

**METRO Gold Line Corridor Management Committee**  
**Met Council Chambers**  
**Notes for the June 7, 2018 Meeting**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Harry Melander, Brian Lamb, Lisa Weik, Stan Karwoski, Brian Isaacson, Bryan Smith, Stan Suedkamp, Paul Reinke, Jane Prince, Rafael Ortega

MEMBERS ABSENT: Chair Alene Tchourumoff, Jim McDonough

**1. WELCOME (CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS)**

Acting Committee Chair Harry Melander called the June 7, 2018 monthly meeting of the METRO Gold Line BRT Corridor Management Committee (CMC) to order at 2:32 PM.

Chair Alene Tchourumoff is absent today due to a prior commitment.

Roll Call taken. Committee members and other attendees introduced themselves.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Chair Harry Melander asked if anyone has any comments or questions about the April 26, 2018 meeting minutes. He noted that they do not need a formal approval.

Chris Beckwith (Gold Line Project Manager) reported a correction to the 4/26/2018 meeting notes. On the bottom of Page 4, Councilmember Andrea Date asked if shade would be considered as functional landscaping, and the reply in the notes was that it would not. However, upon further research, shade trees will be considered functional landscaping at stations. Mayor Paul Reinke asked the Chair to keep the 4/26/2018 minutes as noted since that was the actual conversation. The correction will be officially noted in today's CMC minutes. Chair Harry Melander agreed.

No additional comments to the 4/26/2018 meeting notes.

**3. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT UPDATE**

Chris Beckwith presented the Gold Line Project Development update.

The Community and Business Advisory Committee (CBAC) kick-off meeting was held on May 29, 2018. Chris highlighted the list of community members and businesses that are part of the CBAC. There are 26 members representing station area community and businesses. Sixteen members attended the first meeting with the CBAC. CBAC members were invited to express interest in the two CBAC co-chair positions and encouraged to submit a paragraph or two indicating why they are interested in the co-chair position. One submission has been received so far, but members have until June 15, 2018 to express interest. The CMC Chair will make the final selection of the two co-chairs, and the co-chairs will then become CMC members.

Chris presented an overview map of Peer "New Starts" Projects around the country. Gold Line is the only Twin Cities area project in the Project Development Phase. A handful of other projects nationwide are also in Project Development and are in competition with Gold Line for federal funds to enter the

Engineering Phase. A few projects nationwide are in the Engineering Phase, including two in the Twin Cities; Southwest LRT (Green Line Extension) and Bottineau LRT (Blue Line Extension). Chris noted that the purpose for showing the map is to reiterate that Gold Line needs to remain competitive as decisions are made that affect scope and cost.

Chris explained what is driving the Project Development Phase, which is a federally required two-year project phase. Gold Line has a \$25 million budget, approved by Project local funding parties; Ramsey County, Washington County, CTIB and some state bond funding for this phase. Gold Line entered Project Development on January 19, 2018 and will conclude on January 19, 2020. The focus for Project Development is moving the project forward through the environmental assessment process, advancing design, refining scope and updating costs. The project planning phase is complete, and the project is now in the implementation phase. Chris noted that changes outside the environmental Area of Potential Effect (APE) or limits of disturbance will impact Project Development cost and schedule. The Gold Line team has this in mind as they are preparing recommendations and moving decisions through the Gold Line Committees.

Chris gave an overview of the Gold Line project timeline. Public Engagement started in pre-Project Development and will continue all the way through revenue service. She outlined the tasks that need to be completed in Project Development through October 2019. Gold Line staff are resolving issues together with the Issue Resolution Teams (IRTs). Environmental scope is being refined and will be submitted to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) at the July 11, 2018 TAC meeting as the footprint that will be evaluated with the Gold Line Environmental Assessment (EA) to maintain the two-year Project Development schedule. Gold Line will receive feedback from the TAC and CBAC, and hold public meetings in July 2018 to get public feedback on a few concepts. Gold Line staff will then bring the scope changes to the baseline provided at the first CMC meeting in April back to the CMC on August 2, 2018. This is not necessarily the final decision on project scope, but it is what will be evaluated for the EA. The project will move into the technical work for the EA on September 6, 2018 and then progress to 30% design. An updated cost estimate explaining how Gold Line is measuring up to the \$420 million overall budget will be provided to the CMC later in the Project Development Phase.

Chris presented a breakdown of the Project Development costs expended as of June 1, 2018 for each of the funding sources (Washington County, Ramsey County, State of MN and CTIB). Total expended through June 1, 2018 is about \$1.9 million (approx. 7.6%) of the \$25 million budget, and the project is at 18.8% through Project Development. Chris explained that the project is behind on spending, because it can take a while for Consultants (and staffing) to get mobilized.

Chair acknowledged Councilmember Jane Prince. Councilmember Jane Prince (Saint Paul City Council) introduced herself to attendees.

#### **4. ISSUES RESOLUTION PROCESS CASE STUDY (MCKNIGHT ROAD CROSSING)**

Marc Briese (Manager, Design and Construction) discussed the McKnight issue resolution case study/example. The intent of the walkthrough is to provide a better understanding of the process being used by the Issue Resolution Teams (IRTs), and instilling confidence that Gold Line project IRTs process is working well.

Marc outlined Gold Line Tier 1 and Tier 2 goals. Gold Line concepts must first pass through the “sieve” that meets Tier 1 Goals. Objectives under Tier 1 are to maximize people served, maximize transit ridership, maximize travel time savings, minimize traffic mobility impacts, minimize cost and

maximize cost effectiveness. Gold Line needs to be cost effective and maintain a competitive advantage for federal funding.

Mayor Paul Reinke asked if the project can choose to take on additional changes/staffing/costs that are documented by increased ridership? Is it an option to discuss a funding increase with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) or is the project locked into what was given to the FTA? Marc responded that as Gold Line goes through the Project Development Phase and adds or subtracts scope, project cost will go up or down. The cost at the end of the Project Development Phase when Gold Line applies to enter the Engineering Phase develops the final budget for the FTA's portion of the project. There is some room to modify scope and cost at this point, but once the project enters engineering, the budget is set and any deviations from that point would be entirely at local cost.

Mayor Paul Reinke added that, since Gold Line is in a solid middle on competitiveness with other projects, he assumed that if the project can increase ridership at a slightly increased cost, it would put the project in a better position. Marc agreed and noted that if ridership goes up and cost goes up at a proportional rate, then competitiveness is maintained. If cost goes up and the project does not gain riders, then competitiveness goes down. If costs go down and ridership stays the same or goes up, then the project looks better. Lyssa Leitner (Deputy Project Manager) noted that the Project Management Consultant (PMC) is working on updating the ridership model, and updated numbers based on the design changes will be provided in upcoming months. There may not be a lot of flexibility to increase the ridership projection, because it's based on land uses and the amount of people living and working around the BRT stations. The inputs impacting travel time are probably the biggest thing that will change from the baseline seen in the initial design changes. The changes could slightly impact the ridership projection, but based on historical information from other projects, Gold Line does not expect to see significant ridership increases. The Gold Line team will continue to track and review the cost effectiveness rating.

Marc Briese described the overall structure of Gold Line Issue Resolution Teams (IRTs). IRTs are technical groups of City, County, MnDOT, Metro Transit and Gold Line staff, that work through project issues. The TAC and CBAC act in parallel and consider the recommendations made by IRTs. IRT recommendations are carried forward through the TAC and the CMC, which then advises the Metropolitan Council and local funding partners. Chris Beckwith clarified that there are only a few actions intended for Met Council and Counties in this phase, besides funding for engineering and construction. The CMC will be largely directing project decisions in this phase. Actions will be brought to the Met Council and Counties after the application into Engineering.

Marc Briese discussed the 12 issues that have been identified for consideration by IRTs. The two system/corridor-wide issues are Stormwater and Maintenance/Operations. The 10 station-location-related issues are: Downtown Saint Paul, Dayton's Bluff Area, Etna St. Station, White Bear Av. Station, 3M Headquarters Station (now Maplewood Station), Sun Ray Station, Mounds Boulevard, Helmo Avenue Station, Bielenberg Drive and Woodbury Theatre Station. There are two IRT teams for Saint Paul (one for Downtown and one for other areas) and one each for Maplewood, Oakdale and Landfall and Woodbury. IRTs have been meeting regularly since March 2018:

- Saint Paul and Downtown Saint Paul – weekly meetings
- Maplewood, Oakdale, Landfall and Woodbury – generally biweekly meetings

IRT coordination is a very collaborative and iterative process. IRTs sometimes come up with 3 to 5 concepts, refine and then whittle them down to 2 or 3 options. The teams circle through this process until they come up with a good “final” concept that everyone can agree to.

Marc reviewed the McKnight (east of Sun Ray, west of 3M campus) Issue Resolution example. The primary issue in the area is traffic operations. The original concept a couple of years ago at 1% design was that there would be an at-grade crossing at the intersection of McKnight Rd and Hudson Rd. The Gold Line team reviewed the traffic modeling through 2040, and the conclusion was that the at-grade intersection would not be ideal. The technical solution developed as part of the 1% design (draft EA work) solved the traffic problems, but there were many unintended consequences, including;

- Several infrastructure improvements were needed resulting in greater cost to construct the frontage road behind Sun Ray Lanes.
- Impacts (patron access and parking) to Sun Ray Lanes during construction.
- Additional parking impacts to Sun Ray shopping mall parking lot, and the project would be required to repave all the impacted areas.
- Limits future redevelopment opportunities, which the Gold Line project would like to avoid. Sun Ray has no immediate plans for redevelopment, but the site could be redeveloped later.
- Limits future McKnight traffic/capacity solutions. Saint Paul, Ramsey County, Maplewood, 3M and other stakeholders are currently reviewing McKnight, and potentially looking at consolidating some access points.
- Water Tower north of the Sun Ray Lanes – Gold Line project was unsure of utility/watermain impacts, which means there are potential risks and unknowns.

The IRT took a fresh look at the McKnight area issues, collaborated on a new solution, and reviewed several concepts. The proposed solution was to construct a fly-over bridge over McKnight. They also reviewed the bridge concept, to determine whether it should be one long continuous bridge with multiple spans or two-bridges with a fill area in-between. The preferred solution was a single span, to ensure that vehicles had a complete/unobstructed view. This bridge solution;

- Ensures that vehicles turning onto the Frontage Rd “T” into Hudson Rd have a clear line of sight and there are no safety issues at that intersection.
- Avoids physical impacts and construction-related impacts to Sun Ray lanes and eliminates any infrastructure improvements and costs.
- Provides maximum flexibility and options for Sun Ray redevelopment and future McKnight area improvements, as the Cities and Counties work with 3M to develop transportation solutions along McKnight.
- Has a greater operational benefit (fewer delays and travel time advantage) for the buses compared to the at-grade crossing.
- Most importantly, this was also a cost-neutral change, which is a key consideration as Gold Line develops solutions through the IRT process.

Mayor Stan Suedkamp commented that he grew up on the east side and still frequents the McKnight area, which tends to be a bit hectic and confusing by car. He asked if automated computer traffic models/simulations are done when a bridge is added? Marc Briese responded that traffic models are an important part of the process, and Gold Line is currently in the process of refreshing the traffic modeling/analysis along the corridor. This modeling helped determine that the at-grade crossing would

not work and needed to be realigned. Marc explained further that the proposed McKnight flyover bridge will have zero impact on the operations at that signalized intersection or the un-signalized intersection to the north. As the bridge solution was developed, Ramsey County, Saint Paul and Maplewood were not at the point where they had transportation solutions/improvements in place. Gold Line will engage in further coordination with the Cities and Counties to assess opportunities for additional transportation improvements at the location. Councilmember Jane Prince stated that she appreciates the amount of work that has been done on the McKnight solution. It's a great solution, in terms of potentially being able to redevelop the area and being cost neutral.

Marc Briese highlighted some items that the IRTs are continuing to work through. The Gold Line team wants to make sure that anything the project is doing will fit into MnDOT, Saint Paul and Ramsey County existing plans for pedestrian connections, including work occurring this year. Connections on either side of McKnight on the 3M campus and the Sun Ray shopping mall are under review. Due to the historical significance of the 3M campus, the project is continuing to review environmental impacts in this location. This is in addition to the more traditional environmental issues such as contamination and wetland impacts.

Mayor Paul Reinke asked for clarification on the Gold Line design philosophy discussed at the last CMC meeting. Is the design philosophy to design to the best we can that makes the most sense, knowing that it may not be part of the main baseline scope? For example, accommodating a pedestrian trail that is not part of the baseline, but the County or City may decide to construct at a future date. Or is Gold Line taking the other approach what we think we can afford and adding alternates in at a future date/time? Mayor Paul Reinke suggested that it's better that we do the full design the way we want, with the option to back out. Lyssa Leitner responded that it's a hybrid approach and referred back to the Project Development discussion (slide #7) presented by Chris Beckwith. The Gold Line project is focusing on stations and guideway design and ensuring that people can in a basic way get to and from these stations safely and pleasantly. What we know makes a robust transit system are bike and pedestrian connections, parallel, perpendicular and different land use changes, and getting more people to be able to live and work around these transit stations. The project team and partners are trying to envision the best this system can be but while also remembering the real constraints of costs and competitiveness. Gold Line is out of planning phase and is in an implementation phase. At this time, the project is locked into the Project Development Phase, with a two-year timeframe constraint and a \$25 million budget constraint.

Lyssa Leitner further explained that Gold Line staff have worked with IRTs to get answers to what fits within the proposed pedestrian connections, are cost-neutral options, provide the critical connections needed to get people to and from the stations, and are also within the environmental constraints. Lyssa discussed the Ramsey County Johnson Parkway example. There was a little gap in the sidewalk at Johnson Parkway that the project was considering. It was a fairly minor connection within Gold Line environmental bounds, and was drawing a line to a future connection that the City of Saint Paul is planning. Johnson Parkway is a great bike route, and in a "perfect" world, it would be great if Gold Line could include Johnson Parkway and a bike trail all the way down to the station. When the project looked at it from a transit perspective, the determination was that it is well outside the bounds of what is typically included for a transit project to deliver during the Project Development Phase. Saint Paul agreed and said they will keep it in their local planning, but requested that Gold Line include the little stretch of sidewalk, to be able to connect with the planned trail. Lyssa reiterated that the project is responding to the bounds of the \$25 million budget and two-year Project Development timeframe.

Mayor Paul Reinke noted that this was a great explanation. He further asked that, if an item is not going to be part of Gold Line for any reasons, can the project still plan for it (e.g. sidewalk) so that we're not inadvertently doing something that could make it more expensive or prohibitive engineering-wise to complete later? Lyssa Leitner replied that the McKnight bridge is a good example. Gold Line has been asked if McKnight should have a pedestrian crossing on the bridge as well. There are trails up and down McKnight, and a lot of people are going north and south on McKnight and would use the pedestrian crossings to access the stations. From a transit perspective, the answer is that the pedestrian crossing is not "necessary" from an everyday/all-day operation perspective. Saint Paul and Maplewood then asked Gold Line to at least review it (not include it) to get an understanding of the potential environmental impacts. This issue was further complicated by the fact that a trail can't be fit in front of Sun Ray in the existing condition. Maplewood concluded that if it's a trail from McKnight to nowhere, then it probably makes no sense. For items outside project bounds, the answer was "no", because those would have time, scope and budget impacts within the current Project Development window. Mayor Paul Reinke thanked Lyssa for her explanation and noted that the key is "preclusion". He added that it would be unfortunate to do something that precludes future actions that make sense, and he's glad that it is not the case on Gold Line. Lyssa added Gold Line is also engaging in discussions around future expansion on the MnDOT system (I-94), to ensure that there's a maintenance boundary in place and we're not precluding something from happening with MnPass future expansions, potentially west of 61 and the potential interchange at I-694, I-494 and I-94.

Chris Beckwith addressed the Gold Line design philosophy in further detail. Chris previously worked on three Minnesota Light Rail projects. She went through some cost increases on those projects, and they are not a good experience for funders, project staff or taxpayers. She noted that a question that's always on her mind is; "do you design the best project that all stakeholders would want, and then pull things out later if the costs are too high"? Project staff tend to err on the side of staying within budget. As a philosophy, the \$420 million is used as a guide all through Project Development, and the project needs to evaluate if a proposed solution is going to add cost. In the McKnight bridge case, the project did a cost estimate for the related work, determined that it was cost-neutral and decided to proceed with the recommendation. Gold Line does not want to end up toward the end of Project Development with a ballooning cost estimate and a surprise for stakeholders.

Chris discussed the next steps for issues resolution. Gold Line will continue meeting with IRTs to develop recommendations that will be presented to the TAC at the June 13, 2018 TAC meeting. The project limits of disturbance for purposes of the environmental analysis will be presented on July 11, 2018 with the next TAC meeting. The project will seek public input in July and present some of the concepts and recommendations to the public/community and CBAC, to get their feedback. Any final questions and open items will be wrapped up before the preview/presentation to the CMC at the August 2, 2018 meeting. The plan for the presentation is to go back to the baseline scope that informed the original \$420 million cost estimate that was presented at the April 29, 2018 CMC meeting and walk through what has changed.

Mayor Paul Reinke stated that he was surprised that the Wacouta Station shown in the last CMC presentation appeared to be newly added stop for the Gold Line Project. Lyssa Leitner clarified that the Wacouta Station was not newly added scope. Stations indicated as "new" in the April CMC meeting presentation are locations where there is presently no existing Metro Transit infrastructure/bus stop. Gold Line will be implementing the first upgrades/buildout at those locations to make them stations.

Mayor Paul Reinke asked how the project team makes decisions? He noted that the way the Helmo Station was shown on the presentation from April is not the way the station area planning consultant is showing it now. Lyssa Leitner clarified that the presentation shown at the April CMC meeting was the baseline that was handed to Gold Line staff on day-one (January 19, 2018), for the engineering team to update. The Gold Line design around Helmo Station has since evolved in consultation with the City of Oakdale. However, Gold Line staff wanted to present the design that informed the cost estimate, so all CMC members were informed on the starting point. Lyssa added that the baseline at many locations on the corridor are very different, due to a variety of engineering changes made since January 19<sup>th</sup>. Slight changes have been made to station locations; corners and blocks, due to station spacing and run times. There is no current plan to make infrastructure improvements like higher curbs, longer platforms at Downtown stations. These stations will be pylons, Ticket Vending Machines (TVM), real time signage and smaller shelters, mainly due to the many Downtown area constraints. To reiterate, the April CMC presentation was not where Gold Line was as of April 2018, but it was the baseline (\$420 million estimate) handed to the project on January 19<sup>th</sup>. Mayor Paul Reinke stated that the response causes a bit of concern, but, it sounds like what is implied is that the CMC should sit tight, express any needs/concerns, and they will eventually be involved in working things through.

Chair acknowledged Councilmember Bryan Smith. Councilmember Bryan Smith (Maplewood City Council) introduced himself and apologized for running late to the meeting.

## **5. STAKEHOLDER AND PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT UPDATE**

Lyssa Leitner introduced Liz Jones (Community Outreach and Engagement Coordinator). Liz joined the Gold Line team a month ago and the project is glad to have her on board. Liz is not an engineer or planner, and not a technical expert on transit but brings an extensive public outreach background. Liz's fresh perspective is helpful when the technical members of the team are talking "Transit Speak", because if Liz doesn't understand aspects of the discussion, then the team knows that community members may also not understand. She will be the face of the Gold Line project and will be out in the community to help provide a "voice" for the project and be a conduit back and forth from the community. Liz will be more visible as outreach activities ramp up this summer.

Lyssa Leitner updated the CMC on the Open Houses and other community outreach events planned this summer. Gold Line wants to give the public an opportunity to provide some input on project scope and design changes that have been made in the past year. Two Open Houses will be held on the East and West end of the Gold Line corridor:

- Open House – West; July 17, 2018; 5:00-7:00 pm; Grace Lutheran Church (St. Paul)
- Open House – East; July 18, 2018; 5:00-7:00 pm; Guardian Angels Catholic Church (Oakdale)

Information presented at the two Open Houses will be the same. The format will be open-house style, with no presentations. Community members can come in and out and view the exhibits, maps, station drawings and design changes that will be displayed. Gold Line staff will be on hand to answer questions and walk people through details about the project. Community input is needed on design options, because there are a handful of project issues without technical answers. For example, the White Bear Avenue station has two possible station locations about a block apart. Both locations provide a slightly different experience from a transit user's perspective, and the project has no technical preference. This is an area where Gold Line plans to conduct more geographically targeted outreach and offer more options for people to provide robust feedback. Outreach will include public meetings, direct mailing, door knocking, pop-up events, summer block parties, in-person and online surveys.

Individual property owner meetings are also planned. Gold Line staff are asking Committee members' staff to identify and provide lists of key property owners to set up one-on-one meetings. Sun Ray is an example of a key property that outreach staff needs to engage with on a one-on-one basis, so that they're fully informed of potential changes and possible impacts to them. Outreach staff will also meet with community partners and organizations to get them updated on Gold Line project plans.

Councilmember Jane Prince asked how people will be notified about the Open Houses, and if direct mail will be used to announce the Open Houses. Lyssa Leitner replied that the Gold Line team plans to spread the word about the project through social media channels, press releases, newsletters, and working with Gold Line Partners to use their newsletters and social media channels. Project information will also be sent to City staff to share via City/City Council newsletters and social media channels. No direct mail will be sent. The project is working on completing a Communications Plan.

## 6. RIGHT OF ENTRY PROCESS OVERVIEW

Chris Beckwith noted that the project team decided to provide in-depth information on the Right of Entry (ROE) process, so that CMC members are fully informed if they get questions, comments or concerns from residents about the ROE process. Chris Beckwith introduced Chelsa Johnson (Environmental Lead). Chelsa has been on board for over three months. She has a great background in Environmental work, although not in transit planning, but she is very well qualified.

Chelsa informed attendees that as Gold Line Environmental Lead, one of her primary duties is to oversee the ROE process. ROE is the right to go on another person's private property without committing trespass. ROE will be required for Gold Line, specifically for the environmental analysis and advanced design/engineering. ROE will be needed for some field work activities off the public Right of Way. Met Council has authority for ROE under two Minnesota statutes that permits entry for investigations such as survey, environmental testing and geotechnical testing.

Chelsa provided an overview of the four steps to obtain ROE. This process is consistent with previous Metro Transit projects that have sought ROE. The process provides property owners advanced notice (more than is provided in the statutes) that these activities need to be conducted on their property. CMC members can use the ROE process workflows in today's presentation as a guide to answer the community's questions about the ROE process.

### Step 1: ROE Request for Fieldwork

Chelsa receives field request for Right of Entry from Gold Line Contractor and determines which of the two types of field work is necessary. Field Work Type 1 includes land surveys, data collection or field observations. No physical disturbance to the property and no equipment installation. Field Work Type 2 includes archaeological survey, wetland delineation, and geotechnical boring. There may be some physical disturbance to the property, with activities such as shovel testing for Phase 1 archeological investigations, soil boring, sticking pin flags in the ground for wetland delineation. There may also be a need to install temporary equipment to collect data e.g. camera installation for surveys.

### Step 2: Property Owner Notification (sample letters included meeting handouts)

Field Work Type 1 - One-page notification letter is mailed to property owner three weeks in advance of fieldwork. No response is required from the property owner.

Field Work Type 2 - ROE Permit letter/form is mailed to property owner with a request for response within three weeks. Letter provides more detailed information on the type of activity to be conducted



and notes that the property will be restored to existing condition once ROE work is complete. It also includes an Authorization form to be completed by the property owner.

#### Step 3: Response to Notification Letters

Field Work Type 1 - no response required from property owner.

Field Work Type 2 - has three possible responses; If the owner provides consent, then the process moves to Step 4. When no response is received, a second letter is sent, stating that a non-response is assumed as consent. If owner denies entry, the project will try to meet with the owner to clarify the ROE request and may negotiate a more detailed agreement. Chelsa also coordinates with Consultants to review alternatives to entering the property. After exhausting all means, the project files a court order according to Minnesota Statutes.

#### Step 4: Conduct Fieldwork Activities

Field Work Type 1 – Fieldwork activities begin on the start date in notification letter.

Field Work Type 2 – Contact Owner to schedule fieldwork activities

Commissioner Stan Karwoski stated that this was a great overview of the ROE process. He asked if all properties along the route been contacted. Chelsa Johnson responded that the entire corridor has not yet been notified. The project is concentrating on wetlands and survey activities at this time, and letters have been sent to those property owners. Commissioner Stan Karwoski asked about the status of the resident who objected to entering their property. Chris Beckwith replied that this case was reviewed, and the property can be avoided at this time, although, this may change in the future.

Commissioner Lisa Weik asked whether the project can utilize advanced technology like drones with cameras for some ROE work? Chelsa Johnson replied that the project has advanced technology particularly for underground/utility work. However, she defers to the Contractors on a site-specific basis to determine whether invasive technology is necessary.

## 7. ADJOURN (NEXT MEETING)

Chair Harry Melander made a note for the record to Chair Alene that it is 3:30 PM and not 4:00 PM.

The July meeting is canceled. The next meeting is August 2, 2018.

Chair Harry Melander adjourned the meeting at 3:30 PM.

#### **Meeting Materials Provided:**

*Meeting Agenda, June 7, 2018*

*PowerPoint Presentation, June 7, 2018*

*Right of Entry Field Survey Activities Letter (Sample)*

*Right of Entry Project Surveying Activities Notification Letter (Sample)*

*Right of Entry Level 2 Permission to Enter Property Letter (Sample)*

Respectfully Submitted,  
Banke Oyewumi, Recording Secretary