

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Stephanie Halford, Chairman, called the December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2023, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:30 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following member(s) were present: Wayne Zacher, NDDOT-Local Government; Ryan Brooks, Grand Forks Planning; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; George Palo, NDDOT-Local District; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planning; Jon Mason, MnDOT District 2; Steve Emery, East Grand Forks Engineering; Ryan Riesinger, Airport Authority; Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineer; Rich Sanders, Polk County Engineer; Tom Ford, Grand Forks County Planning; and Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit.

Absent: Brad Bail, Troy Schroeder, Carter Hunter, Michael Johnson, Lane Magnuson, Nels Christianson, and Jason Peterson.

Guest(s) present: Reid Huttunen, East Grand Forks City Administrator; Andrea Edwardson, Grand Forks Planning; Jason Carbee, HDR Engineering; Mark Schill, Praxis Strategy Group, Blue Webber, Bolten and Menk Engineering; Erika Shepard, MnDOT MPO Coordinator; Sharijad Hasan, Upper Great Plains Transportation Institute; and Kristen Sperry, FHWA-Bismarck.

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

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Halford declared a quorum was present.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

Halford asked that guests attending the meeting please introduce themselves.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 8, 2023, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 8, 2023, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

Sperry commented that the minutes reflect her as being present as a guest at the meeting, however she did not have a link to the meeting so was not in attendance.

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO AMEND THEIR MOTION TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 8, 2023, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE SUBJECT TO REMOVAL OF KRISTEN SPERRY AS A GUEST.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**ACTION ITEMS:**

**MATTER OF FINAL APPROVAL OF THE STREET AND HIGHWAY PLAN**

Halford reported that first off, she would like to share that there will not be a presentation. She stated that this is something that you have seen many times before, so just a quick update of where we are and where we are going with the plan.

Halford said that as of today it has been presented to East Grand Forks Planning and Zoning Committee, which was just an hour ago, and they approved the plan as is, as did the Grand Forks Planning and Zoning Committee. She stated that the Grand Forks City Council requested a comparison summary of the 2045 and the 2050 plan, which was presented, and they ended up giving preliminary approval of the plan but striking out any mention of an intercity bridge. She said that presentations of the plan were given to the East Grand Forks City Council, but they will not vote on it until December 19<sup>th</sup>, and a final vote will go to the Grand Forks City Council on Monday, December 18<sup>th</sup> and then to the MPO Executive Policy Board on December 20<sup>th</sup>.

Halford stated that that is where we are at with the plan, and so far, any changes to the document have just been grammar edits, so it will go to the MPO Executive Policy Board as is to see how they want to move forward with it.

Ellis said that she just has a clarification that when, they, as a Planning Commission voted they looked at the plan as truly a Transportation Plan, which is what it is. She stated that they know there is capacity and level of service issues with the current bridges that we have right now, as well as potential growth in East Grand Forks will be dependent on another intercity bridge at this time, so that is how they looked at it, that is how they addressed it, as a transportation plan, so therefore she will make a motion.

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY FORD, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE 2050 STREET AND HIGHWAY PLAN WITH INCLUSION OF THE INTERCITY BRIDGE.***

Brooks commented that from the Grand Forks side, they had split votes, even the motion for approval coming from the Planning Commission was a split vote at their final, and they had City Council vote one way and the Planning Commission vote another. He said that it has definitely

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

been a divisive issue, and he thinks we all understand that, so for that purpose, at this point, not that he thinks there is anything that they could have done as, you as staff or as consultants, done anything differently, but he has a hard time supporting it at this point, and he knows that we are a long way away from actually doing a build, but at this point he just can't support it with where their side is at at this point, so from that perspective he will be voting against this motion knowing that it still goes up to the next level, and still with, hopefully the full intent of having a plan approved so that the money can continue to flow into the community.

Kuharenko stated that he will have a very similar vote to Mr. Brooks as well, and one of the things that he does want to point out is that he does appreciate all the effort that you and your team has put forward, especially getting this in front of the Grand Forks City Council, and it is unfortunate that last minute changes were requested, but he will also be voting against this motion as well.

Ford asked, then, if the decision to strike was that City Council or Committee of the Whole. Kuharenko responded that it was City Council.

Ford stated that today we are being asked as a Technical Advisory Committee to approve the plan with the intercity bridge included, then it will go to the MPO Executive Policy Board for them to make a decision. Halford said that that is correct.

Ford asked, if the intercity bridge, if we all agreed we should strike the intercity bridge from the plan, does that change the scope or the retainer or anything with SRF, if could strike is that a cheaper contract with SRF. Halford responded that SRF is the consultant for the Bridge Study, HDR is the consulting firm that has done the Street and Highway Plan. She stated that at this point it is hard to say how many things will come into play, she definitely will bring forward to the board what everyone is saying, and for them to take that into consideration, that will move forward. She said that if they choose to take the intercity bridge out of the plan, and that is what their motion is, we will have to reach out to HDR to start looking at what that means for the document because we aren't just taking out a line item, it would also be looking at what the charts say, what the data says, the wordage throughout the document. She added that there is another sticking point; you can never fully remove it because we presented it at different committees, we presented it to the public and we got feedback back so it can never be fully removed, and then even if we got to that point just the makeup for the geography of this region is always going to be a talking point and that isn't something we will ever escape.

Bergman reported present.

Halford stated that if they happen to move the plan forward as is, that is what we will forward to our federal partners as well.

Ford asked if this could affect federal dollars that have been earmarked for the region, and if the communities don't agree and we get stuck, could the feds not say "well this money that we had earmarked for Grand Forks, we aren't a bank and we aren't going to hold it, so the money will be sent elsewhere". Halford responded that that is possible. She added that that becomes part of the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

timeline of how much changes and how much of the document changes because we did management presentations to both DOTs and we don't know if they want an updated presentation, it is going back, possibly even out to the public, because this is kind of a new plan, so we would need to get their feedback too, and then we would need to bring it back through all of the bodies again for approval again, and if we don't have it approved by the end of January, she doesn't know if we can make these changes and do those things we need to do in that timeframe, so depending on the projects, federal funding will be frozen at the end of January, how it affects different projects and how long maybe those funds are held, will be dependent on the projects, and both Wayne and Kristen are here today so they can definitely add to that.

Emery stated that, again, as Stephanie said, this is really a planning document that is opening up the opportunity for future funding for an intercity bridge, this study is not, as he understands it, is not committing a location for the intercity bridge, so to him, and he knows there has been a lot of discussion, but to him a lot of the people in Grand Forks agree that we probably need an intercity bridge, it seems like the issue always comes down to location, so again, with this document just opening up the opportunity for federal funding for a future intercity bridge, regardless of what is ever is decided on for a location, he doesn't know what that would not be approved, and kept in the document. Halford responded that as the document reads today, there is no funding, no date, no location tied to it; and as Steve said it just opens up that conversation, and that was what was agreed on at the beginning of this study, that we knew that the communities weren't ready to make a decision on a location, we didn't want to be forcing anyone's hand, but know that this has always been talked about, should be looked at, but it was an olive branch that we were under the impression everyone was comfortable with.

West said that to him it seems the bridge should stay in the plan; however, he really wants to walk a fine line between county interest and city interest, and he really tries to keep those as separate as possible, also recognizing that the cities and the counties will too. He asked if it would be fair to say or could someone from the city elaborate as to why the members of the city council voted against it, do they truly feel that a bridge should never be built within the city limits, a new one, is that fair to say or is it because they can't agree on where. Brooks responded that he has seven different council people and probably, he is guessing you are going to get more than seven opinions on that even somehow, but that is just the way it is, you know there are some that would like to see it, there are some that do have a concern on the Minnesota/4<sup>th</sup> and the thought that the intercity bridge will provide a relief to that, he doesn't know if that will be the only thing that will provide the relief enough, but that certainly has been a concern of some. He said that he also thinks there are others that are very concerned about identifying a location and, whether it be 32<sup>nd</sup>, Elks, 17<sup>th</sup>, whatever corridor we choose and what that would do, but he thinks what he heard out of the city council was that they did have a preference of the Merrifield Bridge road going in, as well as the safety improvements from Minnesota/4<sup>th</sup>, those are two items that were attached to that removal of the intercity bridge, with the thought of let's see what those numbers do to, overall, without just, you know to get pressed into the model we have ideas of what that relief will bring, but until you truly have that connection maybe that Merrifield pulls more, it is really difficult to say, and then what those safety improvements will do in terms of diverting traffic, potentially, and having other connections made, so that is just a quick answer.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

West said that he gets it, he knows this is really tough, especially if you are city staff, he doesn't envy them right now, but this really could put a damper into our SRF contract, as far as them trying to, they are hopefully starting the NEPA process in the near future, and hopefully they will let that process decide where the bridge would go, and if this document and this group decides that we are just going to completely remove the option of an intercity bridge, that might conflict with what the NEPA document comes out with in the future and reduce the chance of us getting federal funding for a bridge anywhere, and if we pigeonhole it to just Merrifield then you are kind of pre-picking the option of NEPA, which you aren't supposed to do; it seems to him like, he wants to vote to leave it in there but he certainly doesn't want to cause tension between the county and the city by no means, but, and then let the NEPA process of the SRF contract; and then hopefully we can get that planning grant, and then let that process decide where the bridge should go, and if at that point we still can't come to a conclusion, between the two cities and counties, or whatever, then at that point then we deal with that repercussion or that issue, where we just don't build a bridge at that point because we can't agree, but it seems premature to do it now.

Ford asked, even if this body, the MPO Executive Policy Board, were to say let's keep the intercity bridge in the long range plan, SRF continues to work on the original scope, now dealing in hypotheticals, SRF could come back and say Merrifield is viable, and they could also come back and say that intercity bridge location "b" is viable, we still don't as a community, a city, they don't have to go after the intercity, the City of Grand Forks can still that they aren't interested in that, which then creates issues with East Grand Forks he realizes, but just because it is left in doesn't mean that we have follow it, and to Nick's point he shares the same concerns, and agrees that he doesn't want to pit city against county, that is not the goal here, but he likes the idea of just letting the process play out and letting the recommendations come back to the two counties and the two cities, and let the policy makers go from there.

Kuharenko commented that from what he understands with what SRF is currently doing is simply a scoping study, it is only really figuring out what's the path that we need to take, what are all the unknowns that we don't have before we start getting into the NEPA process or the PEL process, so he doesn't necessarily think that what decision is made today, or by the Executive Policy Board, or by the City Councils, is going to necessarily impact that; would that impact future potential pursuit of an application for the Planning Raise Grant, that was brought up in yesterday's meeting. Halford said that that application would need to be submitted in February. Kuharenko stated that he would assume because of a necessary budgetary amendment, that would probably have to go forward to the city council anyway for their discussion, to see if that is something they want to move forward with, so he thinks that whatever decision is made today isn't necessarily going to change SRF's current study. Halford said that if you are going after a federal grant, especially in February, they are going to reference current and up-to-date plans, and with that being removed, they probably won't too kindly on the application. West stated that he wanted to make that exact same point Stephanie made, it has been in the Long Range Plan for decades, we take it out at the last minute, and then months later, or a year later ask for federal funds to build a bridge, hypothetically that could happen, it would be like, what do you want, do you want the bridge or not.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

Ford said that he is going to vote yes today because of the points Nick and Stephanie have made; his concern is federal funding at this point, completely appreciating the position you are all in.

Zacher commented that, since it has been brought up if the intercity bridge reference is removed from the plan and the SRF study continues on and it comes back saying that a bridge is needed, then we are going to have to do an amendment also to add it back in because it will not be federally eligible unless it is in your MTP.

Sanders presented present.

Palo stated that in reviewing all of the studies that have been done, by having that bridge in there it has really affected a lot of their trips, their traffic numbers, so if we take it out it will change all of that as well and we will be back to square one and we will have to start everything all over again and there is a high chance that our federal funding will be frozen during that time frame and we will be delaying everything. He said that just because it is brought in, it is in the initial stages right now, they are still trying to scope things out, they are trying to find a process on which way it is going to go; Minnesota uses PEL and North Dakota uses NEPA, both systems are a little bit different, that has to be worked out, all the agencies have to be brought in, we are years away, just because it is in there doesn't mean that in five years there is going to be funding for it, there is going to be a design and it is going to be built, it is way down the road so he doesn't think having anything in there at this point, mentioning it, is really going to affect a build or no-build decision with it, that is something the thinks as a group we should probably focus on for our next transportation plan, to kind of see how this plays out, so with that in mind he will be voting yes to leaving it in the plan.

Mason said that he appreciates all the comments and he would just like to offer that from his perspective, he is not necessarily taking a position on the local intercity bridge concept itself, but he will be supporting the MTP as developed, and given the process followed, public engagement that was conducted, public input that was received, and all that being documented within the MTP as a whole, he thinks the process itself stands on its own and he will be recommending approval of it.

Sperry added that it does seem unfortunate that this is happening at the ninth hour, with all the work and the public participation opportunities that you have had, and all the different components, that it wasn't until now to be voiced, at least that was the first she heard of it, she doesn't know if it came up during any other opportunities, but she did go back and looked through their files and found a letter from July 29, 2013, that was addressed to Earl Haugen from the office, that stepped through the consequences of the last time of not making the MTP deadline; it did freeze the T.I.P., since you didn't have an MTP no additional projects could be changed or modified so if the DOT needed the scope changed on a project or the cost changed it couldn't be done because you didn't have an MTP in place. Halford asked how long the T.I.P. was frozen. Sperry responded that she didn't have that information, she would have to look to see when the schedule was met. She added that it also required Earl to have a schedule within two weeks of receiving the letter on how to get back on track and to have the consultant working on the MTP to give a hard deadline of when everything would be ready. She said that she should

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

have read the end of the letter because it did state that the MTP needed to update by January 31<sup>st</sup>, so it gave them a couple of months, but in that timeline the TIP was frozen. Halford asked if she could highlight; to remind and/or get others up to speed, on what freezing a T.I.P. would entail and what kind of projects are in there. Zacher responded that basically it is everything inside your Metropolitan Planning Area that receives federal funds, so it would include road projects, bus projects, anything that has federal funds associated with them.

Sperry commented that she didn't have a chance to talk to Renae Tunison, with FTA, this morning, she was busy, and she had a bunch of meetings, so she didn't have a chance to touch base, so she may have more information from the FTA side, but what Wayne covered pretty much covers the federal highway side as well.

Kuharenko said that he just wanted to say thank you to Mark Schill and Jason Carbee for putting in all the work you have into this study; he knows it was kind of a last minute curve ball for you guys, and everybody else here at the Technical Advisory Committee, so he just wanted to give thanks for all the work you have done, and Stephanie and her team as well.

Brooks commented that he thinks he knows how this vote is going to go, he completely understands, everybody has their own vote, and the worst thing that could come out of this is the freezing of dollars, so he understands that as well, and they will make sure they are communicating that as we move along.

Bergman asked if the federal funding you are talking about is "All" federal funding. Halford responded that it is so the purchase of buses next year would be in jeopardy. Bergman said that that is what he was thinking.

Sanders stated that he is a bit late to the ballgame, so can you tell me what the motion and the second were, so he has an idea of what he is voting on. Halford responded that the motion and second is to approve the plan as is, and that is to keep the intercity bridge language as is. She asked if he would like her to go over the actions of the other committees/commissions. Sanders responded that that would be fine.

Halford reiterated that the East Grand Forks Planning and Zoning Commission approved the plan as is; the Grand Forks Planning and Zoning Commission approved the plan as is; the Grand Forks City Council requested a comparison summary of 2040 and the 2050 plan to each other, and they did give preliminary approval to strike out all mention of the intercity bridge; the East Grand Forks City Council will be voting on December 19<sup>th</sup>, the Grand Forks City Council will be giving their final vote on December 18<sup>th</sup>, and the MPO Executive Policy Board will be voting on December 20<sup>th</sup>. She added that all motions and votes will be presented to the MPO Executive Policy Board and what they decide will be what is put forward. Sanders said, then, that the big thing with this motion and second is to leave the language in as is, leaving the intercity bridge in the plan, correct. Halford responded that that is correct.

Shepard commented that she was having audio issues earlier so she couldn't pipe in earlier, but she just wanted to sort of echo what Jon and MnDOT District 2 mentioned, and obviously she

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

doesn't have a vote, but she just wanted to reiterate that MnDOT kind of agrees that the MPO followed that process that was agreed upon, didn't deviate from it at all, and she thinks with all that being said the document followed the process and that is a good thing, and if she were voting she would vote to keep the plan as is.

Halford said that MnDOT had a management meeting today, and she was wondering if it was discussed as to whether or not they would need an updated presentation on this if any changes were made to the intercity bridge language. Shepard responded that Jon could correct her if she is wrong, but she doesn't believe they would need an updated presentation. Mason said that that is correct. He added that if it were to impact the State Transportation System directly then they might, but with the intercity bridge being looked at as a local roadway system, they don't feel it would be necessary.

Halford asked Wayne if NDDOT would need an updated presentation. Zacher responded that he touched base a little bit and it didn't sound like they would need an updated presentation, and like they talked yesterday, during the management presentation they didn't spend a lot of time on it, they pointed it out and that type of thing, so we will have to cross that bridge; the bigger question is going to be, or would become what happens now type of thing, so that may require a management presentation in itself, or at least a management meeting in itself as to why it is changing, or maybe not necessarily if it isn't changing why isn't it done type of a thing, if it gets to that point.

***Voting Aye: Emery, Palo, West, Ford, Sanders, Ellis, Bergman, Mason, Riesinger, and Zacher.***

***Voting Nay: Brooks and Kuharenko.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Peterson, Bail, Schroeder, Johnson, Hunter, Magnuson, and Christianson.***

**MATTER OF FINAL APPROVAL OF THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN SUMMARY**

Kouba reported that included in the packet is a resolution that basically summarizes all the documents that are in our Metropolitan Transportation Plan. She said that because we have in the past broken everything out into three documents, this is basically a summary, and we are asking for a recommendation of approval of this summary to our MPO Executive Policy Board.

Kuharenko said that this is a summary that brings everything together between all the documents and then we also have this resolution on the back side to move forward as well, correct. Kouba responded that that is correct. She added that this particular document helps by listing out just the fiscally constrained projects that we are looking at so all of them are all together, short-, mid- and long-term ranges.

Zacher said that this also includes the Street and Highway Plan, the public and management presentations were done as part of the Street and Highway Plan because this is truly just an executive summary of sorts, but this is the key factor type of thing that, the MTP is what needs to



**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

be done. He said that the Street and Highway component is a very big part of that but the MTP is also what needs to be done, and while he understands they are separate studies, but they are being voted on at the same time, so he is assuming it would be a similar situation, but just to be clear that is the MTP that needs to be done, not the Street and Highway Plan, that needs to be done just because the MTP needs to be done.

Brooks commented that just considering our failed vote and that the last vote went in favor, he can support this document, they made the effort on the last one so he will be quiet and vote for this one.

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN SUMMARY, AS PRESENTED.***

***Voting Aye: Emery, Palo, West, Ford, Sanders, Ellis, Bergman, Mason, Riesinger, Zacher, Brooks, and Kuharenko.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Peterson, Bail, Schroeder, Johnson, Hunter, Magnuson, and Christianson.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO ITS ARCHITECTURE SCOPE OF WORK**

Kouba reported that Sharijad, from Upper Great Plains is online and this is basically updating our scope of work. She stated that previously we brought it to you as a yearlong process, with kind of our over-arching contract with Upper Great Plains, and A.T.A.C. ends in September so to make things cleaner and everything else they are going to be working from January to September to get this document completed and that is basically the only change made to the scope of work.

Kuharenko said that one of the questions he would have in here is in the organization plan and the candidate members we have the MPO, Grand Forks Traffic Engineer, City Area Transit, NDDOT District Engineer, MnDOT District Engineer, is there anybody else we should be considering as part of this. Kouba responded that in the past we also made requests of other groups like Highway Patrols and State Patrols on each side of the river, but kind of that program advisory group, that would be the core group. Halford asked if he had someone in mind. Kuharenko responded that he didn't, it was just an open question to the group because it is always good, whenever these things come up, it is always good to double check rather than to just assume.

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE ITS ARCHITECTURE SCOPE OF WORK, AS PRESENTED.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

***Voting Aye: Emery, Palo, West, Ford, Sanders, Ellis, Bergman, Mason, Riesinger, Zacher, Brooks, and Kuharenko.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Peterson, Bail, Schroeder, Johnson, Hunter, Magnuson, and Christianson.***

**MATTER OF 5310 GRANT APPLICATION**

Kouba reported that Items 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, are all grant applications that are for our 2025-2028 T.I.P. solicitation process. She stated that they received actual solicitations from the NDDOT on all of these items and the City of Grand Forks did submit applications for them. She added that the City of Grand Forks also submitted applications for the Urban Road Program and the Urban Regional Road Program, and they are due in February.

Kouba said that unless you have any specific questions about any of the applications, she will just read each one in and we will let you listen and vote.

***MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE 5310 GRANT APPLICATION, AS PRESENTED.***

***Voting Aye: Emery, Palo, West, Ford, Sanders, Ellis, Bergman, Mason, Riesinger, Zacher, Brooks, and Kuharenko.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Peterson, Bail, Schroeder, Johnson, Hunter, Magnuson, and Christianson.***

**MATTER OF 5339 GRANT APPLICATION**

***MOVED BY KUHARENKO, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE 5339 GRANT APPLICATION, AS PRESENTED.***

***Voting Aye: Emery, Palo, West, Ford, Sanders, Ellis, Bergman, Mason, Riesinger, Zacher, Brooks, and Kuharenko.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Peterson, Bail, Schroeder, Johnson, Hunter, Magnuson, and Christianson.***

**MATTER OF ALL OTHER GRANT APPLICATIONS**

Sanders stated that he would like to treat the remaining grant applications as one item and if anyone has a question or comment on any of them, they can pull it for discussion.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

***MOVED BY SANDERS, SECONDED BY FORD, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE RAILROAD CROSSING GRANT APPLICATION, THE TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVE GRANT APPLICATION, THE HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM GRANT APPLICATION, THE URBAN GRANT APPLICATION, THE URBAN ROAD PROGRAM APPLICATION, AND THE URBAN REGIONAL ROAD APPLICATION, AS PRESENTED.***

***Voting Aye: Emery, Palo, West, Ford, Sanders, Ellis, Bergman, Mason, Riesinger, Zacher, Brooks, and Kuharenko.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Peterson, Bail, Schroeder, Johnson, Hunter, Magnuson, and Christianson.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF PM-1 SAFETY TARGETS**

Kouba reported that this item was tabled at the November Technical Advisory Committee for further review of the tables. She said that she did take into account the changes that were going to be proposed, but these safety targets are ones that we do every year and the recommendations are based on five sets of five year rolling averages and the question of why is there ten years, there aren't ten years in five sets of five year rolling averages was brought up, but there aren't ten years there, but she knows that in that timeframe, in those rolling averages they came up with, staff had originally suggested doing the 2.8 for the fatal, 12.6 for the serious, 2.68 for the non-motorized, and the rates for fatal would be .85 and for the serious 3.8.

Kouba commented that just before it was tabled a motion was made that we change the fatality rate to 1.1 and the number of crashes that had serious injuries to 13, which she did put into the table and that is in the resolution as well.

Kuharenko said then that all of these are coming from the five sets of five-year rolling averages. Kouba responded that that is correct. Kuharenko stated that he is looking at the number of fatalities per 100,000 and that is looking like it is coming from Table D above, is that correct. Kouba responded that that is correct. Kuharenko said that is like the one outlier of the group, correct. Kouba responded that it is, as well as the serious injuries. Kuharenko stated that it looks like it just got rounded up from 12.6 to 13, is that correct. Kouba responded it was correct.

***MOVED BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE PM-1 SAFETY TARGETS, AS PRESENTED.***

***Voting Aye: Emery, Palo, West, Ford, Sanders, Ellis, Bergman, Mason, Riesinger, Zacher, Brooks, and Kuharenko.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Peterson, Bail, Schroeder, Johnson, Hunter, Magnuson, and Christianson.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

**NON-ACTION ITEMS:**

**OTHER BUSINESS**

- a. 2023/2024 Unified work program project update – Halford stated that the last page is our summary of where we are at with our work program. She pointed out that we are hitting a lot of the end of the road for some of these, and some we have already finished up for the year, as well as those that we are kind of getting ready to get started on in January.
- b. 2024 GF-EGF MPO Meeting Dates – Halford reported that we also included in the packet a list of upcoming meetings that we have for the Technical Advisory Committee and the MPO Executive Policy Board for the coming year. She said that we didn't see any conflict with any of the holidays that we have off throughout the year, but we just wanted to give everyone a heads up on the meeting schedule for the year.
- c. Agency Updates – None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY ELLIS, SECONDED BY KUHARENKO, TO ADJOURN THE DECEMBER 13<sup>TH</sup>, 2023 MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:16 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager