

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 8th, 2023**

CALL TO ORDER

Stephanie Halford, Chairman, called the November 8th, 2023, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:38 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following member(s) were present: Wayne Zacher, NDDOT-Local Government; Andrea Ewardson, Grand Forks Planning; Carter Hunter, Grand Forks Engineering; Jesse Kadrmas, NDDOT-Local District; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Jon Mason, MnDOT District 2; and Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit.

Absent: Steve Emery, Brad Bail, Troy Schroeder, Ryan Brooks, Ryan Riesinger, David Kuharenko, Rich Sanders, Michael Johnson, Lane Magnuson, Nels Christianson, Jason Peterson, Nick West, George Palo, and Tom Ford.

Guest(s) present: Jason Carbee and Jeremy Williams, HDR Engineering; Blue Webber, Bolten and Menk Engineering; and Kristen Sperry, FHWA-Bismarck.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Halford declared a quorum was not present.

SUSPEND AGENDA

Halford stated that because we do not have a quorum at this time, she would like to suspend the agenda in order to discuss the Non-Action Agenda items.

NON-ACTION ITEMS

MATTER OF URBAN GRANT PROJECT SOLICITATION

Kouba reported that we received a letter of solicitation for NDDOT's Urban Grant Program. She said that they have a December 29th deadline which means that applications need to be submitted to the MPO by November 29th in order for them to go through the approval process.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 8th, 2023**

Kouba stated that, just as a reminder, the North Dakota 5311, 5310, 5339 and Transportation Alternative project solicitations are also open and have a December 29th deadline as well. She added that we haven't heard about Urban or Secondary Roads but are assuming solicitation for them will be open soon, and will also be due on December 29th as well, so application will need to be submitted to the MPO by November 29th.

Kouba said that no Minnesota Protect Grant applications were submitted to the MPO, and their deadline for their Transportation Alternative Grant is due on January 12th, but we will still need to approve it in December, so it also has a November 29th deadline for submittal to the MPO.

Kouba stated that that is all the 2025 to 2028 T.I.P. Program project solicitations. She added that just a quick note, they just heard that Minnesota just extended their 20-Year State Highway Investment Plan Draft comment period to November 27th.

Halford stated that, again, this is a non-action item, information only, but again get the applications, if you are submitting any, in to the MPO by the end of November so we can have it on the December Technical Advisory Committee and Executive Policy Board agendas in December for approval. Hunter reported that their applications will be reviewed at the Committee of the Whole meeting on Monday and at the City Council meeting on November 20th for approval.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2023/2024 Unified Work Program Project Update

Halford referred to the 2023/2024 Unified Work Program Project Update table included in the packet and went over it briefly.

- 1) Street and Highway Plan is really getting close to the finish line where November is the preliminary meetings; basically, where we are doing all the big presentations and then hopefully the study will go on our December agenda for final approval and then we will submit it to our other partners in January.
- 2) Aerial Imagery has been completed.
- 3) Bike and Pedestrian Plan has been completed.
- 4) Land Use Plans will begin in 2025 and 2026.
- 5) ITS Architecture we talked about at our last meeting, just kind of laying that groundwork so we are ready to go with it in January, and that begins the whole process again, that she knows everyone is excited about, but hopefully they will make it a little bit more enjoyable this time around.
- 6) Micro-Transit is looking at being done in either 2024 or 2025.
- 7) Grand Valley we are hoping to get approval of the RFP at this meeting so we can get this going.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 8th, 2023**

- 8) Safe Street For All we are hoping to get approval of the RFP at this meeting as well.

Halford reported that both Tyler and herself have received some comments on both the Grand Valley and Safe Street For All RFPs, and they have put those comments into the RFP, so what you see in your packet is where they are at, and they were hoping for any final comments and approval, but that doesn't look like it is going to happen today, so they will have to back and either have a special meeting or get approval via email, she isn't sure how we can proceed so we can keep things moving. Ellis asked if she had to have approval from this committee or can it just go directly to the Executive Policy Board. Zacher commented that he doesn't know for sure, but he is assuming that it would all be dependent on what your process is. He added that sometimes the policy board wants the Technical Advisory Committee to approve it first, but he did, and George Palo was going to talk today on the Grand Valley a little bit. He said that he did talk to him about it and you can add the Grand Forks District to the Interview Committee if you would like as they are interested in being part of the RFP process, so if you want the District on there they are willing to be on it. Manske thanked him for checking on that for him. Kouba added that as far as RFPs our Executive Board wants to know what the Technical Advisory Committee would like to see in them, which is part of the reason why on our staff reports we include a box that says Technical Advisory Committee recommendation, they like to see that on our staff reports. Halford added that that is usually one of their first questions about everything, what did the Technical Advisory Committee say, what was their recommendation.

Ellis stated so as to not to hold this up is there any way we can make recommendations at this meeting and then hold an e-mail vote or request an e-mail vote to be forwarded to the Technical Advisory Committee. Halford responded that she will have to brush up on the rules because she doesn't know off the top of her head what the process is for something like this, but we will probably need to have things approved either via e-mail or she may have to send out a doodle to see when people are available for a special meeting. Kouba commented that she thinks we can say what the Technical Advisory Committee did but it can't be an official recommendation because we do not have a quorum. Ellis said that she is just trying to figure out a way that we can go through these action items and make recommendations here at the meeting with a request of like a paper or e-mail vote and then that gets forwarded on to the Executive Policy Board so that we aren't holding up these processes an additional month or trying to hold a special meeting because doing that now would be difficult to get in before the Executive Policy Board meeting next Wednesday.

Halford said that we can move ahead, and we can do the items and just forward, off the record, this is what happened at the meeting, there wasn't a quorum but those in attendance had these comments and we are moving them forward. Ellis stated that she is going to make motions and request an e-mail vote, and then how staff wants to handle it will be up to you. Halford said that if everyone feels comfortable doing that, we can move forward with it and see where it goes. Ellis stated that she would like staff to see what they can do because she just hate, with this being so close to the end of the year, if you are holding up votes, now we are moving into a new year, which in terms of audits and money and stuff like that, it can be quite an issue, so she would prefer to try to go through it this way. Halford agreed we can do that.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 8th, 2023**

RESUME AGENDA

Halford stated that we will now return to our action items.

Bergman reported present.

ACTION ITEMS:

MATTER OF PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE STREET AND HIGHWAY PLAN

Kouba reported that this item will come back to the Technical Advisory Committee and Executive Policy Board as it goes through the approval process for both Cities, because the Street and Highway Plan, along with the Transit Development Plan and the Bike and Pedestrian Plan are all part of each City's Comprehensive Plan, and those need to be updated and an ordinance adopted.

Kouba said that she has Jason Carbee, HDR, on the line and he will kind of run us through the presentation.

Carbee stated that he will give a really quick go-through of this presentation because you have seen a lot of these slides so he will get really high level, just a high level one slide summary of each chapter, and he thinks we will really talk about what is in the fiscally constrained plan, because those are the elements that are really the bulk portions of this federally required document.

Presentation continued:

Chapter 1 – Introduction – Carbee said that chapter one is kind of that “what is an MTP, what is the Street and Highway Plan, what does the MPO do, and whether it is the core work products, you can see we have those four listed on this slide.

Chapter 2 – Goals, Objectives and Performance Measures – Carbee stated that they gave the highlights at the last meeting; there are five goal areas, and that was kind of the framework for building out the plan.

Chapter 3 – Plan Engagement – Carbee said that this goes into depth on our public engagement, all the open houses and stakeholder meetings, and on-line engagement that they had at those three milestones meetings, and talking with this body and the Policy Board and City Councils and then the survey results that they had.

Chapter 4 – Community Profile/Chapter 5 – Existing Transportation System Performance – Carbee stated that this is a community profile talking about the people, housing, jobs, commuting, just general patterns and recent trends and how that kind of transitions into the technical results of the existing transportation performance, tied it back to those federal

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 8th, 2023**

performance measures but also looking at traffic operations and safety and a lot of other different topics that we have talked about at length at past meetings.

Chapter 6 – Future Trends and Needs – Carbee said that they looked at how we anticipate land use to change and how that will impact travel patterns and the resulting needs on the transportation system, and also about emerging transportation trends and technologies.

Chapter 7 – Street and Highway Strategies – Carbee stated that this talks about what are the kind of high-level categories of approaches we can use, and how does that frame some of the projects that they came up with. He said that it talks about that range of alternatives that kind of form that basis of the projects that they chose, the fiscally constrained project list from.

Chapter 8 – Fiscal Constraint State Of Good Repair – Carbee said that this chapter gets into fiscal constraint and the big takeaway is that we’ve got predominantly a State of Good Repair plan with some opportunities for some safety and traffic operation improvements woven in, but really focusing on keeping our existing system in a state of good repair.

Committed Project List – Carbee stated that build off of that major committed project list, they didn’t list every single committed project on this slide, they really focused on some of the key safety and system expansion type of projects, like a potential 47th Avenue South Interchange, the grade separation at 42nd and DeMers, etc.

2050 Street and Highway Projects – Urban Roads Program (Grand Forks) – Carbee commented that the part that they just wanted to confirm, because he thinks this is probably, and he knows we talked about this at the last meeting, but the part they want to just make sure everybody has boughten into, is that we have short-term, mid-term, and long-term based on fiscal constraint, and he knows that we have probably had an iteration or two since the last meeting even, probably with most of you in attendance, but they have kind of the base year 2023 costs and then those year of expenditure, future time band costs that reflect cost inflation. He stated that they also have that list of critical, what we are calling illustrative at this point, but those critical needs that are likely needed before 2050 that we are also including that we would promote if more funding became available.

Carbee said that you can see as we go through these, they have green, blue and red for short-term, mid-term, and long-term and the orange are illustrative. He stated that this is the Urban Roads Project list for Grand Forks.

2050 Street And Highway Projects – Urban Grant Program Target List (Grand Forks) – Carbee commented that they are anticipating, from a fiscal constraint perspective; so this is a very discretionary program, the Urban Grant Program, but there are opportunities that they have identified here, and they are calling this a grant program, target list for the Urban Grant Program, so these would be the goals for the short-term, mid-term, and long-term. He said that he thinks, obviously these are discretionary programs so there is nothing guaranteed here, in terms of fiscal constraint.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 8th, 2023**

2050 Street And Highway Projects – City-Sub Target (East Grand Forks) – Carbee stated that we talked about this at the last meeting, and he thinks they might have made an edit based on some later comments, but similar approach, they have the short-term, mid-term, and long-term based on that four year cycle of funding levels, and then the assumption that, we’ve got these critical projects, a lot of them are in the Industrial Park area, that require some paving and we don’t necessarily have federally sourced, or funds from the State in this case, identified but those are critical and we think the need is to have those before 2050.

2050 Street And Highway Projects – Urban Regional Program (NDDOT) – Carbee said that we have the Urban Regional Program reflected here for short-term, mid-term, and long-term projects. He added that you will see on both sides of the river we do have on the State roads, multiple passes at resurfacing and reconstruction type projects between today and 2050.

2050 Street And Highway Projects – District Managed Program (MNDOT) - Carbee stated similarly, on the Minnesota side, we have short-term, mid-term, and long-term, and we do have some overlap with kind of multiple passes of maintenance projects as well.

Chapter 9 – Environmental Mitigation – Carbee said that, again, the project list is probably the critical thing that folks want to confirm, and they just want to make sure it is right as we head into the final stretch of the update. He added that, again, the last two chapters they had environmental mitigation to talk through, environmental justice type of approaches where we are looking at a range of different environmental justice populations, and we continue the practice of looking at carbon footprint estimations for transportation sources and carry the methodology from 2045 forward.

Chapter 10 – Federal Compliance – Carbee stated that this final chapter kind of talks through that federal compliance; looked at the CFR’s and matches it up with what was included in the Street and Highway Plan.

Remaining Schedule – Carbee said that Teri already went through the remaining schedule. He stated that they are hoping to get approval here and then adoption by the end of next month.

Ellis reported that, just so you are aware, they had their Planning Commission meeting at noon, and East Grand Forks was concerned about a potential project that was shown on there for a north end bridge, which they have no interest in, we know why it is on there but they did not bring it up and it concerns them that it is shown on there; that being said if it was shown as being brought up as a potential project, but it hasn’t made its way into the plan, then they are okay with that but they will see where their City Council leads them on it.

Edwardson commented that the City of Grand Forks Planning Commission reviewed it as well, and they didn’t mention the word “bridge” once, but they did have some concerns about wanting to increase 32nd Avenue in terms of timing. She added that Mr. Grasser gave a description of why that isn’t possible, so they kind of kicked it back. She said that they didn’t necessarily talk about a bridge, which was a little bit surprising, but they will also see what their City Council does with it as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 8th, 2023**

Kouba stated that she will be bringing this to both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks work sessions, just to give the council members a chance to hear where we are at, see those numbers, and be able to give us input before we go through that planning process and to hopefully stall some stumbling blocks along the way, or stop them from happening, so she is hoping to get as many questions as possible now and not later.

Kouba said that she was going to bring this up under non-action items but she does have a Draft Executive Summary that basically combines this plan, the Transit Development Plan, and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan all into one document, and in that document it shows all of the fiscally constrained projects that Jason just presented, as well as Bike/Ped and Transit projects, and divide it out into the short-term, mid-term and long-term projects, so if you can get any comments to her by the end of November so we can start the approval process for that document as well.

Kouba stated that they are amending the schedule just a little bit, they are adding an additional East Grand Forks Planning Commission meeting on December 13th and moving the East Grand Forks City Council approval to December 19th.

Ellis said that she would like to make a motion on this. Zacher stated that, just a heads up, George Palo is potentially stepping out of his meeting to join via phone call. Halford said that if he did that that would give us a quorum.

Ellis stated that she will hold off on making a motion until a quorum is present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE SAFE STREETS FOR ALL (SS4A) RFP

Halford reported that you have seen this already, and she didn't receive any comments or questions that would really alter the RFP much, and the only thing that was really done to it since the last meeting was some tweaking to the language to make things a little clearer and some tweaks were made to the proposal schedule, things are done a little more electronically now, before we would get things through the mail so there was a little tweaking to things like double sided pages, if we are getting it electronically things like that don't matter much anymore.

Halford stated that she just wanted to make it clear that the, not to exceed amount of \$400,000 is just for the consultant. She explained that there is also a 20% match, so there is \$100,000 for MPO staff hours as well, so, again the \$400,000 is just for the consultant costs.

Halford commented that there was one other change to the RFP, to the Selection Committee; she narrowed that down a little bit and removed Federal Highway from the committee makeup, so the makeup of the committee will be: East Grand Forks City Planner, Grand Forks Engineering, MnDOT District, NDDOT District, and MPO Staff.

Hunter stated that in the Scope of Work, in the first two paragraphs can we add some language "to meet all requirements for the Safe Streets For All Action Plan". He explained that David

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 8th, 2023**

Kuharenko was worried about them not completing everything and coming back and asking for more money to complete the plan. Halford responded that she will do that.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE GRAND VALLEY RFP

Manske asked if the NDDOT District had any interest in being on the Selection Committee or the Steering Committee. Zacher responded that they are interested in being on the Selection Committee but not the Steering Committee. Manske said that he will make that change to the RFP.

Manske stated that, based on comments received, many similar changes were made to the Grand Valley RFP that were made to the Safe Street For All RFP that was just discussed. He said that he will also make the changes to the scope of work language for this RFP that Carter just requested for the Safe Streets For All RFP as well.

Manske said that the big changes were updating the dates for the project schedule and changing the Selection Committee and Steering Committee membership.

Jesse Kadrmas, NDDOT-Grand Forks District, joined the meeting, a quorum was now present.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY EDWARDSON, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE GRAND VALLEY RFP WITH CHANGES, AS NOTED.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Edwardson, Ellis, Hunter, Bergman, Mason, and Zacher.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Peterson, Bail, Emery, Palo, Brooks, Schroeder, Johnson, Kuharenko, West, Magnuson, Ford, Sanders, and Christianson.

MOTIONS FOR PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSED AGENDA ITEMS:

MATTER OF PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE STREET AND HIGHWAY PLAN

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY EDWARDSON, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY GRANT PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT STREET AND HIGHWAY PLAN, AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Edwardson, Ellis, Hunter, Bergman, Mason, and Zacher.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Peterson, Bail, Emery, Palo, Brooks, Schroeder, Johnson, Kuharenko, West, Magnuson, Ford, Sanders, and Christianson.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 8th, 2023**

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE SAFE STREET FOR ALL (SS4A) RFP

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY HUNTER, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE SAFE STREETS FOR ALL (SS4A) RFP WITH CHANGES, AS NOTED.

Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Edwardson, Ellis, Hunter, Bergman, Mason, and Zacher.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Peterson, Bail, Emery, Palo, Brooks, Schroeder, Johnson, Kuharenko, West, Magnuson, Ford, Sanders, and Christianson.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF SAFETY TARGETS

Kouba reported that these safety targets are reviewed and updated annually, especially for the PM-1 Targets, as they are federally mandated to be updated annually. She said that the Transit Targets are reviewed by the Cities Area Transit and then are moved on to us.

Kouba stated that she basically updated this staff report from last year, and just added the new target; basically, the new process, the math of everything.

Kouba referred to the staff report and commented that because this is a five-year average crash rolling targets every year we change it, although for the past several years for the fatal and serious injuries there hasn't been too much of a difference from 2019.

Kouba referred to Table F – Previous MPO Targets with Staff Proposed Targets for CY2024 and went over the staff proposed numbers for each safety measure for 2024.

Kouba referred to Table G – Comparison Between MPO Targets and Actual Numbers and commented that we do have some comparisons and we are getting pretty close to the targets we had. Ellis stated that we are close, but her concern is with the number of traffic fatalities, the number of fatalities per 100 vmt, etc., you are proposing a performance measure under what our actuals were, is there a concern if we don't meet those performance measures. Kouba responded that for the MPO area we don't have any kind of basically carrot or stick to do these at all, it is nice to set our targets because we are then able to go to the State and say that we are trying to meet our targets, and we need more safety funding, and the State's are doing their own based on the whole of the state.

Ellis asked Wayne Zacher what his thoughts are on this. Zacher responded that it is up to the MPO if you want to do your own targets or adopt the State's because you can also adopt the State's targets, and if you do that then there really isn't a reporting piece to it, but again it really doesn't make a difference to the State if you want to go through the reporting process and submit that. He said that Grand Forks-East Grand Forks MPO chose to start doing their own, from his understanding, based on the fact that there are two different state targets, but it is really up to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 8th, 2023**

what the MPO wants to do. Ellis stated that she is just verifying that we aren't adopting something that we can't meet year after year because then it doesn't make sense to set those measures for something that we can't meet, that is her only concern. She said that she doesn't have a problem approving these, and looking to see where we can make improvements the next year, but again, her concern always is that we don't want to set something or have something out there that people are expecting us to try to meet or to get there that we aren't consistently meeting. Kouba stated that that is one of the reasons why we then went to an actual five-year rolling average, so it isn't just the past five years, it is five years of five-year rolling averages that we are looking at, which evens things out quite a bit.

Edwardson commented that this is just her ignorance in all of this, so she apologizes about that, but if we were to use this for state funding or something like that does the state evaluate this and say, "you set a target knowing you can't meet it just to get more state funding", would that go against us. Kouba responded that one of the things is that we are following the same basic process that each state goes through in figuring out their numbers, so they might tweak theirs higher or lower just based off of what they are seeing out there today, but on average they don't really tweak them because it is five years of five-year rolling averages, which really does smooth out all that data.

Ellis stated that she is looking at them and the MPO actuals for 2021 and 2022, those two years of actuals we aren't meeting what we are proposing this year, so she guesses that is two years' worth of data where it has gone up, so this is her concern, that we are setting them at an average, but it is averages based on four and five years ago when our numbers were lower but now they are higher, so that is just a concern of hers. Kouba responded that when the feds review these for the State's, and the State, on a normal basis, they get the choice of flexing some of their highway dollars towards safety, or just keeping them in their road projects, but if you haven't been meeting your targets, then you can't use that funding for anything other than safety; she should say they can flex their safety dollars into their road projects, but if they don't meet their targets they have to put the funding towards their safety projects, and that is kind of what the penalty is, you have to use all your safety dollars on safety projects.

Kouba commented that we can go higher if you feel these numbers are not adequate. Halford asked if Ellis had a number in mind that she feels more comfortable with or that makes more sense to you. Ellis responded that if you, well let's just say you look at the 2021 and the 2022 actuals, you are looking at number one, 3.8 and 3.6, and you went to 2.8, which was the actuals in 2020, and it is fatalities so obviously she is comfortable with setting that there because you don't want to set it higher, but crash related where it is 13 both years and you have it set at 12.6, so why not just set it at 13. Kouba responded that they can surely do that. Ellis said that serious injuries isn't off enough, but you have a static number for two years; same with the number of non-motorized fatalities, you are pretty close so she would leave that one, but she would probably adjust #2 to 1.1, those are her recommendations, but that doesn't mean you have to vote on it that way but she thinks that if we have two years' worth of actuals, maybe we just set them with those numbers knowing that we are still a little bit under.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 8th, 2023**

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE PM-1 SAFETY TARGETS SUBJECT TO THE CHANGES TO #2 AND #3, AS DISCUSSED.

Hunter referred to Table E – The Average of 5 Sets of 5-Year Rolling Average and pointed out that the time shows nine-year segments on that, so some clarification on that table is needed. Ellis asked if it was in the document, is Table E in the document because if it is she would adjust that. Kouba responded that it is the numbers she used to get the numbers. Edwardson asked if it labeled wrong by year or is the data from a nine-year data set. Kouba responded that it is based of all of these numbers.

Halford suggested, and you don't have to do this, but you can also have this brought back in December, it isn't due in December, we are just trying to get ahead of the game as they aren't due until January or February, so if you would be more comfortable with them reviewing this again and making those corrections, we can bring it forward in December.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO RECIND THEIR MOTION AND TO APPROVE TABLING THE PM-1 TARGETS FOR FURTHER REVIEW AND CORRECTIONS TO THE DECEMBER 2023 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING.

***Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Edwardson, Ellis, Hunter, Bergman, Mason, and Zacher.
Voting Nay: None.
Abstain: None.
Absent: Peterson, Bail, Emery, Palo, Brooks, Schroeder, Johnson, Kuharenko, West, Magnuson, Ford, Sanders, and Christianson.***

Kouba stated that we also need to act on the Transit Targets as well. Ellis said that Dale Bergman and herself have already reviewed these targets and she is comfortable with the numbers so she feels we can move forward with the Transit Targets.

MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY HUNTER, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE TRANSIT TARGETS, AS PRESENTED.

***Voting Aye: Kadrmas, Edwardson, Ellis, Hunter, Bergman, Mason, and Zacher.
Voting Nay: None.
Abstain: None.
Absent: Peterson, Bail, Emery, Palo, Brooks, Schroeder, Johnson, Kuharenko, West, Magnuson, Ford, Sanders, and Christianson.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 8th, 2023**

NON-ACTION ITEMS:

OTHER BUSINESS

Halford stated that the 2023/2024 Unified Work Program Project Update is the only thing we have left to discuss.

Halford said that Teri already went over the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Summary Comments so just a reminder that if you have any comments, please get them to her sooner than later and then we will bring it forward for approval in December.

Halford stated that the December Technical Advisory Committee meeting agenda items will include, again, the MTP final; you will also see the Street and Highway Plan final as well; maybe we will have some T.I.P. amendments; and we will have the PM-1 Safety Targets for approval as well, so that is what our December meeting is looking like, so please tell your friends to come to the meeting so we can have a quorum.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 11, 2023, MINUTES OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY EDWARDSON, SECONDED BY HUNTER, TO APPROVE OCTOBER 11,
2023, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY BERGMAN, TO ADJOURN THE NOVEMBER 8TH,
2023 MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:30 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager