

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 12th, 2023**

CALL TO ORDER

Stephanie Halford, Chairman, called the April 12th, 2023, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:33 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following member(s) were present: David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Wayne Zacher, NDDOT-Local Planning; Ryan Brooks, Grand Forks Planning; Jon Mason, MnDOT-District 2; Ryan Riesinger, Airport Authority, Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Engineer; George Palo, NDDOT-Local District; and Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit.

Absent: Brad Bail, Troy Schroeder, Michael Johnson, Lane Magnuson, Tom Ford, Nels Christianson, Nick West, Rich Sanders, Nancy Ellis, Christian Danielson, and Jason Peterson.

Guest(s) present: Micah Dickman, Urban SDK; Kathryn Engelhardt, MnDOT; Tricia Lunski, MPO Exec Board Member; and Erika Shepard, MnDOT.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Halford declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 8, 2023, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE THE MARCH 8TH, 2023, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ACTION ITEMS:

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF 2023-2024 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM AMENDMENT #1

Halford referred to the information in the packet and commented that there are three parts to Amendment #1.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2023**

Halford stated that we adopted the 2023-2024 Unified Planning Work Program in 2022 knowing that we might possibly have to make some amendments; and the first one is for the Safe Street For All grant that we submitted an application for but hadn't heard if we were going to receive it yet. She said that we did receive the grant, and we did have it in the work program, but we didn't assign any funding amount to it so that needs to be amended into the budget by adding the funding amount and changing the language slightly to say that we did receive the grant and we will be moving forward on it. She stated that the second amendment is for the Bike/Ped Plan, which you saw at our last meetings, and it is to extend the project deadline, no change to the funding amount. She said that the third amendment is to include a contract with Urban SDK, as we felt that it would be a benefit to the MPO and its partners by helping us streamline things. She added that we will be addressing this further in the next Agenda Item.

Kuharenko asked where the Urban SDK shows up in the work program. Halford responded that it is shown under the 300.6 Section, Plan Monitoring and Review, and the cost will come out of Data Collection. She pointed out that the budget sheet shows \$38,588 in federal funds but the contract is actually for \$24,500, and it is for a year and the year will start when we start the contract.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY BROOKS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE AMENDMENT #1 TO THE 2023-2024 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM, AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Brooks, Zacher, Riesinger, Bergman, Mason, Kuharenko, Emery, and Palo.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Schroeder, Ellis, Danielson, Bail, Peterson, Sanders, Ford, Johnson, Christianson, West, and Magnuson.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF URBAN SDK CONTRACT

Kouba reported that Micah Dickman is here on-line for any questions. She said that Mr. Dickman did a very good job of explaining what Urban SDK will be able to do for us earlier, so just a quick overview of what he shared, we are looking at traffic analysis zones and data, origin destination data, and performance measures, etc., so we are looking for approval of the contract.

Kuharenko stated that he has one question, and it is really more of a verification, there are a total of seven user licenses available for this, are those assigned or are they just floating licenses. Dickman responded that they are floating licenses so you can use them any way you want. He said that Stephanie or Teri would be the administrator, but they can assign them to anybody in the region that they would like, including your consultants that may want to use the data for further studies you are working on, and then if somebody either leaves or you want to reassign that license you have the ability to do that, so it isn't like if you use a license you lose it, you just either assign it to someone else or give somebody access for a short time and then take it back.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2023**

Kuharenko said that he thinks this is a great program, and he thinks it will be beneficial for saving staff time, and he thinks it will have a lot of benefit for our upcoming plans, especially when it comes to the origin destination data, that is always something we end up looking at for our consultants, to try to get either StreetLight data or some other data for those plans.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY EMERY, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE EXECUTION OF THE CONTRACT WITH URBAN SDK.

Voting Aye: Brooks, Zacher, Riesinger, Bergman, Mason, Kuharenko, Emery, and Palo.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Schroeder, Ellis, Danielson, Bail, Peterson, Sanders, Ford, Johnson, Christianson, West, and Magnuson.

NON-ACTION ITEMS:

MATTER OF DISCUSSION ON URBANIZED AREA

Kouba reported that this is something we always have to address after we get a final count for our census numbers. She said that the Census Bureau comes out with who they are considering should be an urban area, and recently it was released that all those urban areas as well as the delineation of what is an urban area, so those boundaries were released by the Census Bureau as well, which also allows for Minot to become an MPO, so they are going through that process currently.

Kouba said, just to get this conversation started we wanted to kind of bring this forward to the Technical Advisory Committee and ask you what you think, how you want us to work through you to get some sort of consensus on what that boundary is going to be. She stated that they have some specifics from the Feds of what needs to be in there, absolutely what needs to be in there, it is the actual urban area that the Census Bureau has provided.

Kouba referred to a 2010 Census Urban Area with 2012 Adjusted Urban Area map and commented that it will kind of guide you through what they did back with the 2010 census data. She explained that the orange area is the census area, and they brought in some extra areas, shown in yellow, that they felt needed to be considered as well.

Kouba referred to a Census Urban Area Comparison of 2010 versus 2020 map and stated that this compares what was added in 2010, shown with a purple stripe, and the 2020 census boundaries that are shown in green. She pointed out that they added a little area within the purple striped area, and some of the purple area has been taken out but there are still some spots that are being considered, but it does include all of the airport, and she knows that the airport is extending out their runway, so that will have to be brought in as well, so that means we will also have to adjust our MPO boundaries, and that is also kind of a side-by-side discussion when we are looking at this urban area, because all of the urban area must be inside our MPO boundaries.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2023**

Kouba referred to the 2020 Census Urban Area with 2012 Adjusted Urban Area map and said that just to get an idea of where we are at with what we had previously for adjusted urban area; adjusted is what the Feds look at for what we consider as part of an urban area. She added that this also impacts the functional classification, so instead of those areas being considered urban, they would be considered rural, so right now anything that is outside of the yellow stripe is considered rural, and inside is urban.

Kouba referred to the 2020 Census Urban Area with 2012 Adjusted Urban Area and City Limits map and pointed out that it shows the MPO Boundary and the current City Limits. She said that previously we had used the City Limits, some of this outside, she is assuming the area in green, within the yellow striped area, is the new water treatment plant, that was not part of the city at the time, but Walmart was included as well. She said that they made sure to stay within the actual city limits, but not what was considered out in the airport area, so she doesn't know if that is a consideration that you want to continue to have.

Kouba referred to the 2050 Growth Tiers map and stated that we do look at the growth tiers, as to what would be, for Grand Forks, growth in Tier 1 to make sure it is included just because there is that idea that in the next several years some or all of that would be included with the city limits.

Kouba referred to the Future Land Use, Priority Growth Areas, and TAZs map and stated that we also want to make sure we are looking at some of that land use, will we be wanting to extend out any city facilities, city infrastructure at the time.

Kouba referred to the East Grand Forks 2050 Land Use map and commented that East Grand Forks doesn't quite have a tier system, but we have kind of established what we think will be in the growth area and what won't be in the growth area in the next ten years or so. She commented that just from experience she doesn't think there will be any adjustments needed for East Grand Forks just because what we have already brought in or adjusted is already within city limits.

Kouba stated that Grand Forks is a little different, they will have to bring in, in some way, shape or form, she will need to contact somebody, whether it is from FHWA or the State as to how far away from or how close to around the U.S. #2 area that we will need to get because of the airport. She said that a lot of this is up in the air too, so if anyone has any information or any questions or any suggestions that would be great, that is kind of the discussion that we wanted to have with you, not to just let you know what we are going to do.

Kuharenko said that one of the questions he has, we end up seeing what the adjusted boundary was in 2012, and in looking at this and if we look to expand the urban boundary do we have to expand it by census tracts, do we have to expand it by quarter sections, what are the limitations. Kouba responded that you definitely want a road completely inside the urban area, so it is either in or it is out; otherwise, you don't need to have it in by a census tract or anything, you are looking at roads mostly. She said that most of our census tracts and our census block groups are based off of roads as opposed to, there are only a few rivers and things like that that would be a

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2023**

border of any kind for those, but generally is it whether or not a road will be inside the urban area or not. Kuharenko said, then, that when the group is looking at this, where major roadways are going to be, that is kind of where we need to be looking for where those lines should be. Kouba responded that that is correct, and that is one of the reasons why they brought in looking at what we had for land use as well as those growth areas, those are things we looked at in the past, when we did it in 2012 when we went through this process, and she doesn't know if that was really clear as to how we actually came up with some of this, so that is one of the reasons why she wanted to walk people through that, and just look at this is how we were doing it in the past and a lot of those rules haven't changed, especially that we need to have all urban area, if you are going to have a road inside the urban area you want the whole road, so it is a placement factor for when she does the boundaries, she will make sure the whole road is in and not just half of it. She said that in general the advice is to look at roadways as boundaries, it is easier, especially when you are eventually going to bring those roads in as an urban road.

Kuharenko stated that his other question, just for general group information, so we have to have everything that is shown in green, and then everything that is shown in yellow that is what we had previously and that is something that we probably should continue to carry over, and you are looking more for if there are any other areas that we want to expand into or if there is any of the area in yellow that we want to get rid of. Kouba responded that that is exactly what she is looking for, especially when we are looking and bringing in the airport because we don't want to be greedy and take too much, but we also want to be realistic about the next ten years and how we are going to grow out so that when those areas start to become more urban, and start to become more built up the city has the opportunity to put in that infrastructure as urban as opposed to having to work through a process to make it urban later on.

Kuharenko said, as for general comments from his side, he noticed that there are a couple of areas that are within city limits that are outside the urban boundary; there is the area to the north, north of 27th Avenue, the area that is annexed into the city and then there is also the area south of 62nd, the quarter section that is currently under development. He stated that those are a couple of areas that he thinks would be beneficial as well as west of the Interstate, kind of northwest of Interstate and 47th Avenue, that would probably be another quarter section to look at for consideration because he knows they have the environmental document currently underway for a 47th Avenue Interchange, and are looking to build out South 48th Street and 47th Avenue if and when that interchange does go through, so those are a couple of areas that we should probably look at including. Kouba asked if they would want it to end at 47th Avenue, with 47th being inside the urban area and then everything north. Kuharenko said that he would leave that up for discussion because he knows with the environmental document there is one set of options that is looking at an alignment at 47th, and there is another group of alternatives that is looking at shifting 47th south, and he thinks it is shifting it a quarter mile, and that might be worthwhile and give it a little bit of extra room, but it doesn't necessarily quite follow the road if you have a curve in there like that, but he thinks it gets the general point across.

Kouba referred to the 2020 Census Urban Area with 2012 Adjusted Urban Area and City Limits map, pointing out the new area shown in red at the bottom of the map, and said that she would probably suggest taking it to the quarter line all the way across. She asked if the area to the east

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2023**

of that development is going to be considered in the next ten years. Kuharenko responded that that is hard to say, he doesn't have a really strong feeling one way or the other if that one will go or not, there haven't been any plans put forward as of yet, and that is really up to developers and what they want to develop. Kouba commented that that is part of the reason why a lot of the area between the Interstate and Columbia Road is included because ten years ago there was a good development being platted at the time, so they brought it all the way down to 62nd. She said that she can take some of these things and come up with some options; you said that you wanted the area to the north that the city annexed included, do you want the area all the way to the river included. Kuharenko said that he would think that including the area to Washington would cover the annexed area pretty much. Kouba asked if that would include the diversion or just keep it at the Interstate. Kuharenko responded that that is up for discussion, but his initial take on it is what is currently annexed into the city probably should be considered within our urban limits, those are areas that we have responsibilities for providing services, underground utilities, paving, those sorts of things, those realistically should be included. Kouba said that that was one of her main questions because some of these other areas, including those towards the landfill area, which we haven't included in the urban area previously. Kuharenko stated that that was a question he had, it is annexed into the city, it is a landfill so there isn't going to be a while lot of added development out there, so where is that line, where is the balance between the two. Kouba responded that we don't necessarily have to have everything that is considered "city" inside the urban area. She stated that previously we didn't have the airport included because there aren't people living there, technically, but the city does have a lot of responsibility for infrastructure out there.

Zacher commented that the thing to keep in mind is that needs to be contiguous and it needs to be a polygon, so keeping those things in mind you can't just hop over different areas to add, so if you are looking to add the landfill area, for whatever reason, you certainly can, but then you need to get up there somehow and it needs to be a polygon. Kuharenko said, then, along those lines unless we have some added development that connects out to the airport and starts connecting north, that probably makes sense as to why that hasn't been included in the past. Kouba stated that, just this time around we were surprised that the airport was included, and we do have to make sure that it is part of it. She said that again, what she can do is take this information and come up with a couple of options and bring it back to the Technical Advisory Committee and get your input on what you want to see included and/or excluded.

Kouba asked if Mr. Emery, East Grand Forks Engineer, had any suggestions or changes he would like to see. Emery responded that the only area that he is thinking, and again just one voice right now for East Grand Forks, but west of Rhinehart Drive, on the south end, south of where Laurel Drive ends at the township road, there has been discussion before about potential development in that area so he would say, again, west of Rhinehart Drive and south there for about a half mile. Kouba commented that currently those houses along that township road, and that area, are included in our adjusted urban area, but we can look at moving it a little further south if you would like. Emery said that he thinks we should move it further south. Kouba asked how much of the area he would like to see included, to the Hartsville Road. Emery responded that he was thinking more of Rhinehart west, but we could take it all the way to Hartsville Road as well. Halford said that it is up to the City of East Grand Forks. She reiterated

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2023**

that we aren't taking any action on this today, this was just to begin discussion, so you can think about it. Kouba added that whatever is decided just let her know and she will do some adjustments to the proposed area so you can see what it looks like.

Emery referred to a map and said that where South Pointe Elementary and Central Middle School are located, is that easterly line there, the one that runs north and south, is that right up against the City levee right there. Kouba referred to the map, north of 13th, and said that that area is the school. Emery said that they did look at potentially putting in residential development east of the school property, running north and south, starting at 13th and then tying back into Bygland Road, following the levee there, so that maybe should be considered. Kouba stated that those areas are all within City limits, so she thinks the area you were looking to develop was just kind of breaking off, she doesn't think we would be adding to city limits, we are extending out the city limits with that, so it is on there already. Emery said that off the top of his head he doesn't remember if the city limit is right on the levee line there or not. Kouba responded that she doesn't think it is right on the levee line there. Emery suggested just looking at that and if the city limits line is pretty much on the levee, then you're good, but if not, that might be an area to include.

Kuharenko said that he is looking at the areas from 2012, specifically the areas at 62nd Avenue, right by the river, and commented that we have that small area that is on the east side of East Lake; he knows the area that is striped to the west of that, that more squarish area, and commented that that area has popped up and on as potential development in that area, but that area east, he doesn't know how much development is projected to be out there. He asked if Ryan Brooks, City Planner, had any thoughts about this area, and stated that this might be an area that we might want to consider for removal. Brooks stated that it is definitely not an area that we are ever going to take responsibility for in terms of the roadway network, it is never going to be annexed into the city, so depending on what it means by having it urbanized, that would be the question, so ultimately if that means that potentially we would be taking over responsibility then it should be removed, if not then it doesn't matter to him if it isn't removed. Kuharenko added that he can see there is that East Lake that could act as a demarcation line because he thinks we also have our city limits line there as well and in that smaller notched area we have some townhomes, and the rest of that is outside city limits, and he knows that the larger square area has had some potential development pop up on it, although he doesn't know what the status of that development is, but that area to the east between East Lake and the Red River, might be an area to consider removing. Zacher commented that it does make an easy polygon with it. Kouba stated that nothing really has to happen, there is a lot of area that is not developed or urbanized but also makes it easier if anything changes in status if it is in the urbanized area, otherwise it is a whole other process to get it back in, which some would say just wait until the next time.

Kuharanko said that that is why it is always good to review, so that is why in looking at the area we had in here last time it doesn't make sense to continue having it, so he brought it up for discussion. Kouba responded that that is great, that is kind of her idea; we have all this area, we had all this area up north here as well, and that got pulled out from the census. Kuharenko commented that that area is all platted too, it has been platted for a number of years. He added

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2023**

that there are a couple of things there, a church and ABC Seamless are on those two parcels, he thinks.

Bergman stated that just to let you know he needs to work with Teri, so we get the right numbers. He said that he will get in touch next week to get what we need.

Riesinger said that the airport has been mentioned a couple of times, so he has a couple of questions and maybe a couple of comments. He stated that you mentioned that the airport was added in in 2020, and it was a little bit of a surprise; where did that actually come from, who added the airport. Kouba responded that this was completely census based. She explained that they have their own formula as to how they calculate the urban areas, and previously the airport, which she can show on Map A, was not included but this time around they changed how they did their formula a little bit, it wasn't just about housing density it was also about work, jobs, and where people are actually traveling to, to some extent, so if people are traveling to the airport for jobs, or traveling from the airport for jobs, then that was probably how it ended up being considered an urban area. Riesinger said that that helps, it makes some sense, but along that line, if you go to the newer map, there has been some discussion historically about US#2, he has heard historically that there are portions of US#2 out to the airport there were considered rural and it looks to him like if that yellow striped area, plus the green airport area, not all of that is the airport, some of it is salvage area, would that mean that US#2, all the way to Airport Drive would be considered urban and what impacts would that have, if any. Kouba responded that so far she doesn't see too many impacts, other than once you start getting into the functional classifications of roadways, this area would be considered, that whole section would be considered urban as opposed to rural. She added that to some extent is about funding as well, but all of US#2 is NDDOT maintained and managed.

Shepard stated that she thinks you are right that the urban boundary, one of the main implications is funding, so if a roadway is within the urban area boundary, minor collector and above, would be eligible for federal funding and anything outside of the urban area boundary, major collector and above, would be similarly eligible. She said that she posted a link in the chat that describes some of the changes between how the census calculates what they consider to be urban. She added that she is just confirming what Teri said.

Riesinger commented that he just think it may have some other change to the mindset of some of the intersections, certainly Airport Drive, County Road 5, US#2 would be an intersection of note, historically he seems to recall in conversations that it is a lighted intersection, but that it was considered to be rural, so that isn't exactly normal, but yet in this case if we are actually calling it urban, he isn't sure if that changes some of the mindset of that discussion, but it is something we can work through.

Riesinger stated that you also mentioned, on the west side of the airport, some of the land that they added, the boundary right now essentially is what was the old County Road 5, north south on the west side, he can confirm that the runway and taxi way will not be any further to the west, it will be staying in the green shaded area; the land that they acquired to the west from that area was just for their safety area, runway protection zone and also because they had to relocate a

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2023**

portion of County Road 5 in that area, so again he can confirm that the runway and taxi way itself is not going any further west, and the green there is just the safety area. Kouba responded that the moving of the road, though, will change where that boundary would be so we would end up bringing in that County Road into the urban area to continue having it inside the urban area. Riesinger said that that makes sense. Riesinger stated that he would be happy to work with you further on this if you have any other questions related to the airport. Kouba thanked him and said to let her know if he had any other questions as well, she would be more than happy to walk through any information further on.

Kouba said that if there aren't any more questions or comments, she will take this information and; would it be easier if she put it together and send it out to the Technical Advisory Committee and let everybody kind of draw or write any comments on it, and then she can readjust for those comments and then bring it back to the Technical Advisory Committee for further discussion. She said that will get it back to this body in May. She added that she will be having this same discussion with our Executive Policy Board so they can give us some input as well, and she will include their comments as well.

Zacher said, just a reminder, all of the green needs to be inside the urban boundaries and contiguous.

Palo commented that just to help out a bit, if you pull up Google Earth and you can see the new roadway out by the airport. He said that the last images he looked at on Google Earth has the bell curve, so you can see where it is at. Kouba added that she hopes we will have our new aerial photos soon as well.

Information only.

MATTER OF MNSHIP PRESENTATION

Halford introduced Kathryn Engelhardt, MnDOT, and said that she is here today to give a brief presentation on the 20-Year State Highway Investment Plan.

Engelhardt referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and went over it briefly.

The presentation continued.

OTHER BUSINESS

A. 2022/2023 Annual Work Program Project Update

- 1) Bicycle/Pedestrian Element Update: Halford stated that we recently approved extending the end date. She said that even though it gives an end date of August 31st, it was more of a cushion, and we hope to be going through final adoption in either May/June or June/July, so that will be coming

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2023**

to the finish line. She said that we just had some public input meetings, which were all done virtually on-line. She stated that there was some good attendance at some of them and not so good on others, but we got some good feedback.

- 2) Street/Highway Element Update: Halford said that we did have that discussion on East Grand Forks Industrial Park and there have been a couple of things that have happened since then, like this morning there was discussion on future projects and budget discussion on the Minnesota side, and then in a week or two we will hold a similar discussion on the North Dakota side. She said that even though we are still waiting for the modeling, they are saying sometime this month, we are still trying to keep things moving forward.
- 3) Aerial Imagery: Halford stated that we are hoping to get going on this soon.
- 4) Safe Street For All (SS4A): Halford stated that we are still waiting to hear when we can get started on this.
- 5) Smart Grant: Halford reported that we did hear back that we did hear that we were not awarded the grant.

B. MPO Updates

- 1) Bridge Update - Halford reported that there was a kick-off meeting held on Friday (a copy of the slide presentation that was presented is included in the file and available upon request). She said that it was really kind of a high-level meeting to go over what the project is going to look like and what they are going to do; scoping services and introductions of the SRF Team and the Agency Representatives that will be working on the study. She stated that we had some good representation there from the local side being part of the conversation, again, really just high-level conversation going over what the project is, kind of laying the groundwork of what will be going forward. She pointed out that they are in the scoping phase right now, just gathering information, and looking at our current projects that we have going on, plans that we recently did. She said that they were excited to hear that we are supposed to be getting our modeling done this month, so they will want to have that; they are also excited to hear about Urban SDK, and she told them that they are welcome to have access to that.

Zacher says that he keeps seeing PEL show up, so he is just curious what your comfort level is with the PEL process. He stated that the NDDOT doesn't have one, MnDOT does have one, so he isn't really able to help with it, he knows what the intent is behind it but at the same time what is everybody's comfort level with it and, again, trying to tie the two bridges together is a

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2023**

difficult concept for him, they are two completely separate structures, and to him it seems like it was because we couldn't decide on which location, Elks Drive or 32nd, so let's throw a third one in, and that is where his mind is going, but it almost seems to him it makes it more complicated and then to add PEL on top of it seems to make it extra complicated.

Kuharenko commented that one of the things that the consultant ended up discussing is that this is just the scoping portion, and realistically the scoping portion, whether we are looking at the Elks Drive 32nd Area or the Merrifield area, it should realistically be an identical process, we are going to be looking at the same agencies, doing all the data gathering, and really try to nail down the purpose and need, do they both of these primary locations have the same purpose and need or do they have separate purposes and needs and if they are separate then we would be looking at two different projects most likely, so he thinks that is kind of how they are looking at it. He added that in regard to the PEL process he is just as familiar with it as Mr. Zacher is, so it is a new and intriguing process. He said that the individual from WSP seems to be very fluent in the PEL process, she seems to be one of the people spearheading the PEL process and is very well versed in it so we are hoping that her experience will be able to help guide the process. He stated that at this point in time, this phase is only the scoping so we aren't getting into the PEL process yet, and we will have to see how that all goes and if we have to combine those later on, we can always adjust.

Kuharenko said that even though in this presentation they talk about the PEL process, they talk about the NEPA process, the environmental document and the design process, the scope of work for what SRF is doing is only scoping, they aren't getting into the PEL, they aren't getting into the NEPA, they aren't getting into preliminary design, those are all going to be items addressed at a later date.

Halford stated that any future updates will be brought forward as well.

B. Agency Updates

- 1) Flood Update - Kuharenko stated they have a meeting scheduled for tonight to discuss the Shady Ridge area at Fire Station #5 on 47th Avenue South, just east of South Washington, by the Icon Sports Arena from 5:30 to 6:30 p.m. to go over what they have for options and what the plan is for flooding out there, other than that they are continue to monitor the river levels which haven't risen too terribly much yet, but they are starting to rise down in Fargo so they are keeping an eye on that as well. He said that this is an annual occurrence for us, so staff is used to it and are going through the process.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, April 10th, 2023**

Halford asked what the projections are for us. Kuharenko responded that he can't remember the last time he saw something from the National Weather Service, it was a couple of weeks ago, but they were still predicting a 46 to 48 range which is what we have typically seen the past couple of years, but he hasn't seen a recent update. He added that the National Weather Service has stopped doing those weekly exceedance curves and are shifting over to a different model shortly for us, so they haven't seen anything the last couple of weeks, but they are keeping an eye on it just as we do every year.

- 2) Road Limits – Palo reported that on the NDDOT side they are starting to put out their road limits on our State Highways, US#81 and US#2 and I-29.
- 3) MnDOT Update – Mason reported that on the MnDOT side the Program Update Workgroup has been meeting again, the last meeting was on March 31st, and that group's task is to focus on the MnDOT distribution formula and method related to the new federal transportation bill, things like should MnDOT consider how the distribution process should be changed, and primarily much of the conversation was about how MnDOT distributes this funding based on a national highway system and the non-national highway system and the real question was should that practice continue into the future, how does it reflect on the goals and outcomes, the desire to project it within our Long Range Transportation Plan. He said that at the meeting there was a fairly good discussion about the formula factors, as well as the use of the funding, essentially the group is kind of laying things out on the table as alternative options are being considered. He added that nothing was approved at this point, but it is hoped to have the direction set this summer and there is MPO representation from the Rochester and Duluth MPOs as well as other local representation.

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY EMERY, TO ADJOURN THE MARCH 8TH, 2023
MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:45 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,
Peggy McNelis, Office Manager