided they would have a four, consisting of two people from the board and two from the Technical Advisory Committee. He added that they also prefer the representative from the Technical Advisory Committee be a local staff and also one from each side of the river. He said that the two MPO Board members are Clarence Vetter and Ken Vein, and they are hoping that by having a smaller group and having local agencies that interviews and other things can happen quickly. He added that their intent or hope is that by their March meeting on the 16th, they will have a recommended person for the full board to hire, so the request before you today is to have discussion among yourselves and to have a motion appointing two local people from this body to serve on the selection committee.

Kuharenko stated that it was mentioned that the Grand Forks Human Resource Department was helping with the advertising, collecting and narrowing down the applicants; is there going to be any representation from the HR Department at the interview. He said that he knows that when you have an interview process there are questions you can't ask in an interview, so is there going to be any HR representation, is there going to be someone from HR, even they aren't a voting member. Haugen responded that that is something that the Executive Board is going to have a discussion on with HR folks at their meeting next week. He said that right now they have not indicated HR having a vote or any involvement in anything other than identifying those who are to be interviewed. He added that part of the discussion is how to conduct interviews, he thinks that that may be whether they ask for a presentation on a specific topic, which is fairly common to have. He said that they discussed having a wider public phase happen, and they decided to have it as a four-member interviewing committee and they still are figuring out how to vet the interviews so we will know more next Wednesday, in that regard.

MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE APPOINTING DAVID KUHARENKO AND NANCY ELLIS TO SERVE AS THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE'S REPRESENTATIVES ON THE INTERVIEW COMMITTEE FOR HIRING OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR POSITION.

Voting Aye: Peterson, Emery, Brooks, Mason, Zacher, Kuharenko, Ellis, West, Bergman, and Riesinger.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Kadrmas, Halford, Bail, Johnson, Christianson, Hopkins, Sanders, Williams, and Magnuson.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 9th, 2022**

MATTER OF MN-60506 OR ND-0000GF02 BRIDGE

Kouba reported that as staff was working on the candidate project process, we discovered a slight discrepancy with the name for what is known to most as the Point Bridge, so we are trying to make sure we have consistency with TIPs and STIPs, especially descriptions as we have two different names. She stated that there is a sign on the Minnesota side of the bridge that states Minnesota Avenue Bridge, but there is nothing on the North Dakota side and each side has their own bridge numbering system, so we are looking for a path forward, looking to our Federal and State partners as to how we are going to move forward on a common understanding of what we should be describing this as.

Zacher commented that he did talk with their Bridge Division yesterday and they don't necessarily have a stance, it is a local bridge, so from their point of view it would probably be what the Cities want to call it. Peterson added that as far as the District is concerned; personally they have always called it the Point Bridge, not knowing that their isn't maybe an official name on the North Dakota side, but that is what they always referred to it as, but it isn't in their system because it isn't on a State Highway, it is considered a local bridge for them, so as far as the District is concerned they are fine with the name you mentioned or the Point Bridge.

Emery said that Brad Bail, who kind does a lot of the bridge inspections locally, looked it up and he said in the Minnesota Bridge inventory it is named the Minnesota Avenue Bridge, and that is what it is signed. Zacher stated that according to the plans they have that is what the original plans show as well, as the intercity bridge, but they don't really have an issue one way or the other, which is why they don't have anything on the North Dakota side in terms of signing, if the City of Grand Forks wanted to put something up they wouldn't fight it because, again, it is a local bridge.

Kouba asked if anyone from MnDOT could help guide us through this on the Minnesota side. Mason responded that similar to the conversation in the room, with it being a local bridge, it is sort of up to each side. He said that when he was reviewing this he was thinking about when a project gets authorized, the authorizing agent, whether that be the MnDOT or the NDDOT, whoever that person is, probably in their Central Office, potentially knows which bridge we are talking about since there are multiple bridges over the Red River, and some of them are at points, just to make sure they are clear and that the plan says what is in the TIP and the STIP so they are all matching to some degree; and he doesn't know how the MPO feels about being at least, potentially, maybe his suggestion would be to call it the Point Bridge, but then also include the bridge numbers so when that person is authorizing the project they look up the bridge number and they find that it is in fact this bridge. Ellis commented that that would work it will just look really confusing that we actually have a sign up that says Minnesota Avenue Bridge; except for the fact that nobody calls it that.

Zacher asked if there is a project coming up on it. He said that they don't have anything in their STIP for it on the North Dakota side, so he isn't sure if he was missing something or what. Kouba responded that there is, adding that it will be in the 2026 program year, so it is just entering our TIP process. She said that was when they discovered this, and she was trying to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 9th, 2022**

look for where it stated that it was called the Minnesota Avenue Bridge, and the only thing she got close to was surface connection or something like that, so she doesn't know where it came from, it was a surprise to her when she went across the bridge one day and it said Minnesota Avenue Bridge.

Kuharenko stated that he just pulled up the Grand Forks ordinances, because he knows they have a weight limit on that bridge, and the piece he found here actually calls it Minnesota Avenue, East of South 3rd Street, commonly known as the Point Bridge. Ellis said that they should remove the sign because it isn't even an Avenue, it would be a Street. Kouba commented that it is an Avenue on the Grand Forks side. Ellis said, though, the sign is on the Minnesota side, and it is a street.

West said that the County doesn't have any preference here, but as a native that has lived here his whole life, he has always known it as the Point Bridge and the press has always called it the Point Bridge, and most people would know it as the Point Bridge, so, he doesn't know, it is a tough one.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE CALLING THE MN-60506 OR ND0-0000GF02 BRIDGE THE POINT BRIDGE AND INCLUDE THE BRIDGE NUMBERS.

Voting Aye: Peterson, Emery, Brooks, Mason, Zacher, Kuharenko, Ellis, West, Bergman, and Riesinger.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Kadrmas, Halford, Bail, Johnson, Christianson, Hopkins, Sanders, Williams, and Magnuson.

MATTER OF AGENCY UPDATES

Kouba reported that the last item on our agenda is kind of a new one for everybody. She explained that she added it because we are an interagency planning organization, and we just want to offer the opportunity for everybody to interact and discuss items they are working on that might rise to the occasion of the MPO so the MPO can answer any questions or can make changes to various plans and things of that nature.

Kouba stated that the MPO has been working on projects trying to get some finished and trying to get bids to start others, and we have TIPS and STIPS and other things that need to be worked on, so we are just giving everyone an opportunity to share what they are doing as well.

Zacher commented that this isn't anything new, the other MPOs, at least Fargo does this quite often. He said that from the DOT Central Office standpoint they had the PM1 discussion today, and they are looking to have, they haven't set their PM2 or PM3 Targets yet, but the intent is to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 9th, 2022**

hold a discussion on those during the MPO Directors meeting coming up that is out right now for a review, so hopefully they will have those in the next month or so.

Peterson reported that there isn't anything from the District, but MPO staff can reach out to himself, Jesse, or now with George Palo coming onboard, he is an urban guy, so if you guys have any questions you need to ask feel free to do so, as has been the case in the past, to keep that relationship going. Kouba said that it is always good to keep the lines of communication open. Peterson added that everything that is included in the MPO boundaries has been discussed here recently so he doesn't think there is anything new to talk about today.

Mason stated that as far as the MnDOT District goes, as far as planning and programming, the biggest thing right now is getting the Area Transportation Improvement Program, they call it their ATIP, which is sort of the District's version of the Statewide TIP, so they are working with the local entities, including the MPO and their counties and cities throughout the area, on the program and making the adjustments as needed to the project costs and various things as they add to what they had in the 2023-2026 STIP. He said that over the next couple of months or so they will also be looking at updating their 10-year Capital Highway Investment Plan and making adjustments to the projects within that and their funding targets and adding another year to that as they try to plan out their investments to reach Minnesota's State Highway Investment Plan, and target funding for certain programs.

Pierce commented that statewide they will be meeting with Teri and Earl next Wednesday to go through updates to the Multimodal Transportation Plan, and what is happening with the Minnesota State Highway Investment Plan and the Transportation Asset Management Plan. She stated that for the Multimodal Transportation Plan they are in the process of going through the approval process for strategy, performance development and the document, hoping for public engagement to begin sometime in May, work through June but that might get pushed into July, but that is roughly the timeline on that. She added that MnSHIP is also being updated and doing some investment needs, they are working with their consultant to take a closer look at that since the investment needs are, many times referred to, overlooking at what we set for our budget investment as well, so they want to make sure that that is on par as well as potentially incorporating some of the IIJ or build funding opportunities, and then the Transportation Asset Management Plan is bid for completion by the end of the year, so they are going through a lot of that right now. She said that other statewide things, the global effort to increase TIP/STIP coordination between MnDOT and the MPOs as well as MnDOT's HQ with the district so she is hoping that you will see a little bit better coordination and more timely drafts. She stated that the HQ, she is hoping that they can have a draft of that to the Districts by April 1st and the final draft by April 15th to Central Office.

Sperry stated that the discussion on TIPs and STIPs brought up; Earl had showed that planning emphasis areas that Federal Highway set out are shared by AMPO and ASHTO; on one of those was National Defense Highway Network and coordination of MPOs with military facilities, and to make sure you are reaching out when you are vetting your TIPs and STIPs to see if there are any wants or needs; she doesn't know if the District does that or if that is done at a different level. Peterson asked if she was referring to the Grand Forks Air Force Base. Sperry responded

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 9th, 2022**

she was. Peterson said that he knows they have conversations with the base, but he doesn't know as far as projects, he guesses priorities and he thinks that you talked about... Zacher said, though, the base itself is actually located outside the MPO area. Peterson responded that was correct, so it wouldn't be at the top of the TIP, maybe the STIP. Sperry said that if there were any projects that would impact or if there is coordination then if you guys pick the Highway #2 paving project, if you need to move stuff back and forth. Peterson agreed and said that those discussions do happen so when we know there is a project directly affecting the Base entrances and stuff we have those conversations, that he thinks even happens during the design process as well.

Sperry commented that there is an executive order that also came out that she just wanted to bring awareness to that when you are getting ready for projects, just to make sure that there is access to voting locations so everybody has equal access so if there is a project that is adjacent to your voting location that it wouldn't prohibit anyone from being able to get there, so that is something just to be cognizant of when you're planning projects.

Sperry stated that it is just kind of incorporating those planning emphasis areas, some of the bigger ones that we keep hear are Environmental Justice and Equity; Complete Streets, she knows you had discussion on it but it seems to come up more and more, having plans and being able to incorporate then is something to take into consideration when you are building projects. She said that there is a lot of initiatives, they haven't received information on some of those, there is going to be a lot of pots of money, but as we are under a continued resolution those pots aren't available yet so they haven't received a lot of information on it but as more information becomes available she will be sure to pass it on so that everyone has access to that information as well. She stated that she knows that they have updating and putting a lot of fact sheets on the Bipartisan Infrastructure page for Federal Highway in the White House Page, so usually there is a lot of information posted there. Peterson asked when the continuous resolution ends. Sperry responded that it ends February 18th. Kouba commented that the House just passed its version of the continuing resolution, and it is at the Senate right now. Sperry asked if it was just an extension again. Kouba responded that it is an extension to the current continuing resolution.

Kuharenko reported that they are working on projects, and they have a number of bid openings coming up. He said that the only other big thing that is going on in Grand Forks of any real note is Fufeng, a development for the wet corn facility on the north end of town, it is still going through City Council so more info to come, unfortunately he isn't overly attached to that process, for better or for worse, so he can't provide a whole lot of information, but it is in the process.

Brooks stated that he is a little bit more involved in the Fufeng development, but still not much to give an update on, but they are working on it. Kouba asked if there is anything coming through that would impact transportation. Brooks responded that the Land Use Plan update is on-going, but that will be coming to a future meeting, possibly in April.

Riesinger reported that they have quite a lot of airfield construction planned over the next six years or so in their FAA approved Capital Improvement Program. He said that they will be

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 9th, 2022**

reconstructing and extending their crossway runway and once that is complete, they will be reconstructing their primary runway. He said that that has been programmed and has been in their Master Plan that was approved a couple of years ago and ultimately an environmental assessment and land acquisition was completed in 2021, and now construction and that is why it is taking about six years in total to complete. He said that of note, though, they did break ground on the partial relocation of GF Co #5 on the west side of the airport and that was coordinated with Nick West, so that is the airport project that was state approved, and it is to make way for room at the end of their future extended runway. He said there are numerous other projects so all of those are large projects and will keep us quite busy over the next five plus years.

Bergman said that he isn't putting any more projects on his plate, but at the same time we have to do the NTD report, which has to be done by April; we just got another project a few minutes ago, we have to have a new TAM plan, and he will be working with the State; and he also has to have the DDB plan updated; and by the 6th their LEP plan updated, and this all has to be done by June 1st, so if you are looking for him...no. Ellis commented that we are short a few employees too, Dale, don't forget that. She added that Dale is retired, but not retired, so if anybody is interested, we could use a Cities Area Transit Superintendent, a Mobility Manager, Bus Maintenance Supervisor, and a couple of bus drivers. Bergman added that at the end of the year he will be looking at walking out the door himself.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

A. 2021 Annual Work Program Project Update

Kouba said that our Transit Development Plan existing conditions report will be out soon for review. She stated that she is still waiting on the pavement management data. She explained that there were some issues with the data and connecting it properly, but they are working on getting the conditions done but there is a problem with getting it into their software, but they are still plugging away, and she will know soon if we need to extend their contract for time, not additional costs. She reported that they are still waiting on the Bike/Ped RFP submittals and she hopes to have a scope of work out in the next couple of weeks for the Street and Highway Element, so things are moving along.

Information only.

B. 2022 Flood Forecast

Kouba reported that our current flood forecast indicates we shouldn't have much of a flood event this year.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 9th, 2022**

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO ADJOURN THE FEBRUARY 9TH,
2022 MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:36 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager