

76th Avenue South Corridor Study – SRC #4

Metro COG, Case Plaza
One 2nd Street N, Fargo, ND

Date: March 11, 2020 from 9:00 to 11:30 am

Meeting Attendees:

- Peggy Harter – Stantec Consulting
- Angie Bolstad – Stantec Consulting via Skype
- Wayne Zacher – NDDOT Local Government via skype
- Mike Rutkowski – Stantec Consulting via Skype
- Cindy Gray – Metro COG
- Aaron Nelson – City of Fargo Planning
- Brian Reinarts – Confluence
- Barrett Voigt – City of Horace Community Development
- Grace Puppe – Cass County Planning
- Kyle Litchy – Cass County Highway Department
- Tom Soucy – Cass County Highway Department
- Brenda Derrig – City of Fargo Engineering
- Jeremy Gorden – City of Fargo Engineering
- Michael Maddox – Metro COG
- Jason Benson – Cass County
- Kristen Sperry – FHWA via Skype

Meeting Discussion Items:

Welcome, Introductions and Project Updates

Peggy Harter asked everyone in the room and those via skype to introduce themselves and their agency. She then reviewed the project schedule noting what has been completed to date. She specified that since the last SRC last meeting, the Stantec team has been working to complete additional

- Travel Demand Modeling (TDM) – Update existing base model for full build and run two alternatives
- Collector-Distributor Research
- Updates to the project visioning

Ms. Harter noted that as part of the TDM and visioning updates we have also been working to keep up with Planning Assumption Changes that have occurred in the area of influence to the 76th Avenue South corridor. Some of the major planning assumption changes include:



- Development & Roadway Network Changes in Horace
- Veterans Blvd Extension from 52nd to 76th
- Sanford Sports Complex
- Interchange at 64th and I-29
- Horace Development is moving at a faster pace

Discussion on Final Study Needs:

Ms. Harter noted that she wanted to remind the SRC of previous discussion regarding the final study needs and then discuss the appropriate level of alternative analysis for the No-Build and Build alternatives for the 76th Avenue South Corridor. In summary, the final study needs to include:

- Future Right of Way for Full Build
- Level of Access Control
- Adjacent collector roadway network
- Needs for motorized and non-motorized vehicles
- Intersection Control Alternatives
- Phased plan to get from today's conditions to Full Buildout

Alternatives Review

Ms. Harter reviewed what the SRC members have already reviewed and agreed upon regarding the two build alternatives per the last SRC meeting:

- Segments of Like Context
- Two Build Alternatives: Alternative 1: Urban Expressway with Free-Flowing Interchange Concept and Alternative 2: Signalized Urban Boulevard with Diverging Diamond Interchange (DDI) Concept
- Proposed Full Build Typical Sections
- Maintain current planning efforts for a future Red River Bridge crossing but do not update the TDM to show a future Red River Bridge crossing. At this time there is no need for it on the Minnesota side of the river. The study will note that the planning for the bridge in terms of preserving ROW will continue but is not anticipated to be needed in the near future.

The following items are new visioning items that have not yet been reviewed by the SRC members:

- Arterial Roadway Street Typology from Metro COG's Parking and Access Requirements Study applied to the 76th Avenue South corridor
- Access Spacing
- Intersection Control Type
- Proposed Collector System Network surrounding 76th Avenue South to support the proposed level of access management for build Alternatives



- Integration of C/D and how it is going to access 76th Avenue South
- Differentiation between the two proposed alternatives

Proposed Street Typology

Ms. Harter reviewed the proposed Street Typology for the various segments of 76th Avenue South for both Build Alternatives.

- Diversion to Sheyenne Street
 - This segment will be designated a Mixed-Use Arterial. This was the proposed designation in the Horace Comp Plan and will have a mix of residential and commercial uses.
- Sheyenne Street to Veterans Blvd
 - This segment will be designated a Commercial Arterial roadway and is primarily driven by current and planned Horace development
- Veterans Boulevard to 25th Street
 - Prior to the meeting, this segment was designated a Regional Arterial for both Alternatives. Discussion at the meeting indicated that this section of 76th Avenue South should vary between the two alternatives. Alternative 1 should be classified as a Regional Arterial and Alternative 2 should be classified as a Commercial Arterial within this segment.
- 25th Street to Red River
 - This section was designated as a Mixed-Use Arterial. Discussion occurred that this designation for Segments 4 and 5 may allow too much future access spacing. Jeremy Gorden noted that the access in these segments is fairly set with development already existing along the corridor. Cindy Gray commented that this corridor has been identified as a Red River bridge location, and it has been considered, in the past, as a possible beltway, and regardless of what you call it, with the connection over the Diversion and future connection over the Red River, this corridor will be one of the most continuous east/west corridors in the metro area. The Urban Expressway designation was discussed, but the City of Fargo Planning Department had issues with calling this an expressway. Discussion took place about this, and the group agreed that free flow characteristics were the goal more so than higher speeds. Regional Arterial would better reflect the continuity than Mixed-Use Arterial, but the group understood the overriding desire for the corridor to be multi-modal. Given the existing development along this segment of the 76th Avenue South corridor is residential and schools, it was decided that the Mixed-Use Arterial designation will be utilized.
- Additional Discussion Regarding Street Typology Designations:
 - The idea was also mentioned to avoid using the parking and access study typologies and instead make our own guidelines for 76th Avenue South specifically.
 - It was decided to continue with the typologies in the parking and access study because they give regional planning guidelines, but it should be made clear that they are guidelines. For example, a regional arterial shows a speed limit of 45 – 50 mph but that doesn't mean the



speeds need to be that high but instead should be the limit. SRC members agreed that free-flow is a more desirable characteristic than "high speed".

Alternative 1 - Regional Arterial with Free-Flowing Interchange Concept

The following discussion occurred regarding Alternative 1:

- Key Alternative 1 Elements:
 - **UPDATE:** After the SRC Meeting – Discussions with Metro COG indicated that we should not be calling this alternative an “Urban Expressway” and will instead denote Alternative 1 as a Regional Arterial. The Regional Arterial designation applies to this corridor between Veterans Boulevard and 25th Street where the Full Build traffic volume projections are the greatest.
 - Preference to Move E-W Traffic in a free-flow type manner, emphasizing flow more so than speed/
 - High Level of Access Control
 - Alternative Intersection Control – Not Signalized
 - Pair with a Free-Flowing Interchange
 - Bike and Ped facilities would require grade separated crossings at 76th Avenue South with multi-use trails adjacent to the roadway. This would include a focus on pedestrian continuity and experience internal to the blocks.
- SRC Discussion Regarding Alternative 1:
 - Dashed lines are not the actual proposed roadway network. It is the density of a roadway network needed based on development previously laid out by the committee.
 - White circles are alternative intersection controls and can be multiple treatments. For example, R-CUT, Michigan Lefts, Roundabouts, etc.
 - Ms. Harter noted that at the beginning of the project when they sat down with developers, they said their ideal roadway would be right of way and setbacks wider than 32nd Avenue South from 25th Street to the I-29 but not as wide as 52nd Avenue South at this same section.
 - Important to remember that the existing typical sections show a 4-lane divided section with the opportunity to add 6-lanes without impacting bicycle/pedestrian facilities. The 2045 average daily traffic (ADT) vehicle projections do not reach the level of needing a 6-lane section. However, the Full Build TDM shows a need much greater than a 4-lane section near the future 76th Avenue South & I-29 interchange. Due to the uncertainty in the Full Build model, we are identifying a future 4-lane divided roadway with the ability to expand to 6-lanes if needed.
 - Concern was discussed regarding having a fully developed roadway and maintaining a speed limit of over 40 mph. Cindy noted that the idea of this alternative isn't to have a high-speed roadway, but to keep vehicle traffic moving. Once again, we can have lower speeds than shown in the street typologies and utilize our intersection control and access management to keep traffic moving through the corridor.



- Michael Maddox noted that the differences in the alternatives may be how development occurs around them. Alternative 1 would look more like the development recommendations where Alternative 2 may look similar to how development has currently been occurring around other arterial corridors within our area.
- The group did not decide on one intersection treatment type for the corridor. Stantec will develop multiple intersection treatment types along this corridor to show the right of way impacts and for people to visualize how they would look and operate. Options to consider include roundabouts, Michigan left turns and R-Cuts at the major intersections, Right-in/Right-out, and ¾ Access. Jeremy Gorden suggested consideration of a roundabout at 76th Avenue South and Veterans Boulevard. It was also suggested that a hybrid mixture of signalization at the major north/south intersections may be needed with the alternative intersection controls at lower vehicle volume north/south intersections.

Alternative 2 - Commercial Arterial with DDI Concept

- **UPDATE:** After the SRC Meeting – Discussions with Metro COG indicated that we should not be calling this alternative a “Signalized Urban Corridor” and will instead denote Alternative 2 as a Commercial Arterial. The Commercial Arterial designation applies to this corridor between Sheyenne Street and 25th Street where the Full Build traffic volume projections are the greatest.
- Key Alternative 2 Elements:
 - Significant movement of E-W traffic
 - High Level of Access Control (slightly less than Alternative 1)
 - Full access intersections would be signalized or roundabouts
 - Pair with a signalized interchange such as a Diverging Diamond Interchange
 - Bike and Ped crossings would occur at signalized/controlled intersections
- SRC Discussion regarding Alternative 2:
 - Jeremy Gorden noted that he is not a fan of DDI's but agreed that it could be included as part of this study for Alternative 2.

SRC Discussion for both Alternatives 1 and 2:

- Cindy Gray noted that Metro COG has the role and responsibility of considering our transportation system from a regional perspective, and for a long time now, 76th Avenue S has been looked at as a route that serves a broader area, as the first opportunity south of 52nd Avenue S for a Red River bridge, and even without a bridge, it will be a very continuous corridor, so we consider it as a regional route. However, they understand that the cities have the authority and responsibility for how development occurs which is why Metro COG is looking for the city's comments now.
- Who is the street going to serve? Mainly vehicles or pedestrians/bicycles as well? If Alternative 1 is chosen, then pedestrian connectivity gets difficult. You will most likely need pedestrian under/over passes. Although complete streets are great, there is a need to have roadways that have a priority (or



emphasis - not an exclusive priority) for vehicles and ensuring that adjacent corridors can focus on the non-vehicular modes. Michael Maddox noted that if a future 6-lane roadway is needed along 76th Avenue South, they are also difficult for pedestrian to cross and aren't very pedestrian friendly either.

- Brenda Derrig noted that the City is looking at extending Drain 53 straight south, rather than curving toward I-29, to make room for additional storm water ponds. This would also reduce impacts to a future interchange at 76th Avenue South & I-29.
- The City of Horace's standpoint is that they do not want to be tied down to constructing all the roundabouts shown on this plan. They are not opposed to the concept but asked for a caveat within the plan indicating that the decision about the intersection treatment can be left open until the time comes to build it. The City is also open to alternative intersection types in lieu of roundabouts and this could be shown as part of Alternative 1.
- Right of way preservation is the most important aspect at this stage in the planning horizon. An RCUT vs a Roundabout will take up varying degrees of ROW. The City of Fargo currently preserves 100 feet of ROW on each side of an arterial roadway (total of 200-feet). The City of Horace is currently preserving a total of 150-feet along 76th Avenue South.
- Mike Rutkowski noted that phasing of this plan is key. In the interim, even for Alternative 1, signalization may be needed and then changed later to an alternative control type. The Cities noted that once a signal is in place, it is difficult to remove.
- Jason Benson noted that Cass County has two projects scheduled for the corridor. 76th Avenue South from where the last project ended along the eastern edge of the future school site up to 45th Street will have a grading project in 2021 and a paving project in 2022.
- Jeremy Gorden noted that where roundabouts are being considered, they should have a 175-foot to 185-foot inside diameter.

Proposed Collector Roadway Network Surrounding 76th Avenue South

Mike Rutkowski noted that the collector street roadway connectivity is the same for both Alternatives 1 and 2 as a high level of internal network connectivity is needed with a highly access managed 76th Avenue South. The SRC reviewed the proposed collector street networks and had the following discussion:

- Additional network connections were identified on the maps for both Alternatives.
- The City of Fargo noted that it will be expensive and difficult to have ½ mile grade separations from I-29 as shown on the maps. Metro COG has advised that we updated the roadway collector system to show a shaded area where the bridge symbols are that denote ROW preservation.

Additional Alternative Comments Received After SRC #4

After SRC #4 was completed, the City of Fargo submitted additional comments on the two alternatives being considered. Metro COG staff responded to the comments. The City of Fargo comments and Metro COG's response to the comments are included below:



City of Fargo Comment #1: City of Fargo staff does not see the need for 76th Avenue S to be an expressway/regional arterial/bypass. Staff is not comfortable that such a concept has been sufficiently explored and accepted at the regional level, and this corridor study is probably not the place for that type of regional decision to be made.

Metro COG Response #1: Metro COG agrees that not going for an expressway or bypass here – where we're departing from the usual, is to look at the potential for more of a free-flow corridor, at normal urban arterial speeds such as 40-45 mph. We threw around a lot of different terminology at the last SRC meeting, but I think in the end, we were all of the same understanding about what we're talking about, regardless of what we call it. The characteristics of the roadway that have been put forward for Alternative 1 are indicative of speeds on current arterial roadways in our region i.e. 45 mph. The difference between the alternatives is how traffic and traffic operations are being handled. The TDM runs for this project indicate that future "full build" volumes are between 40 and 50 thousand cars a day. We know that time frame is beyond our 2045-2050 planning horizon. Alternative 1 is trying to deal with these volumes more efficiently and with less infrastructure by creating a more "free flow" condition. Alternative 2 is more of a hybrid alternative as I will get into on the last bullet point.

The key is going to be how development manifests along the corridor. Stantec is scoped to analyze the difference between how development patterns in each of the alternatives. I have directed Stantec to start that process by creating a rough sketch example of the difference in development pattern in each alternative. The overriding philosophy of Alternative 1 is that commercial development would face away from the roadway towards the interior of the development. Residential development would be sheltered by a wide "park-style" buffer, and more intense residential land uses would be used as a buffer. The development style in Alternative 2 would be different in that the roadway would draw in at commercial nodes, with development facing the roadway. We have not talked about development setbacks or anything of that nature yet. We will work very closely with our project partners to show development patterns that they approve of and can implement.

City of Fargo Comment #2: Following up on conversation at the SRC meeting, while staff agrees with the need for the corridor to handle projected traffic volumes through methods such as medians and access control, staff does not desire for this to be accommodated through excessive traffic speed. In addition to accommodating projected traffic volumes, the City desires for 76th Avenue South to complement the future development and neighborhoods within this area. A proper balance must be maintained between the need to accommodate vehicle flows and the needs of future adjacent residents and businesses. Things like safety and negative impacts to adjacent development need to be factored into the discussion. For example, the Economic Development Policy from the recently adopted 2045 MTP, *Metro Grow*, states: "Transportation is tied to economic development in a variety of ways. Higher volumes and speeds do not consistently equate to



higher levels of investment. Lower speeds and higher levels of walkability equate to greater investment, higher levels of vitality, and improved neighborhood quality of life in many situations.”

Metro COG Response #2: The speeds that have been identified for this facility match those already utilized on arterial roadways the City of Fargo has and is currently developing. Some of the benefits of a more “free flow” condition is that there is less noise generated from starting and stopping. Vehicle acceleration can be loud. Also, drivers have greater satisfaction because they can keep moving without interruption, even if they’re not going faster than usual. One of the things that Alternative 1 is trying to accomplish is maintaining an average speed throughout the corridor closer to the posted speed limit. Metro COG and Stantec are proposing corridor treatments that would protect adjacent residential land uses, such as parkway buffers where berms, walls, plantings, fencing, or a combination of those can be used to shelter these areas. Currently, roadways like 52nd Ave S and 45th Street have little protection from traffic.

Metro GROW puts forward a philosophy of balancing mobility and livability. We totally agree that a balance must be struck, however, we also recognize that corridors like 76th Ave S will likely have a higher functionality with traffic demands that must be accommodated. The study will take into account safety concerns for all modes of transportation. Traffic is naturally going to demand to use this corridor and it comes down to what we prioritize how that traffic impact is mitigated. I assure you that the 76th Ave S Corridor Study will take these things into consideration.

City of Fargo Comment #3: There needs to be a lot more discussion and detail regarding options for bike and ped connectivity east/west at intersections and north/south crossings. We may need to consider unique alternatives (such as mid-block crossings in locations without signalized intersections and where grade-separated crossings are infeasible.)

Metro COG Response #3: If you look to other areas of town outside of the urban core, there are very few examples of arterial roadways that are inviting to bicycles and pedestrians. Arterials such as 13th Ave S, 32nd Ave S, 52nd Ave S, 45th Street, 42nd Street, 25th Street, etc. have been developed in a way that are not inviting to other modes of transportation. We would all like to do better on 76th Avenue S, even if it does need to have a priority of handling arterial-level volumes of traffic. Stantec is currently working on the bike/ped element of the study. This coincides with the development of intersection types. Stantec will be drafting graphical examples of different types of intersection treatments that could be employed and will specifically indicate how bicycles and/or pedestrians are accommodated.

City of Fargo Comment #4: There was some discussion about a hybrid corridor alternative at SRC meeting #4. We would be interested in learning more about that 3rd alternative when available. Based on past experience, a hybrid alternative would probably need to have signalized lights at the arterial intersections.



Metro COG Response #4: There might be some confusion on the scope elements that were talked about at the last SRC meeting. Stantec is scoped to provide two concept visions for the corridor. The first being Alternative 1: “free flow”, and the second being Alternative 2: which is more of a hybrid option with signals at the north/south arterials. There were three TDM scenarios that were amended into the contract. We have already run two scenarios, and Stantec is looking for the SRC to develop a third. Stantec is coming up with some ideas. One idea that Metro COG staff had was to run a “connectivity” scenario where connections across the drains and at mid-mile points along the interstates would be made. This third option is still being developed, and we will ask the SRC to decide on a model run scenario once we can develop some options for them group to react to. I think we are really on the same page with what needs to be done after the last SRC meeting, and I’ll work with Peggy to make sure we’re going in that direction. Thanks for discussing it as a group within your department and following up with these comments. Let me know if you think I’m misinterpreting your input.

Proposed Alternative Analysis:

Peggy Harter reviewed the proposed alternative analysis for the build and no-build alternatives. She noted that given the lack of existing development and extremely low traffic volumes, it will not be accurate enough to conduct detailed intersection analysis. The follow analysis items are being proposed:

- Corridor V/C Ratio for motor vehicles for 2045 and Full Build TDM projected ADT volumes
- Travel time comparison for east-west movements for peak periods
- Right of Way Impacts
- Cost
- Public Feedback
- Accommodations for non-motorized traffic
- Access for adjacent development

The SRC members discussed the following regarding analysis for the no-build and build alternatives:

- Peggy Harter noted that we will apply peak hour factors that are present today to apply to the TDM volume results to determine our peak hour travel times. Jeremy Gorden is going to look for this data to provide to Stantec.
- Aaron Nelson asked to add safety as an analysis criterion. Peggy Harter noted that there is no current crash data, but we can analyze safety for the different intersection types for both vehicles and pedestrians.
- Aaron Nelson also asked if the north/south travel times can be analyzed for the major section mile line intersections. Stantec will look at available information to determine if sufficient data is available to analyze the north/south travel times.



Full Build Travel Demand Model Update

Peggy Harter reviewed maps and a memorandum that were distributed for the TDM updates and analysis that were completed.

Updated Full Build TDM

- The Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZ) stayed the same in the Updated Full Build TDM as they were in the SWMTP 2040+ TDM.
- Updated Full Build TDM changes from the SWMTP 2040+ TDM:
 - 64th Ave S was coded as 3-lanes b/w 25th and Sheyenne St.
 - 76th Ave S was coded as 4-lanes b/w 25th and 45th St.
 - Veterans Boulevard was extended south to connect 52nd to 88th Avenue South as 3-lanes
 - Changed intersection control at CR 17/76th Avenue South to a roundabout
 - SE Data adjusted per meetings with Metro COG & Cities
 - Updated school enrollment projections and new planned schools

Full Build TDM Alternatives 1 & 2 – Select Link Analysis

- Full Build TDM Alternative 1: Interchange at 64th Avenue South
- Full Build TDM Alternative 2: Grade separation at 64th Avenue South with an I-29 Collector-Distributor System between 52nd Avenue South and 76th Avenue South – picking up traffic at 64th Avenue South
- A third alternative is TBD

Ms. Harter presented a summary of changes between the 2045 MTP TDM, Full Build Updated TDM, Full Build Alternative 1 TDM and Full Build Alternative 2 TDM vehicle volume changes along 76th Avenue South as shown in the following table:



SRC Meeting #4 – Meeting Summary

76TH
AVE

76th Avenue South Segment	2045 Metro Grow TDM	Updated Full Build TDM	Full Build TDM Alternative 1*	Full Build TDM Alternative 2*
81 st St to CR 17	NA	3,500	4,000 (+14%)	3,800 (+9%)
Just east of CR 17	4,700	6,600	6,500 (-2%)	6,550 (-1%)
Just west of Veterans Blvd	NA	31,000	29,100 (-6%)	30,000 (-3%)
Veterans Blvd to 45th St	5,100	27,000	25,200 (-7%)	25,700 (-5%)
45th St to 38th St	NA	48,000	45,500 (-5%)	47,000 (-2%)
38th St to Inter. West Ramps	7,400	46,000	41,400 (-10%)	42,100 (-8%)
Inter. West Ramps to East Ramps	NA	28,000	24,400 (-13%)	25,600 (-9%)
I-29 & 76 th Ave S Inter. SW Ramp	NA	1,200	930 (-23%)	940 (-22%)
I-29 & 76 th Ave S Inter. SE Ramp	NA	1,200	700 (-42%)	700 (-42%)
I-29 & 76 th Ave S Inter. NW Ramp	NA	12,000	12,700 (+6%)	12,500 (+4%)
I-29 & 76 th Ave S Inter. NE Ramp	NA	14,000	15,100 (+8%)	14,300 (+2%)
Inter. East Ramps to 36 th St	NA	19,000	16,900 (-11%)	18,400 (-3%)
36 th St to 25 th St	4,800	10,000	8,900 (-11%)	10,400 (+4%)
25 th St to Univ Drive	5,000	4,900	4,600 (-6%)	4,700 (-4%)

It was discussed that the changes between the Full Build TDMs do not affect the Full Build scenario roadway section needs. However, the project daily traffic volumes in the 2045 Metro Grow TDM show very low volume projections along 76th Avenue South. This verifies the need to preserve right of way for full build and identify a phasing plan as the growth in our study area occurs. The SRC members were to review the TDM Technical Memo and provide comments.



76th Avenue South Corridor Study

METROCOG
FARGO-WOODHEAD METROPOLITAN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Collector-Distributor (C-D) System Research

Ms. Harter reviewed the C-D System Technical Memorandum that was distributed to the SRC members. She noted the current considerations for a C-D system along I-29 between 52nd and 76th Avenue South that would collect and distribute traffic between 64th Avenue South and I-29. The C-D roadway that the City of Fargo has preliminary designed is for the purposes of designing a 64th Avenue South grade separation that would allow to incorporate this in the future. This type of system would both remove the weave/merge movements off the I-29 Mainline and allow the possibility to maintain current speed limits on the I-29 mainline. Discussion on this C-D system included the following:

- Jeremy Gordon noted that maintaining the speed limit is not important in his view.
- This ultimate decision maker on a C-D system will be up to the NDDOT.

Ms. Harter then reviewed three other types of C-D systems:

- Scenario 1: C-D Roadway Part of the Interstate Serves Major Crossroads & Adjacent Interchange
- Scenario 2: C-D Roadway Part of the Interstate Serves Free Flowing Interchange
- Scenario 3: C-D Roadway Part of the Local Network Serves Interstate, Crossroads and Local Roadway Network

The SRC members were planning to review the C-D Systems Research Memo and provide comments.

Next Steps:

- Review Updated Schedule – Schedule addendum needed at April TTC & PB meeting
- Finalize Visioning and Preliminary Alternative Concepts
- UPDATE: Identify a 3rd Travel Demand Alternative to run for the Full Build. Send out a poll for SRC members to vote as this was not discussed during the SRC meeting.
- Build Alternative Layouts, Cost Estimates and Analysis
- Build Alternatives Modeling (Land Elements – Visualization of Corridor Alternatives)
- Develop Corridor Project Phasing
- Alternatives Descriptions and Analysis Matrix
- Develop Plan for Final Newsletter, Stakeholder Meeting & Public Input Meeting
- SRC #5 – May 2020 to review the above tasks



Action Items:

- Jeremy Gordon to provide peak hour factors
- All members of SRC committee review the alternative layouts and provide any outstanding comments in one week.
- SRC member to review TDM and C-D Technical Memos and provide comments.
- Stantec to develop project schedule addendum for April TTC & PB meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 am.

The foregoing is considered to be a true and accurate record of all items discussed. If any discrepancies or inconsistencies are noted, please contact the writer immediately.

Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.



Peggy Harter PE
Senior Associate
Phone: (701) 566-6020
Peggy.Harter@stantec.com

Attachments: Meeting Sign in Sheet



76th Avenue South Corridor Study – SRC #4

Metro COG Conference Room, Case Plaza – One 2nd Street N, Fargo, ND

Date: March 11, 2020 at 9:00 a.m.

NAME	ORGANIZATION	EMAIL ADDRESS
Peggy Harter	Stantec	peggy-harter@stantec.com
Wayne Zacher via skype	NDDOT-Local Gov't	
Mike Rutkowski via skype	Stantec	
Angie Bolstad via skype	Stantec	
Cindy Gray	Metro COG	cgray@metroco.org
Aaron Nelson	Fargo Planning	anelson@FargoND.gov
Brian Reinarts	Confluence	breinarts@thinkconfluence.com
Barrett Voigt	Horace Comm. Dev	bvoigt@cityofhorace.com
Graa Puppe	Cass County Planning	gpuppe@casscountynel.gov
Kyle Litchy	Cass County Hwy Dept.	litchyk@casscountynel.gov
Tom Soucy	Cass County Hwy Dept	soucyt@casscountynel.gov
Brenda Derrig	City of Fargo	bderrig@FargoND.gov
Jeremy Gordon	City of Fargo Eng	jgorden@fargoND.gov
Michael Maddox	Metro COG	maddox@metroco.org
Jason Benson	Cass Co.	bensonj@casscountynel.gov
Kristen Sperry - via skype	FHWA	

