

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2019
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen Chairman, called the January 9th, 2018, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:34 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Jesse Kadrmas, NDDOT-Local District; Richard Audette, Airport Authority; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Dale Bergman, Area Cities Transit; Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Consulting - Engineer; and Paul Konickson, MnDOT District 2 Crookston.

Absent: Darren Laesch, Brad Bail, Ryan Reisinger, Dustin Lang, Ryan Brooks, Lane Magnuson, Ali Rood, Mike Johnson, Stacey Hanson, Mike Yavarow, Lars Christianson, and Rich Sanders.

Guest(s) present: Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Al Grasser, Grand Forks Engineering; Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning; Clarence Vetter, East Grand Forks City Council/MPO Executive Board; Michael Huot, Resident; and Troy Schroeder, NWRDC.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTION

Haugen stated that for our guests present today he would ask that everyone please state their name and the organization they represent.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 12TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 12TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2019**

MATTER OF FINAL APPROVAL OF THE 2045 BIKE/PED ELEMENT

Haugen reported that included in the packet was the staff report and a full draft version of the performance measures document. He stated that based on our discussion last month our interest is in performance, and with that he will turn this over to Mr. Viafara for a brief overview.

Viafara commented that in the packets you received a line describing a number of performance evaluations for the common measures and targets for the bicycle and pedestrian plan or elements.

Viafara stated that the idea behind this is to provide a type of government or related agency the opportunity for us to establish baselines that will allow us to start the process that allows us to measure improvements conducive to the betterment or improvement of the overall network.

Viafara pointed out that there are a number of goals, objectives, and standards leading towards that particular direction, therefore we need to measure the steps being taken for us to get there.

Viafara said that there are some performance measures for each one of the US National Transportation Goals; we have assigned ten of them, and tried to tie it through accepting performance targets or by initiating a number of monitoring activities so we can start moving towards that direction.

Viafara commented that the performance measures that you have you got prior to today's meeting, however he would like to bring to your attention that through conversations with the Department of Engineering from Grand Forks and East Grand Forks and Planning from the two cities, some minor changes have been made and those changes he would highlight them indicating that with a few exceptions there aren't any changes on the ones that you have in your packet.

Viafara referred to a slide and stated that the one he would like to discuss first is on Goal #3, which is the need for us to measure accessibility. He said that where it corresponds to East Grand Forks, East Grand Forks originally had indicated that after 10 years 40% of accessibility features would be ADA compliant, because that was what was indicated on the plan that is under consideration at the moment; but it is our understanding that Engineering, Planning and Recreation met together and agreed that rather than 40% they would like it to be 30%, and they have provided the rationale for that.

Viafara stated, though, that for Grand Forks we had originally a number of ramps that were not really determined at the time that he sent the packets, but we have since received news that 44 ramps is an acceptable number of ramps that the City is committed to repair or retrofit in a period of the year.

Viafara said that another thing is that we had established 3 miles either of new or retrofitted sidewalks based on historical review; but East Grand Forks indicated that they were willing and happy to cooperate in achieving at least one mile of either repaired or constructed sidewalks per year in the next period of five years, so that is where the changes are.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2019**

Viafara stated that the remaining changes are really pertaining to East Grand Forks, and based on conversations with them those changes are really related to the fact that there is a lack of staff and issues with resources, but nevertheless they would like to cooperate by reducing some of them; for instance on the same topic the miles of sidewalks, we had originally envisioned 1.5 miles of new sidewalks but they have said that a quarter of a mile per year to 1.25 miles per year in the period of five years is acceptable.

Viafara said that the second thing on the miles proposed for bicycle facilities in the two miles, originally we had 20% or 2 miles built per year of bicycle facilities, but they indicated that in the period of five years 2.5 miles will be doable, or the equivalent of half a mile per year.

Viafara commented that there is one other thing on Access to Jobs; originally we had increased it to 100% in the five years but based on issues with the Land Development factor and things like that East Grand Forks indicated that 91% to 92% is the most appropriate measure for them.

Viafara stated that he will leave these measures with you for discussion and for consideration but it is important for you to remember that we are basically compelled, as an MPO, compelled to request the local governments and agencies to please produce or participate in the operation of those performance targets in order for us to configure the requirements that the MPO has based on the FAST ACT or Fix America Infrastructure legislation.

Bergman referred to Goal #5, Bicycle boarding on buses; and pointed out it states that the percent of transit shelters on fixed routes that are accessible and adjacent to the bike network will increase to 70% in the next five years and said that you will get 7%, you aren't going to get no 70% of the people to put bikes on a bus. Ellis responded that it is just asking us to have the bike racks on the bus. Bergman stated that they have 100% of the bike racks on the bus, which has a target of 100%, but then you go down further and it says the currently 19 of 35 transit shelters are adjacent to the bike network, but there is some of that bike network that doesn't even come close to our shelters, so unless someone is going to put in sidewalks that are specially made to get over to those bus shelters, you aren't going to get that to increase either, they will look at it when they start putting them up but when they get a request from citizens to put them on a certain area they look at that too; how many on and off boardings are we getting at that particular area, but he isn't going to do like they have now, out of the 38 shelters that Grand Forks has we might use 15 of them, and if we start changing that this year because of the route changes, the majority of those shelters are going away because they are nothing but a smoking shelter for someone or someone will dump their leaves or grass in it so they will be looking at knockdowns before they would make a determination and follow this rule that you have in here, it isn't going to happen.

Haugen responded that they aren't establishing a rule that you have to follow, so let's get past that language. Bergman asked if he was saying that they aren't establishing a goal that they have to follow. Haugen responded that they aren't establishing a rule that you have to follow. Bergman asked, then, what they are doing when they are putting it in there. Haugen responded that they are seeing that there are thirty-five shelters; nineteen of them currently are adjacent to the bike network, and as the bike network expands part of what they are trying to implement is to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2019**

try to get more of the shelters, the bikes and shelters adjacent to one another, so they aren't even suggesting the moving of shelters, this is just suggesting that as we expand the bike network that we look towards expanding the bike network for those other remaining shelters and the target would be to have not 100% of the 35 shelters in the five year period, but 75% of the shelters in that five year period. He explained that a lot of the future network is on-road bike routes, which would make this target not onerous, so it isn't about you moving shelters or adding shelters, it is about where bike networks are being established and trying to make a connection between the bike network and the transit shelter network.

Halford asked if there was a similar target in the Transit Plan that we could just mirror. Haugen responded that there is not a similar target that connects the bike network to the shelter locations in the Transit Plan. Bergman asked if they looked to see what their Transit Development Plan had listed for shelters next to the bike network. Haugen responded that we have a target that is saying that there are 35 shelters or 2 shelters. Bergman is asking how does it match up with 2d, aren't these plans all supposed to be following or interconnected. Haugen responded that the TDP doesn't suggest or identify that you are adding shelters or needing shelters, it is saying that you have 35 shelters, and then it talks about the whole State of Good Repair and part of your TAM discussion there are ratings on them, etc.; so that is addressing the facility itself, the transit facility itself; this document is addressing how the bike network can be better connected to where the transit shelters are located, so, again it's not a rule that says you have to implement shelters anywhere, or move shelters; but the target says that as we expand the bike network we are working towards making the bike network connections with your existing shelters better, increasing it from just roughly 60% up to 70% in a five year period.

Ellis asked what classifies as adjacent, because she is just thinking of East Grand Forks and the fact that the number of miles that they have in the Greenway that are bike routes or bike trails, it will be hard for them to get to that 70% because the bus routes aren't near the Greenway so she is thinking that the definition of adjacent would probably be... Haugen commented that she is looking at the wrong data; it isn't the miles of bike network, it is the number of shelters adjacent to the bike network. He explained that the denominator is 35, how many of the 19 of the 35 are we getting towards. Ellis rephrased her question as; a majority of their bike network is in the Greenway so based on the shelters they have she wouldn't consider them necessarily close to the bike network at this time, so what you are asking them to do is to essentially turn a lot of our City into bike network to kind of meet the percentage of what their bike network is in the Greenway, does that make sense. Haugen responded that he doesn't understand the connection to the Greenway. Ellis explained that they have maybe seven miles of bike trail in the Greenway, how many bike facilities do they have that are not on the Greenway but are in City Limits, maybe a mile. Haugen responded that you have 23rd Street, Central Avenue, for two miles. Ellis said, then, that they have nine miles of bike facilities, and seven of those miles are in the Greenway so the percentage there is quite a bit higher in the Greenway than it is on their street network, so it is hard to get to that 70% adjacent to a bus shelter if a lot of it is in the Greenway. Emery said, though, that just 70% of the shelters need to be adjacent to a bike route. Haugen agreed, and explained that as you expand, this plan is about expanding your bike network, and it isn't all going to be expanded in the Greenway; so as you expand your bike network you will have shelters placed around the City, so as you try to expand and make the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2019**

connection between the bike network and your shelters, so he doesn't understand the connection to the Greenway, it isn't a percent of how many total miles are adjacent to a shelter it is how many shelters are adjacent to a bike facility.

Emery commented that to go from 55% to 70% the City of East Grand Forks just has to get bike routes adjacent to six more shelters; because they have to go from 19 of 35 to about 25 of 35. Haugen responded that that is correct, although it is system wide not just East Grand Forks.

Haugen reiterated that this isn't about moving shelters, it isn't a ratio of miles of designated bike facilities, it is the ratio of how many shelters that exist today are adjacent to a bike designated facility, not all of them are so as we try to move towards that connection between bike and bus they are suggesting that target be 70% in five years. He added that going back to the question of how does this connect to the Transportation Development Plan, that is how it connects, we are trying to get that multi-modal connection so that your bikes and buses are on a similar system. He also clarified that the 70% is 70% of 35; and the target of 100% is to maintain the target at 100% of fixed route vehicles having bike racks.

Bergman said that the way he looks at it, any sidewalk in the City is a bike trail, maybe we can use that. He added that he doesn't see a designated sign that says this is for pedestrians only. Haugen commented, though, that not all sidewalks are legal for you to ride your bicycle on. He added that we do have a designated bike network so that is what this is focusing on; we aren't saying that you can't ride your bicycle on any street, but we are promoting a bicycle network and we are promoting increasing the connection between the bike network and transit shelters.

Viafara suggested that if you have time to review Chapter 4 in the proposed plan that has been approved, there is a response brought by a consulting company in Washington to a question similar to this that says that every sidewalk, therefore, is a bike facility; there is an explanation coming from professional engineers explaining that and certainly at the beginning the comments seem to sound unreasonable, but once we go into further analysis of which one is the purpose, which one is the function, which one is the level of service of these facilities then render some sidewalks that aren't really part of this system, and the same happens to some of these, so that is basically how to explain how we came to this particular kind of bike facility determination.

Haugen reiterated that again, the overall goal is better integration of the two modes, and so the target is to try to increase integration by having more bike routes, more bike facilities adjacent to those bus shelters.

Ellis reported that the other one she would like to discuss is to reduce the number of complaints by 50% on snow removal; and if anyone has any idea on how they can reduce the number of people complaining that would be helpful. Viafara responded that Grand Forks uses a system based on complaints so when the complaint comes to the #311 immediately the City sends somebody to check that particular property to see the length of the sidewalks and the snow that needs to be removed, so what we are asking is for them to reduce, by 50%, the length of the sidewalks for snow removal, that is basically what this is doing, and in order to achieve this one has to take a proactive approach.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2019**

Viafara stated that he agrees that it is impossible to reduce the number of complaints, what we are striving to do is to reduce the length of the sidewalks that come through those complaints. Kuharenko said, then, that what you are saying is that the performance target of reduce by 50% the number of complaints received concerning snow removal shouldn't be there. Viafara referred to Goal #9 and responded that in 2018 Grand Forks received 232 complaints through #311. Williams said that their question is how are you going to stop people from complaining, not all of the complaints are founded, sometimes you get out there and there isn't enough to qualify for removal, so the problem is is that you are never going to stop people from complaining about things, but whether it is founded or not, that is another story and that is why they have to check things out; so how do we get people not to call in, that is the question. Ellis agreed, and added that the struggle is is that she thinks everyone is aware that they need to move snow off of their sidewalks, but it is really hard, without fining them, to get them to move the snow and often times it is difficult to enforce the issue. Emery added that East Grand Forks really doesn't monitor complaints either. Ellis stated that they address complaints when they receive them, but they don't have anyone that can go out and look for those that aren't moving snow. She explained the policy/procedure they follow for snow removal and the costs involved.

Ellis commented that she thinks their process is not working so for them to meet this performance target at this time would be very difficult; so that is why she mentioned that right now, based on where they are at, it is difficult to meet that percentage.

Viafara reiterated that there were 232 complaints received by Grand Forks; when we added each one of those complaints in terms of lengths of the sidewalk that needed to be cleared, it comes to about 18,860 feet that were cleared; now what the suggestion is is to reduce the number of that length by 50%. He stated that we don't know how, but one way may be to enforce the ordinance, if there is one, which means that they have to send somebody to inspect and check the complaint location and then probably someone would need to provide notice to the property owner, that is one way, proactively to reduce the number of phone calls or complaints after the fact.

Viafara commented that, ideally, there shouldn't be any snow on sidewalks, particularly because as Cities you are compelled to follow ADA Legislation, that is ideally; but because that isn't the case at least having a system in place will bring to ADA's attention your good faith as a City that something is being done.

Williams asked, if the performance measure is to report on a coordinated program for education and enforcement, how does a target have anything to do with snow removal, it should have something to do with the number of programs, or the number of notices, or how are we informing the public of how we will do this; they are not complimentary. Haugen responded that the one data set they had was this data set of the number of complaints and how they were addressed through the assessments that were levied, and so one of the major topics we hear when we talk about pedestrians is snow removal, so in order to try to establish a target they looked at the one data set they had and that was how much the City had to go hire someone else to move the snow, so the intent is instead of having the City have the onus was through those materials that you mentioned to strive to have less City effort and place more effort back to where the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2019**

expectation is to have it done and that is to the homeowner to remove the snow; so that is the thought process behind setting this target. Haugen stated that if you look at the assessment list you will notice a lot of frequent fliers if you will, and they aren't homeowners, they are builders, so they can give you some thoughts on how to perhaps improve the removal of snow on their properties instead of through this method, but that is what the thought process behind this target is, to reduce this method as the way to get snow removed.

Ellis said, then, that the performance target should say reduce the number of complaints received concerning snow removal by; because there are two different targets there. Haugen responded that the confusion we are seeing here is that there are two separate targets; the first one is not all complaints lead to a City assessment, a lot of complaints lead to the homeowner complying before the hiring of snow removal companies, so we are suggesting two separate targets that are very similar, but are separate.

Grasser commented that he thinks there is a bit, on this and some others, that part of the issue is with the measurements; that they are responding to something that is outside of their control. He gave a brief explanation on what/how things are out of the City's control. He asked if there was some way to put a paragraph or something in here that recognizes some general variability of things that we don't control. He said that he doesn't have the answer to what should be measured exactly, but he thinks that that is why there should be some recognition of financial constraints on a local level, state, and federal; and just reactions to things that are outside our control. Viafara cited an example of how property owners don't remove the snow and how it affects pedestrians; and asked how this can be addressed.

Haugen stated that in response to what Mr. Grasser mentioned, there is already some language in the draft about external factors; these targets are not those that have penalties attached to them. He added that they can certainly beef up that section about how these targets are varied by recession, etc., to acknowledge that they are and that we have some measure outside of staff control. Ellis stated that that would be helpful because increasing the number of people commuting by a certain percentage or increasing the number of people on the greenway, those are hard to meet from an engineering standpoint; they can provide opportunities or better connections, but to actually get people to use it or to commute through biking or walking is kind of out of our control, so that is her concern; she doesn't want these to be set and then have them in the plan and then be something that we are tied to in terms of funding, so as long as it is something that we are striving towards, she has no issue with it.

MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY ADOPT THE FINAL 2045 BIKE/PED ELEMENT; RECOGNIZING THE FINANCIAL CONSTRAINTS OF FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL FUNDING, AND OTHER CONSTRAINTS THAT WOULD BE OUTSIDE OF OUR CONTROL.

Halford reported that Mr. Viafara was quoted in the Grand Forks Herald that the MPO would still be receiving comments on the Final 2045 Bike/Ped Element through January 23rd. She asked if that was that just to receive them or could that edit the document; or does it still go to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2019**

public hearing for final approvals for council, but outside of that anybody can comment and then the plan could still possibly change, or will the comment just be received. Haugen responded that it could cause a need to edit the document. He explained that until the MPO Board adopts a document it is still available for comment and if a comment comes in at 11:00 on the 23rd, and it is a substantial comment that the board decides has to be implemented and causes a modification of the plan then it would be edited. Halford asked if the document would then go back to the Technical Advisory Committee and the Executive Policy Board to approve the change. Haugen responded that the language states that if it is a significant change then it would need to go back through the process, but if it is determined that it isn't a significant change then it would not. He added that, just as what happened with our last Transit Development Plan, both cities would have to make a determination of their level of significance, so it could possibility have to go through the whole process, or it could just go through the MPO participation process.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Gengler, Audette, Ellis, Bergman, Emery, Kuharenko, and Konickson.

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Bergman, Lang, Brooks, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Bail, Johnson, and Christianson.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FY2019 T.I.P. AMENDMENTS

Haugen referred to the staff report and pointed out that it notes that there are four amendments. He stated that one of them is for an East Grand Forks transit vehicle, one is for Grand Forks and is related to transit as well but not for a vehicle but for other equipment, and then the NDDOT has two that we are amending into the plan.

Haugen said that we did advertise that there would be a public hearing at today's meeting so he would open the public hearing; there was no one present for discussion so he closed the public hearing. He added that there were no written comments received either.

Haugen stated that staff is recommending that the Technical Advisory Committee approve a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board that they approve these T.I.P. amendments as submitted.

Kuharenko asked if the safety project that came through with the regional project request last month; are the chip seals not included here. Haugen responded that we aren't being asked to amend those into the T.I.P., they are being asked to be added to the next T.I.P. as they are candidate projects and haven't been fully vetted through the S.T.I.P./T.I.P. coordinated process yet, but these have been. He added that it was mentioned last month that we would handle these projects this way.

Bergman stated, then, that these are the funds that we were awarded in December, correct. Haugen responded that that is correct.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2019**

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FY2019 T.I.P. AMENDMENTS, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Gengler, Audette, Ellis, Bergman, Emery, Kuharenko, and Konickson.

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Lang, Brooks, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Bail, Johnson, and Christianson.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR NDDOT FTA 5339 SOLICITATION

Haugen reported that, as they have been saying over the last several months, there are a lot of transit dollars going through the cycle. He cited that the NDDOT has announced a new solicitation for another year of appropriation from the 5339 program which we just amended the T.I.P. for. He said that they did advertise for the solicitation of projects for this program, and it was for vehicles only, and the Cities Area Transit has submitted this prioritized list of projects for consideration with the top priority being the purchase of vehicles to serve the possible merger of City Bus and the UND Shuttle Service; and the other three are more of a shop type replacement vehicles not so much in-service vehicles.

Haugen stated that staff is recommending the Technical Advisory Committee approve a recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board that they approve the candidate projects for NDDOT FTA 5339 Program as being consistent with the Long Range Transportation Plan and to give them priority ranking as submitted.

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR NDDOT FTA 5339 PROGRAM AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE MPO LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING, AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Gengler, Audette, Ellis, Bergman, Emery, Kuharenko, and Konickson.

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Lang, Brooks, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Bail, Johnson, and Christianson.

Haugen reported that this is related to the T.I.P. cycle. He reiterated that last month they mentioned that the North Dakota Recreational Trails Program was open; but they have had staffing changes so it was not officially opened in December but it is officially open now for candidate projects, so if anyone has any projects for this program, please submit your application for candidate projects.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2019**

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE EAST GRAND FORKS ADA TRANSITION PLAN

Haugen referred to the staff report, included in the packet, and explained that staff was originally seeking consideration of approval of the document, but will ask that it be tabled. He stated that we all, he thinks, understand the legal reasons why ADA is in place and requires transitions plans and why it became a focus on the Minnesota side in particular was this action by Federal Highway, interpreted by Minnesota State Aid, that they would be freezing T.I.P.s if our jurisdiction didn't have an up-to-date transition plan so we worked with East Grand Forks.

Haugen pointed out that also included in the packet is a draft of the document. He stated that the goal was to have this done prior to the approval of our current T.I.P.; we didn't meet that goal however they have accepted the T.I.P. because they saw that we were making reasonable progress for this.

Haugen referred to the draft document and went over it briefly.

Haugen commented that one thing that SRF did not do was to assess the transit facilities, the bus stops/shelters, so this draft is absent of that.

Haugen stated that we also talked a bit about who has jurisdiction over what curb areas' right-of-way; not all of it is the City of East Grand Forks, there are other jurisdictions involved. He cited an example of where we go the data set that is all GIS based, and stated that the City does have access to that information, so if you go look at these funds and identify what was identified as compliant and not compliant at those points, you can see that there is quite a number of them throughout East Grand Forks. He went over this information briefly.

Haugen commented that the financial picture, based on cost components; the plan document only as a total cost of \$1.99 million to bring everything up into compliance asset of the transit. He said that the plan does not break that down into proper jurisdictions so we are asking that SRF do that. He stated that this is the language in the current draft, based on our earlier discussion there might be a change to these values, but as you can see on the implementation schedule it wasn't going to be done in one year, but it does set out a good faith effort to get it done over a span of time.

Haugen reported that we are still under the determination that reasonable progress is being made, so they are not withholding our funding, but Federal Highway is advising us to not finalize this plan until we do have that transit facility information. He added that we would also like to have the cost breakdown identified and then if there is another change in this performance target we would include that in the draft.

Haugen said that another thing that we have to document in the draft is how frequently it will be updated; right now it is kind of silent on that issue so we will have to amend the text to identify, as we do with everything else, five years or if significant change occur, but he isn't sure if Federal Highway will give us a definition of what significant changes are.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2019**

Haugen stated that our action today is, we have a draft but we have some things that are still outstanding in the draft, so we are asking you to table this until we have the cost restriction and the transit assessments included. He added that in talking with Federal Highway Minnesota, they indicated that sooner than later, but with snow conditions if we have by June would that be acceptable, and they agreed that it would.

Haugen commented that we will need to talk about who will be doing this additional work; SRF still has some money left in the budget if we want them to do it. He explained that the reason they didn't do it is because they had information that said that Cities Area Transit staff would be doing it, so that will need to be figured out so it can be done as soon as the snow is gone, April or May, then it can be inserted into the draft and we can finalize the document.

Ellis asked how many shelters there are in East Grand Forks. Bergman responded that there are five. Ellis commented that she knows that four of them are already in compliance because they were just done within the last three years, so we would be looking at one that they already have plans for, so we essentially have the inventory so it won't take them long, and she feels that they can even have it done by the end of February if we want to because they did two on 5th last year; the one by the Library is compliant, and the one on the northend by the College was just done two years ago, so to only one she can think that needs to be considered is the one by the Apartment complex and they already have plans and specs for that one, so she would think that they would all be compliant by August of next year, but they will verify that if needed.

Ellis asked what was needed, in terms of inventory. Bergman asked if there is a document that they can follow for this. Haugen responded that there is and he will provide it to them. He added that this won't be as extensive as the data sets they looked at for the sidewalks and curb ramps, so essentially you will be looking at slope, shelter opening width, etc.

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE TABLING THE EAST GRAND FORKS ADA TRANSITION PLAN UNTIL THE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION CAN BE INCLUDED.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Gengler, Audette, Ellis, Bergman, Emery, Kuharenko, and Konickson.

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Lang, Brooks, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Bail, Johnson, and Christianson.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE RFQ FOR TRANSIT ABSORPTION OF UND SHUTTLE

Haugen reported that this agenda item is requesting quotes to assist us in merging the Cities Area Transit and the UND Shuttle Program.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2019**

Haugen stated that we are going with a quote process rather than proposals as the dollar value is below the threshold required and we are trying to get a quick turn-around as our hope is that if things work out financially, if the previously prioritized transit vehicles are awarded, that by the fall semester the Cities Area Transit will be operating the current UND Shuttle routes, so we are trying to get this request for quotes processed through quicker than it would take us for proposals.

Haugen said that the scope of work does have some holds still on the dates, and the need to work with the NDDOT to finalize what those dates are between now and the full process, which is the proposal process, so they will hopefully have them filled in by the Executive Policy Board meeting in two weeks. He added that they did have the draft scope of work reviewed by transit staff and UND staff prior to this presentation.

Haugen commented that this is principally a financial review of how to merge the two systems; the current route structure of the UND Shuttle would be a route structure that CAT would consider implementing so that is again a financial piece of utilizing the current prorated cost model that CAT has because of its connection between Grand Forks and East Grand Forks operations, so that is who captures it.

Haugen stated that there have also been talk about future replacement as we know that vehicles don't last forever so we will try to negotiate an agreement as to how those future replacements are cost shared.

Haugen said that staff is seeking a recommendation to approve the release of this Request for Quotes to the MPO Executive Policy Board. He added that the budget is \$40,000.

Kuharenko asked if this is included in the Unified Planning Work Program. Haugen responded that it is.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE RFQ FOR TRANSIT ABSORPTION OF UND SHUTTLE SERVICE.

Audette commented that on the route structure it references the Airport Shuttle; the Airport Shuttle right now is only between UND Campus facilities and UND facilities at the Airport, it doesn't technically serve the Airport in general. Bergman responded that they will do a study to see if there is a feasibility stop near the terminal and make it a dual purpose function, and then the question will be when, that is something they will look at.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Gengler, Audette, Ellis, Bergman, Emery, Kuharenko, and Konickson.

Voting Nay: None.

Absent: Lang, Brooks, Laesch, Hanson, Yavarow, Rood, Magnuson, Sanders, Bail, Johnson, and Christianson.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 9th, 2019**

OTHER BUSINESS

- a. 2019 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that the monthly work program update is included for your review.

- b. Connected Automated Vehicle Workshop in East Grand Forks

Haugen reported that you have all received an invite to the MNDOT Connected Automated Vehicle Workshop; please register if you can attend. He believes it is scheduled for January 31st in East Grand Forks City Hall.

- c. Open Houses For Regional Transit Coordination Council

Ellis reported that there are three open houses for Regional Transit Coordination Council; January 17th, January 24th, and January 31st in Crookston, Ada, and Karlstad. She explained that they will essentially be talking about how we can be better coordinated between different cities with different types of bus service, to make sure that we are getting a person who may be in Roseau to Thief River or East Grand Forks; how we can accommodate those people. She said that this is just the beginning of how we can accomplish that type of service.

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO ADJOURN THE DECEMBER 12TH,
2018, TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:35 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager