

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2019
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen Chairman, called the February 13th, 2019, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:44 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning; Jesse Kadrmas, NDDOT-Local District; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Consulting - Engineer; Darren Laesch, MnDOT-District 2; Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Local Government (Via Phone).

Absent: Paul Konickson, Brad Bail, Ryan Reisinger, Richard Audette, David Kuharenko, Dustin Lang, Ryan Brooks, Brad Gengler, Lane Magnuson, Ali Rood, Dale Bergman, Stacey Hanson, Mike Yavarow, Lars Christianson, and Rich Sanders.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 9TH, 2019, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY HALFORD, TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 9TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF ANNUAL SAFETY PERFORMANCE TARGETS

Viafara gave a brief introduction, explaining that MPOs are required by the Federal Highway Administration to adopt these performance measures and the targets in the areas of safety, transit, asset management, system performance, bridge conditions and pavement conditions. He stated that in our case every year the NDDOT, MnDOT and the MPO establish the performance targets for safety, and they are based on the examination of the following factors:

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2019**

1. Number of Fatalities
2. Rate of Fatalities
3. Number of Serious Injuries
4. Rate of Serious Injuries
5. Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Non-motorized Serious Injuries

Viafara referred to the staff report and went over the proposed safety targets briefly, explaining how they arrived at the target shown.

Halford asked, with the whole campaign for “Towards Zero Deaths”, aren’t we kind of obligated to have our goal be zero and not two or fewer. Haugen responded that that is actually a long term target, and this is an annual target, and as you can see the State of North Dakota and the State of Minnesota are not targeting zero because it is an annual target, but their long term vision is zero, and that is our long term vision as well.

Haugen commented that another thing that Mr. Viafara focused on was 2016 and 2017 data. He explained that if you will recall, last year when we did the annual targets for safety, MnDOT did not have 2016 data available to us so we had to use 2015 data which was the year that North Dakota and Minnesota last synced together; now we have 2016 and 2017 for both States so we are up-to-date now with our targets, so these numbers reflect those two years of additional five-year rolling numbers.

Viafara added that depending also they carefully based on the analyses because the analysis of five years rolling average, that would be the possibility mathematically speaking of having some numbers of fatal episodes, but then when they are averaged in the five-year rolling period, because of the way how the average is taken, may be reduced; so are we spending to zero, that is the idea. He referred to the staff report and pointed out that it shows the numbers supporting the results from the five-year rolling averages and also the rates, and stated that these are the numbers that you need to review in case you have any concern concerning the table.

Haugen commented that the last thing he would like to note is that for the first time both States have introduced a decimal point with a number behind it. He said that last year when we discussed this we did not do that because we felt we can’t have half a person, so we rolled it up, and so that is what we did with the four or fewer, we kept whole numbers; but it is up to you if you want to go with the decimal point number, but as it is this is what staff is recommending the MPO adopts as its 2019 Safety Targets.

Williams referred to page four of the staff report and asked what the letter “A” stands for in the tables. Viafara responded that it stands for serious injuries.

Kadrmias commented that all of the safety factors show or fewer or lower so should the #2 safety factor show that as well. Haugen responded that it certainly could.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2019**

MOVED BY KADRMAS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY ADOPT THE ANNUAL SAFETY IMPROVEMENT FACTORS SUBJECT TO THE AMENDMENT OF ADDING THE TERM “LOWER” BEHIND THE RATE OF FATALITIES FACTOR #2.

Laesch asked how they came up with the goal rate, is it a 10% increase, or is this a rate that is recommended. Haugen responded that it is a calculation based on our vehicle miles traveled, so just as the fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled, it is a calculation of that rate; so we've had so many fatalities in different years so the rate is a little bit different, but we have combined them all to the most recent five-year rolling average, that is the calculation that we've come up with. Laesch asked if our goal is the five-year average rate. Haugen responded that our goal is a reflection of the five-year rolling average, that is the federal requirement. Williams commented, then, that we are going to have a problem in 2018 because we had several fatalities last year. Haugen agreed that there will be a movement. He said that that is the only way he can answer Mr. Laesch's question, that it is a calculation straight out of the federal definition of what this rate of fatalities is. Laesch asked if that is what the .673 is and then the .59 is what we've come up with. Haugen responded that that isn't correct. He explained that that was last year's and this is an annual target so last year's five-year rolling was a little higher than this year's five-year rolling, so every year it is going to be a different calculation based on the last five years of data.

Laesch stated that we aren't really setting a goal for lowering, we are setting a goal to maintain what happened in the past. Haugen responded that our ultimate goal is towards zero deaths, so our rate would be zero, but our target for the annual target is less than it was last year so our goal is to continue that trend toward zero.

Laesch asked what happens if we don't meet any of these. Haugen responded that for the MPO there isn't a penalty clause, but at the State level there are penalties imposed. Halford asked what those penalties are and if they would trickle back toward us at all. Haugen responded that the penalty if the State does not meet; four out of five have to be met and then there is also another part of the matrix that is not just an annual target for what the baseline data is, so you have a lot of opportunity to meet the targets, but to answer the question on what the penalty is, it is that you have to spend all of your obligation for your Safety Program. He explained that States have the flexibility to spend 100% of their obligation in surface transportation, which means that they may only spend up to 80% of their safety dollars to meet their overall cap of 90%, so they would just have to spend 100% of their safety and use all of their other flexibility in the other programs, safety just gets eliminated as being a flexible program to spend money out of if they don't meet the targets.

Williams asked if they use any of our target goals in their calculations. Haugen responded that they don't. He added that their data is the statewide data, and our data is just our study area data. Williams stated that she is still kind of stuck on the two or fewer on the fatalities because she knows they aren't going to meet that so she would like to just keep it as it is with three or fewer. She explained that the problem is that mathematically that is a third, so if we keep it at three for

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2019**

three or four years and then reduce it than mathematically that works out better than a third all at once.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO AMEND THE MOTION TO KEEP THE FATALITIES TARGET AT THREE OR FEWER.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Halford, Ellis, Emery, Williams, Laesch, and Johnson.

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Bergman, Lang, Brooks, Gengler, Hanson, Kuharenko, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Bail, Riesinger, Audette, Konickson, West, and Christianson.

ORIGINAL MOTION, AS AMENDED: MOVED BY KADRMAS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY ADOPT THE ANNUAL SAFETY IMPROVEMENT FACTORS SUBJECT TO AN AMENDMENT TO ADD THE TERM "LOWER" BEHIND THE RATE OF FATALITIES FACTOR #2 AND TO KEEP THE FATALITIES TARGET AT THREE OR FEWER.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Halford, Ellis, Emery, Williams, Laesch, and Johnson.

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Bergman, Lang, Brooks, Gengler, Hanson, Kuharenko, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Bail, Riesinger, Audette, Konickson, West, and Christianson.

MATTER OF DRAFT ITS REGIONAL ARCHITECTURE UPDATE

Viafara reported that staff is seeking approval to engage A.T.A.C. in advancing the ITS Regional Architecture for the Year 2019.

Viafara explained that this is a program that has been updated every five years, and the last time it was updated was in the Year 2014 and the whole idea is to develop the ITS Regional System to assist in the implementation of the number of initiatives and strategies that are included in the 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

Viafara stated that it is important to note that Emergency Management activities constitute a vital component of the ITS Architecture.

Viafara commented that in our case we have two boundaries; Minnesota and North Dakota, and each one of these States has its corresponding ITS Architecture, so the idea is to try to integrate our region within those two systems.

Viafara stated that the following are the objectives of the update:

1. Address changes in regional needs

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2019**

2. Address changes in stakeholders
3. Address changes in the scope of services considered, deployment of ITS projects in the region, and
4. Address changes in the National ITS Architecture.

Viafara commented that because it is important to have the stakeholders participation, a number of agencies are listed here as potentially being the sources of the stakeholders. He said that they are there because in many cases part of the regional architecture will address some of the needs, objectives, or initiatives that are also included in corresponding plans and in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

Halford said she had a question on this. She said that on the list of stakeholders in the staff report compared to the Advisory Group listed in the scope of work is a lot shorter. She asked if some of those stakeholders should be more of an advisory group, or what is the difference between the two and/or their roles. Haugen responded that the Advisory Group is monitoring more of the progress of the work and the Stakeholders are all the people that would be engaged at some point in time. He added that they won't engage all of the stakeholders all the time, however they would like to have more of an executive group to help guide the process.

Viafara stated that the scope of work documents were also included and staff is requesting consideration of approval of this activity.

Laesch asked for a definition of what ITS Architecture means. Haugen responded that because there are so many different components that it affects differently, the essence of it is that back twenty some years ago when this was emerging technologies were perhaps not interconnected or interoperable so the process behind ITS Regional Architecture is to have a more arching architecture so that East Grand Forks and Grand Forks communication could be more interoperable. He added that as things have evolved it has shifted away from some things and software has enabled ease of the interoperable so it has expanded into other things as they have emerged. He said that with this update one of the major things that we will be looking at is the CAV component, automated vehicles and automated equipment component that right now is an emerging architecture so this update will take the National Architecture, which is a real high level, and State Architecture, which brings it down a couple of levels, and then to our Regional Architecture level where we will identify some more detailed components that we might be implementing and how that interplays and how things are interoperable.

Williams asked if either of the States have theirs done yet. Haugen responded that the State of Minnesota just adopted their Statewide ITS Architecture; the NDDOT, because of staffing issues, is in the midst of updating their ITS Architecture. Johnson agreed that to his knowledge it is not complete. Williams said, then, that at this point, and that may be discussion for the project advisory group, but it may be premature for us to identify stuff because we don't want to create a conflict with what the States are, because her understanding is that A.T.A.C. is doing the State one, and we are kind of carving our part out of that, so would that be discussion for the Project Advisory Committee or is that something in the tasks here. Haugen responded that it is a Catch-22 because the State has drafts available, and the same person that is doing the State's will

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2019**

be doing ours. He said that it is more of a staffing level at the NDDOT is where the delays are occurring, so perhaps now that the MPOs are rolling up their Regional Architecture Updates the State will have to spend a little time and resource to get theirs up-to-date. Williams asked if they even have a CAV in here anywhere, as far as a deliverable or a task. Haugen responded that it isn't specifically listed but it is part of the update; the software package.

Williams stated that she thinks she can solve this by just saying that wherever that is included, if we just put the term "if applicable", as she doesn't want us to back ourselves into a corner, and then try to pre-empt the State, because she is sure there will be more discussion on this as far as that goes, and she doesn't want to create a problem. She added that we may not have that component right now, it may be that in two years we come back and amend our plan, or when it is done again in five years. Haugen stated that there will be a component to it, how expansive that component is is the question.

Laesch asked if we could change the Advisory Group to be the MnDOT District Traffic Engineer instead of the District Engineer. Haugen responded that that would not be a problem.

Williams asked if she is correct that you said that the Project Advisory Group would be reviewing every task and will have oversight on each one of those tasks. Haugen responded that they will be meeting as needed to guide us through this process so he isn't sure that "every" task is the appropriate wording, but at key points in the decision making yes. Williams said that she thinks she would like to see that included though, and then in some cases it might just be okay, and it could just be done by e-mail, but she would like to make sure that everybody is aware of what is going on with every task. Halford suggested that maybe for each of the task have the Project Advisory Group review and/or approve. Williams agreed.

Williams asked when this was going to be done. Haugen responded it is scheduled to be completed by December. Williams said, then, that you could almost bring these tasks to the Technical Advisory Committee meetings and to the Executive Policy Board Meetings as we go along for their review and input. Haugen agreed, adding that there are deliverables at different points. Williams said, though, that you might have two tasks together in one month, so she would like to include that also.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY LAESCH, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE AUTHORIZING THE MPO CHAIRMAN AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR EXECUTE AN AGREEMENT WITH A.T.A.C. TO PERFORM AN UPDATE TO THE MPO REGIONAL ITS ARCHITECTURE PLAN SUBJECT TO REVIEW OF ALL TASKS BY THE PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP, THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD; AND THAT THE CAV COMPONENT BE COORDINATED WITH THE NDDOT ITS ARCHITECTURE PLAN.

***Voting Aye: Kadrmaz, Halford, Ellis, Emery, Williams, Laesch, and Johnson.
Voting Nay: None.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2019**

Absent: Bergman, Lang, Brooks, Gengler, Hanson, Kuharenko, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Bail, Riesinger, Audette, Konickson, West, and Christianson.

MATTER OF US2/US81 INTERSECTION STUDY UPDATE

Kouba reported that the Steering Committee for this project met on Monday. She stated that one of the tasks is to evaluate the existing conditions and throw out some of the future conditions based on our traffic demand model and KLJ has put together a detailed report on the future conditions. She said that she did include a summary of that report in the packet and the full document is available on the MPO website.

Kouba commented that they did provide quite a bit of detail of what kind of traffic is happening, what happens when the trains go through, what happens during peak period traffic, etc. She stated that there are possibilities for crashes, especially when traffic controls aren't necessarily warranted so they evaluated each intersection. She added that they also looked at truck traffic and did get some great input from the Dakota Mill, who is part of the Steering Committee, as well as from the School and other businesses along the corridor.

Kouba stated that they did find some bike and ped issues, mostly with the low availability of land for right-of-way which makes it difficult for people to go through there so they will be looking into those issues.

Kouba reported that the main issue for transit is getting across the train tracks to be able to maintain their route schedules.

Kouba said that the Steering Committee went through an exercise to help them get into a brainstorming mindset to discuss what kinds of things people feel would help improve the intersection, what are their interest is in the intersection, particularly since they invited some of the property owners along those corridors.

Kouba commented that there is a webpage for this on the MPO website and she will be adding additional information from the Steering Committee meeting on it.

Kadrmass referred to the list of Steering Committee members and said that he does not represent NDDOT District #2; and asked that it be changed to either District #6 or Grand Forks District.

MATTER OF DRAFT 2019 BIKE MAP

Viafara said that you may have received a report that is basically telling you three things:

1. The MPO is embarking into updating the 2019 Bikeway Map
2. The map, as you can see it, has been drafted to include these objectives – Economic Vitality, Accessibility and Mobility, Environmental/Energy/Quality of Life, Integration and Connectivity, and Tourism.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2019**

3. Posting recreation as a way of enjoyment.

Viafara stated that what staff is asking now is for you to please provide any comments you may have from your department or agency point of view telling your opinion to help with the betterment of improvements of the cover and map.

Viafara commented that if you look carefully at the back of the map there are some panels, and those panels bring some level of information so a survey that we are expected to close on February the 26th, and the link has been given to you, it is available so that you can bring your comments to our attention by answering that survey, telling us how much you like that information or if you want the information to be reviewed or revamped you can tell us exactly what you want. He added that from the point of view of the Cities of East Grand Forks and Grand Forks, if you happen to notice a segment that is missing or that needs to be added into that map please have a careful review and let us know so then the map is fully updated.

Viafara stated that he is expecting to close the survey on February the 26th because the complete map is expected to be launched on March the 22nd or 23rd at the Home Improvement Show in Grand Forks. He commented that we are currently on track to meet that deadline.

Kadrmas referred to the map and asked to zoom in on the Kennedy Bridge area. He stated that the trail there should loop back and connect with the greenway towards the river.

Williams said that in addition to some comments that you should have received from Mr. Kuharenko; along 47th Avenue South they completed a segment on the southside of 47th between 20th and Columbia last year. She added that, just an FYI, on 62nd Avenue South they are currently in the planning and design stage to extend the existing multi-use path on the northside of 62nd from its current terminus over to Washington and then north on Washington to connect to the other existing path. She said that it isn't there now but it will be put in this summer. Ellis commented that since it isn't done now it probably shouldn't be put on the map yet. She added that they are going to be putting up some signage for some bike routes so next year they will let the MPO know where they are, but not for this map.

Williams stated that there is one other correction up on North 3rd Street, just south of Gateway, where it is shown as jogging, it just goes along 3rd now, that jogged section is gone now. She added that the other piece just to the north that is shown as going through, they never had an easement for that so that was not ever a consideration, so it is just a straight line along 3rd. Haugen asked what color it should be on the map. Williams responded that it should be red.

Halford commented that during the Bike and Ped update there was discussion about doing an app for larger maps than what were done in the past, and maybe updating the map every two or three years, is that still part of the discussion or not this time around. Viafara responded that there is one electronic version of the bike map posted on the Grand Forks website. Halford said that she knows about that but there had been discussion about having an app or larger existing maps, paper maps, making them bigger than what we have now and then maybe updating the bike map every two or three years instead of every year; those are just a few things that were talked about

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2019**

during the update and she is just wondering if that was still being considered. Viafara responded that there were some financial implications so Mr. Haugen would probably be the one to explain. Haugen commented that a year ago discussion was held on this issue and the decision was to continue with an annual update and a similar size map as we currently have. He said that since then, with the help of Grand Forks, we added an interactive web application of it, but these can be blown up and printed to whatever size is desired. Viafara added that they were printed for the greenway kiosks. Halford agreed but said that she is referring to discussion that they may enlarge the folded maps and having fewer maps because they would cost more, and she was just wondering if that was something that was still being considered or if this year you are just doing the existing size maps. Haugen responded that they are doing the same size because that is what they understood the decision was a year ago.

Halford reported that the City of Grand Forks' logo is changing. She said that this was just announced at today's State of the City. She added that in addition, the definitions and pictures that were used as examples of bike lanes, bike routes, and sharrows; she is curious where you got those definitions. She stated that some of those examples, such as you used 42nd for a bike route example, that probably isn't the best example. Viafara responded that that was what was used in the past. Halford said that the definitions; one that really stood out was the definition of sharrow in that she thought that it was kind of an odd definition, so she is curious where they got these definitions. Viafara responded that when you review them please make sure that you send us your comments and changes. Williams suggested that she thinks if you just use what FHWA has, and MUTCD, it specifically has five things in there that a sharrow does; Chapter 9c-9.

Haugen said to please feel free to provide more comments as you review the map, and added that staff is asking that you provide them by the end of February so that we can get the map to the printer and get them distributed by the end of March.

MATTER OF 2019 FLOOD BRIDGE MANAGEMENT PLAN

Haugen reported that every year about this time we discuss the possibility of flood events. He said that when this staff report was produced we didn't have quite as much snow as we currently have, however they are still forecasting little risk for a flood, so this graphic has not changed much.

Haugen stated that in any event the main point of this agenda item is to review the contact list and phone numbers and let us know if any corrections are required to ensure that if there is a flood fight we have one sheet that people can go to to know who to call, so please review the accuracy of the list and let us know as soon as possible if anything needs to be changed.

Williams commented that she knows she brought this up last year, and is going to bring it up again on this one; in the background part of the staff report the information included is getting close to 20-years old and she thinks it should be reworked and updated in some way or another. She added that the study that A.T.A.C. did is obsolete at this point because so many changes and improvements have been made and our signal system isn't even close to being the same as it was before, so maybe this can be reworked for next year.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2019**

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2019 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that the monthly progress report is included for your review.

Halford stated that she has a couple of questions on this report. She asked if these are all the projects for the year or are there some that aren't listed. Haugen responded that there are some that aren't listed because we haven't started working on them yet. Halford asked if that is something that we can get listed, upcoming ones, because it kind of goes into more of the overall question she has on this in that there is a column for completion date, and in the past those dates have changed as projects have been pushed back, so she is wondering if there could maybe be another column where the original completion date is listed in addition to the new completion date and then when it does change it comes back to the Technical Advisory Committee as an update that it has either been pushed back or it is going to take a little bit longer than planned so everyone is aware of it. She asked if this needs to be a motion or if it can just be a request. Haugen responded that a request is sufficient.

Haugen said that if he understands this correctly you want all of the things that are in the work program identified whether or not there is any progress on them. Halford responded that this is correct. Williams added that maybe in the task description you could give everyone an idea of when a project is proposed to begin, like a July kickoff or something, as it helps them to be able to plan their time a little bit better.

b. Possible CAT Route Change

Haugen reported that CAT has some possible route changes and a link to that report was given. He asked if there were any meetings scheduled for this yet. Kouba responded that no meetings have been scheduled as of yet as they are still working on what kind of changes they are looking at doing in-house before they bring it forward for public input. Ellis added that they are looking at possibly some time in March to schedule some meetings.

Discussion on ridership numbers; and route changes, issues and concerns ensued.

Williams said that she heard that there was an app for tracking a bus. Kouba stated that the Route Match is off-line and they have launched a new app and it is available through Google Play and Apple Store, but it is fairly recent that the new app has been released. Williams asked what the name is. Kouba responded that it is called CAT Prowler.

Ellis commented that there is no reason why it should take an hour and a half for someone to get from their home to City Hall so they should contact their Mobility Manager and she can determine a more direct route.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 13th, 2019**

Viafara asked how many people can dial a ride; is there a limit a day or a month or something. Kouba responded that dial-a-ride is more paratransit or senior rider so it has its limitation of whether a person can use it or not and then senior rider has an age requirement before it can be used. Ellis added that there is no limit as to how many rides you can have a day. Viafara asked if the number of people that can use it is limited. Ellis responded that it really is somewhat defined by the number of vehicles available, the number of drivers available, and what trips are called in because if a trip is called from the north end of Grand Forks and they want to go to Altru Clinic they are obviously going to try to pick up some people along the way but they are very limited on how many people can fit into a van. Kouba added that she thinks where the limitation comes in is who can use the paratransit service, not just anyone can use it or senior rider. Ellis said, though, that as far as rides per day if we notice an uptick in more people qualifying and wanting to use it more, there might be some limitations on availability.

Viafara stated that he was asking if this might be something that Ms. Williams, or others in the same situation of having an hour and a half trip, might want to consider using. Ellis responded that they would have to qualify and then it is \$3.00 per ride so it would cost her \$3.00 to get downtown and then \$3.00 and to get home and she doesn't think most people would want to do that every day when they can get bus ticket for much less.

c. Mn220 North Meeting – February 19th, 2019

Haugen reported that February 19th in the afternoon is the next Steering Committee meeting for the Mn220 North Study.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY HALFORD, TO ADJOURN THE FEBRUARY 13TH, 2019, TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:35 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager