

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 12th, 2019
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen Chairman, called the June 12th, 2019, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:30 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; Nancy Graham (Proxy For Darren Laesch), MnDOT Planning Director; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; Richard Audette, Airport Authority; Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Jason Peterson, NDDOT-Local District; and Michael Johnson, NDDOT-Local Government.

Absent: Brad Bail, Jesse Kadrmas, Nancy Ellis, Ryan Riesinger, Darren Laesch, Dustin Lang, Ryan Brooks, Lane Magnuson, Ali Rood, Jane Williams, Stacey Hanson, Mike Yavarow, Lars Christianson, and Rich Sanders.

Guest(s): Patrick Hopkins, MnDOT Planning Engineer; Michael Huot, East Grand Forks/Grand Forks Property Owner; Bobbi Retzlaff, MnDOT; and Sandy Zimmer, FHWA-Bismarck.

Staff: 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.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen stated that because we have some new people present today, he would ask that everyone please state their name and the organization they represent.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 12th, 2019**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MAY 15TH, 2019, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL
ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY EMERY, TO APPROVE THE MAY 15TH, 2019,
MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF FINAL EGF ROW ADA TRANSITION PLAN

Haugen reported that Teri Kouba is the manager on this item and will walk us through it.

Kouba stated that we did the bulk of this document at the end of 2018, but when we took it before our Federal Partners there was some things they wanted added; specifically the evaluation of the transit facilities in East Grand Forks, but as it was winter we had to postpone doing it until May.

Kouba said that the East Grand Forks City Engineer went out and performed the evaluation of the transit shelters; so we went through the body of the document and replaced and/or added the necessary information that was obtained. She referred to the document and went over the changes/additions briefly, adding that as soon as a copy of the full accounting of this information is received it will be included in Attachment A, which has all of the facilities listed, and it will be part of the final document.

Bergman commented that the shelter prices listed are the minimum cost now, the lower end of them, because they can run \$10,000 to \$15,000. Kouba responded that the shelters are already there, we are just looking at doing concrete improvements and adding the truncated domes and things like that to them. Emery added that that is correct and explained that this is just including the necessary sidewalk improvements, shelter improvement type things, it doesn't include new shelters.

***MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY EMERY, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A
RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY
APPROVE THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE EAST GRAND FORKS ADA TRANSITION
PLAN FOR PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY, SUBJECT TO REVIEW AND APPROVAL FROM
THE EAST GRAND FORKS CITY COUNCIL.***

***Voting Aye: Audette, Johnson, Kuharneko, Peterson, Emery, Gengler, Graham, and
Bergman.***

Voting Nay: None.

***Absent: Lang, Ellis, Bail, Brooks, Riesinger, Laesch, Konickson, Williams,
Hanson, Rood, West, Magnuson, Sanders, and Christianson.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 12th, 2019**

MATTER OF UPDATE ON CAT/UND SHUTTLE MERGER STUDY

Kouba reported that just to reiterate, UND approached Cities Area Transit (CAT) to possibly take over their campus shuttle service, which is provided by the University itself. She added that UND is the only North Dakota University that provides this type of service.

Kouba commented that there are some cost variances involved with this service, which causes a lot of volatility and unknown costs to the University, which is why they approached CAT.

Kouba stated that we did a cost allocation to see what East Grand Forks pays for, and using that as a base we modified it a bit for UND and got some 5-year costs; basically a base cost, and then did a 5-year projection.

Kouba said that the next steps will be to look at where UND is at with those 5-year costs, as well as the City sitting down with UND and discussing those costs as well.

Haugen commented that this is an update only, there is no action requested. He added that last month you were given the UND costs, this month you are being given CAT's cost to provide the exact same shuttles, times and routes.

Haugen referred to the agreement and pointed out that with the allocation model, there is this first year agreed to by staff to carry some of the peak vehicle cost allocation. He explained that the \$44,000 is a cost that was identified to bring in the UND routes to these cost line items, and that is where we get a cost comparison of \$361,800. He stated that it makes the cost comparable for Cities Area Transit to provide the service as UND is currently providing it based on their average annual cost per hour of fleet buses.

Haugen reiterated that as Ms. Kouba said, the next step is for each agency to take it through their governing bodies to concur with the cost sharing, and work out agreements, then we will finalize this study. He said that our contract is based on a fall limitation, but now we are waiting a year so it appears we have time to finalize the report and extend the contract a couple of months. Bergman added that they wouldn't be doing anything until August 1, 2020. He said that the issues is trying to get the University back to the table to iron out what they want to do, that seems to be the hardest part with this.

Haugen commented that we have shown in the study that CAT can provide the service at our cost, what their typical costs are on an annual basis CAT can have cost assumptions for it that are easily predictable versus the current situation where they fluctuate dramatically, so it seems like it could be a win/win to have the merger take place, but we do need to have this information reviewed by the key people and concurrence with what is being provided.

Bergman reported that on the other side of this is that there are zeros cost to either the City of Grand Forks or East Grand Forks, because the University is paying the local match portion of this.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 12th, 2019**

**MATTER OF POSSIBLE WORK PROGRAM AMENDMENT FOR 32ND AVENUE
BRIDGE FEASIBILITY STUDY**

Haugen reported that this item is at the request of the MPO Board. He explained that after their last meeting they were interested in making progress on both future river crossings.

Haugen stated that there was discussion as to how we could proceed forward with the 32nd Avenue location, and one of the options they asked staff to put together was an amendment to the work program to do a study similar to what was done on the Merrifield location; the Merrifield Feasibility Bridge Report that was done; so staff looked at that study, found that the cost of the study was \$60,000 back then, so we adjusted for inflation for this study and set the cost at \$110,000 for the consultant budget.

Haugen referred to the staff report and commented that also you will see there are four projects listed that are currently in our 2020 Work Program that staff feel could be moved to accommodate this study. He said that he did talk to most of the technical people individually on them. He went over the four projects briefly, explaining why it is felt they can be delayed.

Haugen commented that before he gets into the scope of work for the 32nd Avenue Bridge, he would like to talk about the Merrifield Bridge project. He stated that they have been trying to get the two counties to schedule a joint meeting. He said that there was, at one time a date of June 18th was discussed to hold a meeting, but that date has since fallen through; so they are still hoping that both counties will get together and start discussing how to proceed forward with the Merrifield project.

Haugen stated that the scope of work for feasibility study comes straight out of the RFP that was written for the Merrifield study, however with Merrifield we also had the issue of Cole Creek, and with 32nd we wouldn't have that drainage issue tied so closely to the river crossing, but a lot of the rest of the work would be very similar in the scope. He said that with that he is also asking for our State and Federal Partners to make sure that these items they did back then are still eligible for us to do this time around.

Haugen reported that the intent is to take the maps and graphics that we currently have, which are very broad, and bring some level of refinement to them; it does not create a shovel ready project, but it does take it one additional step to help whittle down the alignment and to answer some questions to get us a more detailed traffic operations forecast at key intersections. He added that they would look at the impact it would have on the flood protection system, and what is permitted.

Bergman asked if this study is going against what the City Council had decided at their meeting, is this something that the City Council doesn't know about. Haugen responded that they do know about it. Bergman commented that he is surprised after the last ??? that they are going to be asking you to do a feasibility study. Haugen responded that he would say that there is probably on the North Dakota side, not a unanimous decision, just as the plan adoption was not unanimous, but the City Council reps on the MPO Board are part of this request, so from there, it

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 12th, 2019**

is still at a discussion point within the MPO. He said that you will notice that there isn't a request to recommend an amendment in the staff report, it just identifies that there is a future possible amendment coming. He added that the MPO Board was interested in what staff thought it would take to do this, and what projects would be delayed to do it.

Bergman reiterated, though, that this is not going to give a shovel ready project. Haugen responded that that is correct. Bergman said that it is just a review. Haugen responded that it is not just a review, it takes it to another level just as the Merrifield Bridge Feasibility Study took that location to another level, it will be more refined than just a line on a map, and if you look at the Merrifield report you will see that we looked at several different possible alignments, we looked at flood impact differently with those alignments; that involved Cole Creek, so we had to deal with that issue, but Merrifield didn't have to deal with a lot of the urban setting requirements that this one will have to deal with.

Bergman said that he knows that this is a hot button issue out there, and all we do is stir up the pot again, but if that is really what they want to have. Haugen stated that he would encourage you to read the MPO Board Minutes for May when they are available, and they will be available at the end of the week. He explained that if you read the minutes he thinks you will see that one of their attempts is to not have this sit for five years and have the same or similar discussion as was this past 18 month period, that this would have a little more informing information on the feasibility of this actual location. He stated that one result might be that we find that there is a fatal flaw and this location can be dropped, but until you go to the next level we don't know, so it is still an unknown and this will begin to answer the question. He added that some question a little bit more, but not all question, to a design, shovel ready project evaluation.

Haugen stated that the key things would be to review this scope of work to see if it is appropriate, with those few exceptions, and if there are some things that are omitted that you would like to, perhaps, see emphasized; that would be it. He added that it would also be good if you would give an honest opinion as to our cost estimate for the consultant costs.

Bergman asked if, when this is completed, and it goes to the MPO Board, it will still have to go through the City Council for their approval, correct. Haugen responded that it would still have to go through both respective City Councils.

Emery said, then, that at this point you are just asking us to review the scope of work and let you know if we have any comments and then it will come back to another TAC meeting for further review and discussion. Haugen responded that it will go before the MPO Board next week, and unless we get comments between now and Friday this is what will be presented to the Board; and we still have some review taking place by our partners, and we aren't asking the Board to take any formal action, so his sense is that if they still want to move forward after next week then in July we would produce one that is more specific to 32nd Avenue, and RFP document, and we would also have to produce, then, the formal Amendment to the Work Program and that format, so there would be two agenda items; one would be the work program amendment first and the second would be the Draft RFP specific to 32nd Avenue.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 12th, 2019**

Haugen commented that they did also discuss going to project shovel ready, but they felt it was too costly. He added that if they can get a similar report as the feasibility report for Merrifield, which seems to have advanced Merrifield further along, it might advance or find a fatal flaw for 32nd that would indicate why it shouldn't advance; but, again, the intent is to not let it just sit idly for the next five year cycle.

DISCUSSION

Michael Huot asked if anyone was at the East Grand Forks Council meeting last night. Emery responded that he did attend the meeting. Huot asked for clarification on the discussion about getting bond money for shovel ready projects, and that Friday was the last day for them to apply for those funds. Emery responded that that was through the Build Transportation Grant Program. Huot said that that is money they are going to use to get 32nd somewhat shovel ready. Emery responded that that is a program that could potentially provide money for construction plus any engineering or planning type of stuff. Huot said, again, though that the deadline is Friday and they want information a year in advance, so probably two years. Emery responded that he thinks the deadline for that program is sometime in July. Huot stated that the gal mentioned June 15th. Emery responded that that date is for some bonding money. Huot said that that is what he was referring to.

Huot commented that the thing that was discussed yesterday was the council president was talking about the money being spent for shovel ready; is it going to be wasted, is it not going to be wasted, can we use it, how long does it last, and so forth. He said that they didn't bring up the Merrifield Feasibility Study, but one thing that was very clear in that discussion was, just because it is on the MPO plan doesn't mean that 32nd is actually the location of the bridge, and really what the president wanted to say is that we have to have further discussion to decide what site we want before we spend a lot of money and time deciding what we are going to do; so one of the things he said is why don't we get more meetings together.

Huot stated that he has homes in both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, he has no idea why he would advocate 32nd or not advocate 32nd; he has no idea why he would advocate Merrifield or not advocate Merrifield, there doesn't seem to be a clear discussion that he can use to make his decision; so he goes to these meetings and everyone is just talking, but the real moose on the table is getting all the folks together and actually make a decision, it is a hot button but nobody is talking the same language.

Huot commented that the Mayor of East Grand Forks says it is a neighborhood bridge, he wants a neighborhood bridge; well it goes right smack into a section of dirt, that isn't a neighborhood, so he is just wants honesty as far as where this bridge goes, and he hasn't heard any of those discussions; when it is on the radio you get one side or you go to Grand Forks and you get something else so how do we get two communities together and have a discussion and actually add some things to the list, and/or eliminate some things so we can get some cohesion and get this thing moving because nobody wants to go through this again in three years, right, it's not only separating Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, but it is separating 32nd, Elks Drive, 17th, all those locations. He added that even if you put a bridge at 32nd, but you don't put this

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 12th, 2019**

roundabout, it isn't going to help the traffic anyway, and the roundabout we're talking about isn't really a roundabout it is just a sign that says it is a roundabout because you can't build a roundabout because we've got a neighborhood right through it, and that doesn't make sense to him.

Huot stated that he likes coming to these meetings and see all the work you are putting into them, but it doesn't go anywhere, and then you try to present that at a council meeting and ask them to try to make a decision at the last final hour, that isn't fair to anyone. He added that he is really trying; he goes back to his community and tells them this is what we talked about, this is where we are at, and we're no different than we were last time it came up.

Huot said that he really wants to see something done; if it is 32nd then by-god it is 32nd, but there better be some strong evidence why that is the place instead of just someone winning and someone losing, it better be a community win or we will have issues.

Emery commented that the way he understands this is that has to be the intent of this feasibility study, to take a better look at 32nd and see what is feasible and what isn't. He said that for ump-teen years there has been discussions about five or six different locations, but we can't seem to get past that, so it seems like the Executive Board is at least wanting to take it to the next level and keep the ball rolling to gain some momentum; and maybe through the process we will find out that this isn't the location, but at least they are doing something.

Huot asked, even last night, was there a clear decision where the bridge should go. He added that the meeting last night was ??? where the bridge should go. Emery responded that he doesn't personally think that the City of East Grand Forks knows where the bridge is going to go. He added that he thinks they have some representation on the Executive Board, but if you ask the full council where the bridge is going to go you wouldn't get seven unanimous opinions.

Huot commented that this is just his observation, he is really trying to sink his teeth into something, and at least grab on something that he can advocate more and he can't do either one. Emery stated that he was at the Joint meeting a few months ago, and they talked about 32nd, but when he walked away from that meeting it was very political; with 90% of the people not wanting it and 10% of the people that did.

Haugen said that all he can say is that if you asked what is in the plan of all three entities, all three would say a bridge at Merrifield and a bridge at 32nd. He added that the MPO Board is trying to move on both ends, they are trying to facilitate a joint meeting between the two counties to continue moving Merrifield forward. He said that Merrifield is more advanced and even then there is likely some persuasion that needs to be done at the county level to have any movement of that project, but at the same time he has already stated that they want to try to do something with the 32nd location to either move it forward or to find that fatal flaw and go back to the drawing board.

Haugen reiterated that they are asking the Technical Advisory Committee to review the scope of work; the eligibility of some of those items, and give us feedback. He added that you will get

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 12th, 2019**

another chance before we do any formal changes to anything, and we will also have a meeting a week from today where we will have more discussion, and either a continue moving this forward direction, or a slight change in direction, or a stop and rethink direction.

Haugen stated that this is what the MPO Board asked us to provide them with. He added that the sooner you get us your comments the better off we would be.

MATTER OF DISCUSSION ON FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION UPDATE

Haugen reported that last month we talked more generically about the process, the Federal Highway Guidelines, and so on. He said that they also distributed last month after our meeting, on both sides of the river, but as was stated since we had just completed something major on the Minnesota side we are anticipating that most of our work will be on the North Dakota side, however we still gave our Minnesota friends the opportunity to comment. He said that as he noted in the staff report, our Minnesota friends didn't see much of anything that needs to be changed, so, again, our future discussions will be on the North Dakota side.

Haugen commented that there were some e-mail exchanges; to highlight some things, but for the most part we didn't get a lot of great comments so we compared this map that further discusses some area, so in addition to the stubs that were highlighted by the NDDOT last time, we are also including some other areas where we need to have some discussion; we actually did have some discussion at one point about the possibility of changing the functional class in those areas, but further discussion is necessary. He added that as we discussed last month there is the federal funding tie-in with the decision of future extensions only showing up if there are in the T.I.P./S.T.I.P. process.

Haugen referred to the map and went over some areas that need to be discussed. Discussion ensued.

Haugen stated that what they are asking is; particularly where we have County Major Collectors coming to a City Limit Line, which we classify as Principal Arterials, part of the discussion is that we are no longer supposed to follow political boundaries, or necessary geographical boundaries but functionality of the roadway, and so he is wondering how the extensions of a County Collector should be done. Kouba commented that that is the area where they switch from a Principal Arterial to a County Major Collector. Haugen said that in the past it has been purely just because it crossed that imaginary boundary. Kouba pointed out that we then go from a Principal Arterial to the Minor on the other side of the Interstate and then we immediately go to the County Major Collector.

Haugen referred to the map and pointed out another area they highlighted and explained that we now know that 55th extends to Washington, so that should be changed. Kouba said that the question is will the rest of Cherry be counted down to 62nd within the T.I.P./S.T.I.P. period. Kuharenko responded that he would think that Cherry Street will be extended to 62nd within the next couple of years. Kouba stated, then, that it would be feasible to make it officially part of the network.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 12th, 2019**

Haugen commented that we also have frontage roads highlighted. He said that it is his understanding that at the time that these were classified was to make them eligible for federal aid, not so much based on function as collectors, perhaps, but now we are now using a new guidance process. He stated that the last time he recalls us discussion frontage roads and federal aid was when we doing our fiscally constrained financial plan, and we were having all these frontage roads pop-up as very needy federal aid routes, that had a lot of dollars attached to them. He said he thinks the guidance came from North Dakota Federal Highway and NDDOT back in the day to put them on the class system; he asked if there was any guidance today. Johnson responded that if you want to be able to use any federal aid dollars at all at any point in time, whether it is a NDDOT or City project they have to be classified. Johnson concurred, adding that at one point in time we had to have them classified, then they moved away from that and were treating them as an element of the highway corridor, almost like a lighting system or shared use path, so if you are doing a mainline project we would put federal aid on the frontage roads, but through coordination with Federal Highway that was not the right way to be doing things so they now have come back full circle. He said that for any federal aid to be used on them the need to be classified, but it does eat away at the mileage limit for collectors.

Kuharenko asked if the current mileage numbers broken down. Haugen responded that they do. He explained that they have a North Dakota tally and a local tally. He added that he thinks we are in agreement with the same base year; and then our 2019 numbers are, we have what we think might be the point of making functional class, so we don't know if you know what they might be. He said that he doesn't know if we kept the frontage road functionally classified. Kouba responded that they are currently included in the tally; she was having the intern work on highlighting how much mileage the mileage would be reduced if we did take off the frontage roads and/or some of the other areas. Kuharenko asked if it would be possible for them to send that information so they have a better understanding as to where we are at currently, that way they might be able to better figure out where we need to trim in order to fit those guidelines.

Gengler asked if the individual allocations are set in stone, so to speak, in terms of are they based on size of the city relative to lane miles. Johnson responded that they are a percentage range. He cited examples of the percentages; for the Interstate system its like 3%-9%, and that applies here or to Minneapolis, so they would most likely be over with their mileage; for minor arterials it's like 7%-14%, collectors, etc. He stated, though, that on the North Dakota side the collectors are a little different because they asked that you not to do two collector systems, it is just one system, so for the guidance table you unofficially add the two collector systems together so it is like 6%-32%, and then the locals are like 65%-80%. Haugen pulled up a table with the correct percentages for review.

Haugen referred to the map and pointed out that they also highlighted, particularly in the downtown area, where we have every roadway classified; so getting back to the new guidance would we have such close spacing taking place with these roadways. Kuharenko asked if that causes us issues with a currently programmed project. He said that we have the Urban Grant program for North 3rd Street from DeMers to University, would declassifying that to cause that project issues. Johnson responded that it would. Haugen said, though, that he thinks that an argument could be made that the Urban Grant Program originally wasn't set to be holding up

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 12th, 2019**

federal aid roads; and the discussion he heard was that they want to be as broad as possible with the projects and the funding, and we do know that some STP dollars can be spent on non-federal aid routes. Kouba commented that the northern roadways are all minor arterials, and not collectors, so it could be just a difference of downgrading them. Johnson responded that it that wouldn't work.

Haugen stated that absent of getting much feedback we developed this map for further discussion, so if you want to have further discussion we can do that. He said that the only last piece, that Mr. Johnson made reference to, was a letter and a timeline as to when this needs to be completed. He explained that currently we are just working off our old programs timeline for this, which is the end of the year. Johnson responded that the general thought in his head if the letter goes out is that they would want it done by the end of the year, so you are probably on track without knowing you're on track.

Haugen commented that at some point in this process, until the end of the year, we will have to give better identification of future extensions and how they get into the T.I.P./S.T.I.P. so that they can be functionally classified. He said that he thinks the first effort will be to identify those changes, and the relatively few projects in the current T.I.P./S.T.I.P. and base a functional class map off of that; and as mentioned there is a possibility that this will require annual maintenance, depending on the T.I.P./S.T.I.P. projects, so we will have to come up with an agreed to process procedure on making changes of future extensions, when to make those changes.

Johnson said that one comment he has, if he understands the earlier discussion, is where to break county roads as compared to the urban roads, it should be an urbanized boundary. Haugen asked if it was the Adjusted Federal Urban Aid Boundary. Johnson responded that is correct.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2019 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that included in the packet was the monthly progress report.

b. Mn220No Meetings – June 25th

Haugen reported that there is a Mn220No Corridor Study meeting scheduled for June 25th here in the Training Room from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. and you are invited to attend.

c. Selection Of KLJ For Downtown Transportation Study

Haugen reported that as you are aware we recently released the RFP for the Downtown Transportation Study. He stated that they received four proposals and the interviewed all four; the Selection Committee is recommending we hire KLJ to do the study so we are now in negotiations with them and hope to have it wrapped up to present the contract to the MPO Executive Policy Board at their meeting next Wednesday, after which we will then submit it to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 12th, 2019**

our State Partners for review and concurrence on our selection process so July is our anticipated begin date for the study for both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks.

d. Continued Discussion on EGF ROW ADA Transition Plan

Peterson asked if a similar document to the EGF ROW ADA Transition Plan exists for Grand Forks. Kouba responded that it is only for East Grand Forks and is something that MnDOT requested the City of East Grand Forks do.

Haugen commented that there is a North Dakota DOT ADA ROW Transition Plan as well as some State Highways on the North Dakota side.

Peterson said that he was wondering specifically about Grand Forks. Haugen commented that he is sure the City of Grand Forks has an ADA Transition Plan; but whether they have the right of way identified to the same extent that this document does he doesn't know.

Johnson commented that his guess is that if they don't they will be required to have one soon, when your DOJ audit comes back, that will be a finding his guess is as they just had that audit last year and are waiting on the results.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY BERGMAN, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO ADJOURN THE JUNE 12TH, 2019 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 2:26 P.M.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager