

**Proctor Transportation Plan**  
**STEERING COMMITTEE ENGAGEMENT MEETING #2**  
**August 6, 2020, 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM**  
**Virtual Meeting**

---

**AGENDA**

**1. Introductions, Recap of Work to Date (20 minutes)**

- a. Summary of project purpose, Steering Committee Role, Completed Work
  - i. The purpose of this plan is to bring all the studies from the last 10 years together to provide a good background and plan for future projects.*
  - ii. Steering committee will help set the vision, goals, and future projects*
  - iii. Work completed to date: Review of Plans, Existing Conditions, now moving into visioning and project/program/policy prioritization*
- b. SC #1 meeting outcomes, visual comments summary
  - i. Add the hockey complex onto the south proctor map*
  - ii. "Are there 9 elements to what makes a good small town?" We should do something similar in our plan.*
- c. What we heard for our "What makes a good Small Town?" question.
  - i. Some themes included attractive downtown, easily accessible, a mix of shopping and dining, family friendly amenities, multimodal and pedestrian infrastructure, and transportation safety.

**2. Vision, Goals and Performance Measures (30 minutes)**

- a. Purpose of drafting a vision, goals and performance measures
- b. Initial Vision, Goals and Performance Measures
  - i. How do you feel about the vision statements?
    - 1. The vision should be short, definable, not too cumbersome, and more specific to Proctor. The two statements shared could be about anywhere.*

2. *The vision statement doesn't necessarily need to be specific to Proctor, it's more what we do with it. Goals are the things that need to be Proctor-specific, we should focus our energy on the goals instead.*
- c. Comments – What needs to change? What needs to be removed or what did we miss that needs to be added?
- i. *Combine goals 2 & 4 – David*
  - ii. *Goal 3 hits home with the portion about businesses, we want to attract people to the city.*
  - iii. *The goals aren't ranked in any certain order*
  - iv. *Goal 5 – might be a perception that the lines of communication haven't been perfect? – David*
    1. *Some of the best projects worked on have been in partnership with others*
  - v. *Goal 1 & 5 could be combined*
  - vi. *Goals 5 & 8 & 9 could all be combined.*
  - vii. *There a lot of goals, we should narrow them down to around 5 to make them more digestible*
  - viii. *Everyone agrees goal 6 is important*
  - ix. *Goal 7 is good because there are a lot of funding sources that like to see safety aspects, so this goal is good for the overall project*
  - x. *Goal 9*
    1. *What can we afford to build and what will give us ROI (example, adding a trail increases property values, get people to locate near them, etc)*
    2. *User costs are often overlooked*
    3. *Right fix at the right time, align projects/efforts to be financially responsible*
  - xi. *Plan timeframe: Focus on the next 10 years, but to transform and build out this vision it'll take 20-25 years.*
    1. *It's important to define the timeframe. There are a lot of plans and ideas but not all have energy behind all of them. This is a good*

*opportunity to define what we are going to do in the next 10 years and update it down the line. We should decide we want to focus on and cut the fat.*

*2. These are high-level on-going goals; objectives are where we can put words into action.*

*xii. Project team will edit and reorganize goals, then get measures for each goal. This will be shared electronically with the steering committee.*

*xiii. Prioritize actions*

### **3. Initial Projects & Programs (30 Minutes)**

a. Origins of this list – SC comments/map markups, previous plans, Project Team observations

b. What needs to change, what needs to be removed or added?

*i. Capital planning process?*

*1. Planning process where we prioritize based on need, started process a year ago, initial draft response earlier this week but still needs to be approved, 2<sup>nd</sup> street & hwy 2 working with the state, school, etc and timeline has already started with MNdot*

*ii. Grade separated crossing of CN facilities would be very expensive, and David doesn't think they scored well. SC members wondered where this idea had come from.*

*iii. The downtown circulation study looks at downtown Proctor and how people can easily get to, around and through downtown as well as what other features (sidewalks, beautification, streetscaping, etc), are planning priorities*

*1. Hwy 2 corridor is a priority issue*

*iv. Add this to the city center category: community center to Kirkus St (the sports center) is the "sports corridor" because of all the sports facilities, it's a jewel and a place where ppl could go but it's not on the list, it needs more pedestrian facilities and parking areas*

*1. Restriping and chip sealing on Kirkus St is delayed a year, per comments from the City of Proctor and St. Louis County*

*v. Low priority or should be cut:*

1. *Munger trail spur segments, it'd be nice to have a connection between Proctor and the Munger Trail but there's no energy behind it*
  2. *New exit at I-35/Ugstad – no energy behind it and MnDOT isn't willing to do it unless businesses come to the area and vice versa. It is an expensive investment.*
- vi. *Increased connectivity to Kirkus St – What is this? Snowmobile trail along powerline corridor to Kirkus as well as an extension over to Hwy 2. Line showing extension to Hwy 2 was shown in Steering Committee #1 map markup.*
1. *David – Kirkus might be more land use than transportation issue, in terms of policy priority for the City.*
- vii. *How do we connect the new hockey center with downtown as well as pedestrian paths?*
- viii. *An interchange at Boundary Ave and Ugstad Rd may be possible based on MnDOT spacing guidelines, but it's not a guarantee given funding*
1. *An I-35 corridor study is planned from Midway interchange to east, but hasn't received funding. We should keep the Ugstad interchange in the plan, but it's better to vet it as part of the I-35 corridor study.*
- ix. *Proctor to Hermantown Trail is the same thing as the Munger Trail Spur.*
1. *More of a push from Hermantown, not Proctor because there are more barriers for the Proctor portion (the interstate, the rail line).*
- x. *Safety driven improvements not interventions*
- xi. *Nothing ADA for sidewalk improvements*
1. *Should be common practice – does Proctor have an ADA transition plan? Might not be required given its size.*
  2. *Move “regular sidewalk maintenance and improvement program” from city center to city wide*
  3. *City of Hibbing has had an ADA plan for the past 10 years and when they come in contact with a county road the county participates. We should reframe that sidewalk improvement program to include ADA. Worth considering a similar type of small amount annual program for sidewalks and ADA ramps.*

**4. Options Evaluation/Project Prioritization: (20 minutes)**

- a. Initial options evaluation, based on the preliminary projects/programs list
- b. Discussion
  - i. Ratings 0-1-2 (poor/fair/good)? Are we rating properly?
  - ii. Choice of PMs can greatly influence prioritization

**5. Next Steps (20 minutes)**

- a. Review & revise vision/goals/performance measures, programs and projects, matrix evaluation and prioritization – we will share this with you and invite you to change it
- b. Confirm locations where we will apply some more focused design tools
- c. Demonstration project update; rollout in September
  - i. Demonstration project is a short term, temporary installation to pilot more permanent solutions. They are quick build and low cost.*
    - 1. Residents will be informed through onsite signage and online communication*