METROCOG Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments

Case Plaza Suite 232 | One 2nd Street North
Fargo, North Dakota 58102-4807
p: 701.532.5100 | f: 701.232.5043
e: metrocog@fmmetrocog.org
www.fmmetrocog.org

Metropolitan Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee
Wednesday, November 4, 2026 – 3:00 p.m.
Hybrid Meeting – Virtual & In-person
In-person: Metro COG Conference Room
Virtual: link provided below
AGENDA

1.	Welcome and introductions	
2.	Approve minutes from July 15th, 2026 meeting - **Attachment**	Action Item
3.	Public input opportunity	Public Input
4.	Recommended Bike/Ped Committee citizen rep - **Attachment**	Action Item
5.	Transportation Alternatives (TA) solicitation – **Attachment**	Information Item
6.	Shared use path signage at street crossings – **Attachment**	Discussion Item
7.	Discussion about east-west corridors for biking	Discussion Item
8.	Agency updates	Information Item
9.	Other business	

Citizens can provide comments on an agenda item either in writing, in-person, or virtually. If citizens wish to provide written comments, please email comments to farnsworth@fmmetrocog.org. To ensure your comments are received prior to the meeting, please submit them by 12:00 p.m. on the day of the meeting and reference which agenda item your comments address.

Those unable to attend in-person can attend via Zoom at:

https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87510209733?pwd=at5fq7jpk2ApEaXAbgptrjFYL0bO7y.1
Meeting ID: 875 1020 9733 (if required) Passcode: 434428 (if required)

NOTE: Full Agenda packets can be found on the Metro COG Web Site at http://www.fmmetrocog.org – Committees

Metro COG is committed to ensuring all individuals, regardless of race, color, sex, age, national origin, disability/handicap, and/or income status have access to Metro COG's programs and services. Meeting facilities will be accessible to mobility impaired individuals. Metro COG will accommodate all requests for translation services for meeting proceedings, and related materials. Please contact Angela Brumbaugh at 701-532-5100 at least five days in advance of the meeting if any special accommodations are required for any member of the public to be able to participate in the meeting.

133rd Metropolitan Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee Meeting
July 15th, 2026 – 3:00pm
Hybrid Meeting – Virtual / In-person (Metro COG Conference Room)

Members Present
Dan Farnsworth, Chair, Metro COG
Robert Gunderson, Fargo Park District
Maegin Elshaug, Fargo Planning
Terry Steen, Citizen Representative
Jason Pike, Citizen Representative
Cole Hansen, Cass County Planning
Matt Jacobson, Clay County Planning
Derek Boman, Moorhead Parks
Amy Zundel, West Fargo Parks
Nathaniel Mchaffie, City of Horace
Patrick Hollister, PartnerSHIP 4 Health
Cheryl Stetz, Fargo Cass Public Health
Christine Holland, River Keepers

Others Present:
Jason Benson, FM Diversion
Ben Griffith, Metro COG
Aiden Jung, Metro COG
Linghao Zhang, Metro COG
Jack Butler, West Central Initiative
Dan Bergerson, HDR
Barb Witteman, Citizen

1. **Welcome and Introductions**

   The meeting began at 3:02 pm. Both virtual and in-person attendees introduced themselves.

2. **Minutes from April 1st, 2026 meeting**

   There were a few corrections pointed out in the minutes. A motion to approve the April 1st minutes with the corrections was made by C. Hansen and seconded by T. Steen. The minutes passed unanimously.

3. **Public input opportunity**

   A public input opportunity was given to any members of the public wishing to make comments.

Barb Witteman, a local citizen, was in attendance and provided the following comments:

- There are a lack of porta potties along the trails in the FM area. Particularly in the area of Lions Conservancy Park in Fargo. The lack of porta potties makes it difficult to use the restroom when on bike rides, especially for females.
- There is a large crack/joint on the trail located on the east side of University Dr over Rose Creek in Fargo. Some members on the Committee also acknowledged the presence of this crack/joint. M. Elshaug said she'd make note to bring this up to Fargo Engineering. D. Farnsworth would also follow up.

Jason Pike also brought up a public comment:

- There is excessive gravel/debris on the shoulder of CR 17 in Horace. J. Pike was wondering if the shoulders get swept and whose responsibility that would be. C. Hanson replied that with construction nearby causing a lot of that gravel, it should be the contractor(s) who should clear the gravel/debris. C. Hanson will follow-up with this.

4. Update on FM Diversion trail

Jason Benson, Director of the FM Diversion provided a presentation on the planned trails along the FM Diversion.

Gravel maintenance paths will double as trails for use by bicycle riders, walkers, runners, etc. There will be a gravel path located on each side of the diversion channel. With the Diversion's length roughly 30 miles long, about 60 miles of gravel paths will be available for public use along the Diversion. These paths will be for use by non-motorized vehicles only (except maintenance vehicles) and will restrict vehicles (including ATVs and side-by-sides) by means of gates at the entry points. However the gates will allow for the passage of bicycles and pedestrians. It was asked whether recumbent bikes could fit through the gates. The answer to that is unknown at this time.

The FM Diversion team is also working with the local snowmobile clubs on a snowmobile path on the west side of the Diversion.

Trees are being planted along the Diversion and a meandering path has been worked into the Diversion's earthwork. This path will be mowed grass and can be used for hiking, mountain biking, and other recreation. FM Diversion staff hopes to pave this path over time. The base of the path will likely settle over the next 10 years or so. Therefore it's not feasible to pave this surface too soon.

In addition to these trails, nine trailheads are located along this Diversion alignment. Two larger trailheads will include parking for ~50 vehicles, vaulted toilets, picnic tables, and trash receptacles. Seven smaller trailheads will include parking for ~10 vehicles and contain trash receptacles.

The P3 contractor will be responsible for maintenance of the Diversion, including the trails and trailheads for 30 years after completion of the Diversion. The Diversion is scheduled for completion in 2027. Once the 30 years has expired, another entity will take over maintenance of the trails, however this has not been decided yet. It was discussed that it might be a challenge to figure out who the best entity(s) should be to take over long-term maintenance of the trails since the Diversion abuts several jurisdictions.

5. Review of bike/ped project status table

The bike/ped project status table that Metro COG recently created in collaboration with the Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee was reviewed at the meeting. It was recommended that the Committee review this table each year prior to solicitation of the annual Transportation Alternatives (TA) applications. This is so local jurisdictions can see which bike/ped projects have not been completed in order to help inform their decisions about which project(s) should apply for TA funds.

D. Farnsworth also asked if there are any updates to the table that should be made based on new projects completed. No updates were identified at the meeting.

6. Regional Plan for Active Transportation

Jack Butler, Green Corps member working for West Central Initiative, notified the Committee of the Regional Plan for Active Transportation that WCI is working on with MnDOT. As part of this plan there is a 5-question survey and interactive map where the public can share input and pinpoint locations of walking/biking issues.

J. Butler provided a flyer which included QR codes for the survey and the interactive map. After the meeting he will send the URL links for the survey and map for distribution to the Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee members.

7. Agency updates

D. Farnsworth asked if there are any bicycle/pedestrian-related updates from jurisdictions in the meeting. The updates were the following:

- City of Fargo – Construction of a new shared use path behind VA hospital is underway.
- Fargo Parks – Construction of a gravel trail from Lions Conservancy Park to Iwen Park will be completed this week.
- West Fargo Parks – WF Parks is looking at potential path connections to future developments and the future FM Diversion trails.

- Cass County – There will be disruptions to the shared use path along CR 81 as a results of FM Diversion work. Next year the path along CR 81 will then be torn up for rehab.
- PartnerSHIP 4 Health – P. Hollister showed the results from the funding they were awarded from the MN Pollution Control Agency. Some projects completed with this funding included: a new bike repair station (near Bluestem), crosswalk paintings nears schools in Moorhead,
- Terry Steen – Flatlands Cycling Club has the following events coming up: Mountain bike race next Monday night at Lions Conservancy Park, mountain bike race the following Monday at MB Johnson Park, a 100-mile road ride on Sat Aug 22nd, a cross-country mountain bike race called the Red River Ripper is scheduled for Sat Aug 29th.
- Jason Pike:
    - The All American Trail North between Dike East and Lindenwood Park is now complete and an event will be held there on Thursday from 5pm-8pm. There will also be a community ride on that trail the week of TEDx.
    - FM Trailbuilders has added some additional features at MB Johnson Park.
    - J. Pike was curious about any plans of a path along Sheyenne St between 40th Ave and 52nd Ave. Some members of the Committee noted that there are plans to eventually install a shared use path along that section of Sheyenne St, however that likely won't occur until the roadway is reconstructed to an urban roadway section.
    - J. Pike was curious if there are any local bicycle rules of the road materials or videos that have been created that can be used to help educate the public on rules of the road for bicycle riders or vehicle drivers interacting with cyclists. He felt it could be good to get these to the public, perhaps even as a PSA. D. Farnsworth noted that there have been materials developed locally over the years. In fact, a billboard was developed about 10 years ago encouraging drivers to pass bicycle riders safely. Farnsworth will provide these materials to the Committee following the meeting.

8. Other business

There was no other additional business. The meeting was adjourned around 4:25 pm.

Agenda Item 4

METROCOG Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments

Case Plaza Suite 232 | One 2nd Street North
Fargo, North Dakota 58102-4807
p: 701.232.3242 | f: 701.232.5043
e: metrocog@fmmetrocog.org
www.fmmetrocog.org

To: Bicycle & Pedestrian Committee
From: Dan Farnsworth
Date: November 2, 2026
Re: **Recommended Bike/Ped Committee Citizen Rep**

In early-September Metro COG solicited for a new citizen representative to serve on the Bicycle & Pedestrian Committee. The Committee maintains two citizen representatives, both serving two terms, with the terms staggered by one year.

Metro COG received a total of seven applications, all received by the September 30th deadline. A selection committee comprised of representation from the jurisdictions of West Fargo, Fargo, Moorhead, and Dilworth was used to review the applications.

Upon application reviews and ranking by the selection committee, Robert Anderson was the top ranked applicant. Pending approval by the Committee, Robert Anderson will serve the two-year term beginning January 1, 2027 and ending December 31, 2028.

Requested action: Approval of Robert Anderson as the citizen representative on the Bicycle & Pedestrian Committee with a term effective January 1, 2027 through December 31, 2028.

METROCOG Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments

Case Plaza Suite 232 | One 2nd Street North
Fargo, North Dakota 58102-4807
p: 701.232.3242 | f: 701.232.5043
e: metrocog@fmmetrocog.org
www.fmmetrocog.org

To: Bicycle & Pedestrian Committee
From: Dan Farnsworth
Date: November 2, 2026
Re: **Transportation Alternatives (TA) Solicitation**

The Transportation Alternatives (TA) program is a federally funded grant opportunity for projects that provide enhancements to alternative means of transportation such as bicycle/walking trails, safe routes to school projects, crosswalk improvements, and more.

Solicitations are currently underway for TA applications in both ND and MN. Below are the various solicitations categories and their associated timelines.

ND Transportation Alternatives – Urban

- Location qualifications: Projects located with Metro COG's urbanized area (West Fargo, Fargo, Horace, and Harwood)
- Due date: December 18, 2026
- Submittal instructions: Submit applications to Metro COG – Adam Altenburg (altenburg@fmmetrocog.org) and Linghao Zang (zhang@fmmetrocog.org)

ND Transportation Alternatives – Rural

- Location qualifications: Projects located outside of Metro COG's urbanized area but within Metro COG's planning area (Mapleton, Casselton, Kindred, Oxbow, portions of rural Cass Co).
- Due date: November 20, 2026
- Submittal instructions: Submit applications to Metro COG – Adam Altenburg (altenburg@fmmetrocog.org) and Linghao Zang (zhang@fmmetrocog.org)
- Additional information: www.dot.nd.gov/construction-and-planning/transportation-plans-programs/transportation-alternatives-ta

MN Transportation Alternatives – Urban

- No MN Urban TA projects are being solicited through Metro COG this year.

MN Transportation Alternatives – Rural

- Location qualifications: Projects located outside of Metro COG's urbanized area but within Metro COG's planning area (Glyndon, Hawley, Sabin, Barnesville, portions of rural Clay Co).
- Timeline:
  - Letter of intent due date: October 30, 2026
  - Application due date: January 8, 2027
- Submittal instructions: Submit applications to West Central Initiative – Wayne Hurley (wayne@wcif.org)
- Additional information: https://www.dot.state.mn.us/ta/

Agenda Item 6

METROCOG Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments

Case Plaza Suite 232 | One 2nd Street North
Fargo, North Dakota 58102-4807
p: 701.232.3242 | f: 701.232.5043
e: metrocog@fmmetrocog.org
www.fmmetrocog.org

To: Bicycle & Pedestrian Committee
From: Dan Farnsworth
Date: November 2, 2026
Re: **Shared use path signage at street crossings**

At a meeting on September 8th involving Fargo Parks, it was stated that Fargo Parks had been getting request(s) for stop signs on a shared use path where the path crossed roadways. There was then some questions about when Stop or Yield signs should be installed along shared use paths, and if there is a local or jurisdictional standard.

At this November Bicycle & Pedestrian Committee meeting, we'll have some discussion regarding this topic. To aid this discussion, **attached** is an email sent by Dan Farnsworth in September along with an attachment from Virginia DOT regarding this topic.

Daniel Farnsworth

From: Daniel Farnsworth
Sent: Wednesday, September 9, 2026 10:15 AM
To: Tyler Kirchner; Jeremy Gorden; Jonathan Braski; 'Dave Bietz'; Donald Kress; Tony Schmitt; Kevin Gorder; Chelsea Levorsen; Matt Jennings
Subject: Follow-up from meeting - Stop signs along paths
Attachments: VDOT Signing and Marking For Sidewalks and Sidepaths.pdf

All:

Per our discussion at yesterday's Trails & Open Spaces meeting regarding Stop signs along shared use paths, I did some research in Fargo's Traffic Ordinance, ND Century Code, and the MUTCD to try an see whether Stop signs, Yield signs, or no signs are appropriate along shared use paths. I'm no lawyer so my interpretations may not be perfect. Also, Jeremy, feel free to chime in when you get back..you might know more about this than I would.

For pedestrians, the ordinances seem to be pretty clear in both Fargo's Traffic Ordinance and ND Century Code (language is identical between these two). Peds have the right-of-way at all crosswalks at intersections. Even if a crosswalk is unmarked, it's still a crosswalk. However, if a ped is crossing a midblock crosswalk or crosswalk outside of an intersection, it sounds like the ped needs to yield to vehicles, even if it's a marked crosswalk (Fargo Ord 8-706) (ND Cent Code 39-10-29).

For bikes there doesn't seem to be as much specific language. It seems that bikes would follow the same priority as the parallel roadway when riding on a shared use path. So if the parallel roadway is uncontrolled, the path should also be uncontrolled, and the sidestreet would have the Stop or Yield sign. When a path intersects a roadway away from an intersection (for example Milwaukee Trail crossing 35th Ave S) Stop or Yield priority should be assigned to either the roadway or the path per guidance in MUTCD Section 9B.01. In most cases I could see the priority given to the roadway and the Stop or Yield sign would be on the path. Per the MUTCD "the least-restrictive control that is appropriate should be placed on the lower-priority approaches". Therefore I'd recommend a Yield sign along the path rather than a Stop sign.

There are some locations where I could see the priority given to the path rather than the roadway. One example that comes to mind is where the Fargo River Trail crosses a boat access road in Dike East (just north of the dog park). Currently there is a Stop sign along the path. I think the Stop signs here could be switched to the boat access road, or removed entirely.

Below are the applicable ordinances, codes, and guidance from Federal resources. Also, I found a good policy that Virginia DOT put together to keep signage consistent along shared use paths (attached). Something like this could be considered.

City & State Ordinances / Code

Pedestrians

- Definition of Pedestrian - Any person afoot or otherwise moving or traveling about by means of any human-powered device, including a human-powered or motorized wheelchair. For purposes of this definition, persons operating a motorized scooter meet the definition of "pedestrian," but persons riding a bicycle do not.
- Definition of Crosswalk – Part of a roadway at an intersection included within the connections of the lateral lines of the sidewalk on opposite sides of the highway measured from the curbs or, in the absence of curbs, from the edges of the traversable roadway; or any portion of a roadway at an intersection or elsewhere distinctly indicated for pedestrian crossing by lines or other markings on the surface.

- Driver of vehicle shall yield right-of-way to a pedestrian crossing the roadway within a crosswalk at an intersection. (Fargo Ord. 8-0703) (ND Cent Code 39-10-28)
- No pedestrian shall suddenly leave curb and walk into the path of a vehicle making it impossible for the driver to yield. (Fargo Ord. 8-703) (ND Cent Code 39-10-28)
- When a pedestrian is crossing a roadway at any point other than a marked crosswalk at an intersection, the pedestrian shall yield the right-of-way to all vehicles. (Fargo Ord 8-706) (ND Cent Code 39-10-29)

Bicycles

- An individual operating a bicycle who is approaching an intersection shall yield the right-of-way to any vehicle that already has entered the intersection. (Fargo Ord 8-1424) (ND Cent Code 39-10.1-05.1(4)) (This ordinance doesn't define whether or not this applies to a bicycle using an adjacent shared use path)

MUTCD (FHWA)

Bicycle signage

Section 9B.01

- (06) When the placement of STOP or YIELD signs is being considered, the priority at a shared-use path/roadway intersection should be assigned with consideration of the following:
    A. Relative speeds of shared-use path and roadway users,
    B. Relative volumes of shared-use path and roadway traffic, and
    C. Relative importance of shared-use path and roadway.
- (07) Speed should not be the sole factor used to determine priority, as it is sometimes appropriate to give priority to a high-volume shared-use path that crosses a low-volume street, or to a regional shared-use path that crosses a minor collector street.
- (08) When priority is assigned (see Sections 2B.06 and 2B.08), the least-restrictive control that is appropriate should be placed on the lower-priority approaches. STOP signs should not be used where YIELD signs would provide adequate control.

Small Town & Rural Multimodal Networks guidebook (FHWA)

Sidepaths

Minor Street Crossings

Give sidepaths the same priority as the parallel roadway at all crossings. Attempts to require path users to yield or stop at each cross-street or driveway promote noncompliance and confusion, and are not effective. Geometric design in these cases should promote a high degree of yielding to path users through geometric design.

- Visual obstructions should be low to provide unobstructed sight of the crossing from the major street. Both motorists and path users should have a clear and unobstructed view of each other at intersections and driveways.
- Consider using a R10-15 RIGHT TURN YIELD TO PEDESTRIANS at street crossings with right turn interactions.

Dan Farnsworth
Transportation Planner

Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments
1 2nd Street North
Case Plaza, Suite 232
Fargo, North Dakota 58102
Direct: 701-532-5106
Metro COG: 701-532-5100
farnsworth@fmmetrocog.org

METROCOG
FM REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Northern Region Traffic Engineering Practice	No. 902.1
Signing and Marking For Sidewalks and Sidepaths	July 5, 2013



VDOT - Traffic Engineering
Fairfax, VA
Traffic Engineer

According to the Code of Virginia, a shared-use path is "a bikeway that is physically separated from motorized vehicular traffic by an open space or barrier."[1] In addition to bicyclists, shared-use paths may be used by pedestrians, skaters, and joggers, among others.

Where a shared-use path is "located immediately adjacent and parallel to a roadway,"[2] it is known as a sidepath. Paths on independent alignments are not addressed by this practice.

This practice shall apply to new or reconstructed sidewalks and sidepaths maintained by VDOT, and it shall be used to make decisions about new traffic control devices on existing paths. Existing paths may be retrofitted to comply with this practice where appropriate. This practice may be used as a reference for paths not maintained by VDOT, since it represents VDOT's preferred traffic control approach.

In general, signs along sidewalks and sidepaths have not been shown to assist adjacent motorists in anticipating (and avoiding collisions with) path users when the motorist turns onto an intersecting roadway that also crosses the path. Furthermore, bicyclists traveling on sidewalks and sidepaths have been observed to take their right-of-way cues not from signs or other traffic control devices on the path, but rather from traffic movements on the parallel roadway.

[1] Code of Virginia, § 46.2-100

[2] *Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities*, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. Washington, DC, 2012.

STOP AND YIELD SIGNS

Neither STOP nor YIELD signs shall be installed where they apply to users of sidewalks or sidepaths in any of the following circumstances:

- **Where a sidewalk or sidepath crosses a roadway or driveway at a traffic signal**
- **Where a sidewalk or sidepath crosses an unsignalized intersection at which traffic on the roadway parallel to the sidewalk or sidepath is not required to stop or yield**
- **Where a sidewalk or sidepath crosses a driveway at an unsignalized location**

At crossings where a locality has adopted an ordinance pursuant to § 46.2-924(D) of the Code of Virginia, the locality may install STOP signs that apply to path users.

Where a sidepath crosses a roadway or driveway at a traffic signal, path users must comply with the traffic signal indications[3].

Where a sidepath crosses a roadway at an unsignalized intersection, it is a "crosswalk," whether or not crosswalk markings are present.[4] In crosswalks, bicyclists and many other path users have "all the rights and duties of a pedestrian under the same circumstances."[5] As such, pedestrians and cyclists have the right-of-way when crossing a roadway at an unsignalized intersection on a sidepath (though they may not cross in disregard of approaching traffic).[6]

Where a sidepath crosses an unsignalized driveway, motorists on the driveway must stop prior to the path crossing and yield to path users before proceeding.[7]

WARNING SIGNS

Warning signs shall not be installed where they apply to users of sidewalks or sidepaths for conditions that also apply to traffic on the adjacent roadway. This prohibition shall apply whether or not a sign is posted to warn roadway traffic of the condition.

Warning signs may be considered where appropriate on sidepaths when they warn of conditions that do not apply to the adjacent roadway. A PATH NARROWS sign (W5-4a) is one example.

Since they normally travel slower, path users are less likely than roadway users to need warning signs for conditions that are readily apparent, such as roadway curvature and grades. Unnecessary signs may be fixed-object hazards for path users.

---

[3] Code of Virginia, § 46.2-925
[4] Code of Virginia, § 46.2-100
[5] Code of Virginia, § 46.2-904
[6] Code of Virginia, § 46.2-924
[7] Code of Virginia, § 46.2-826

CYCLIST BEHAVIOR SIGNS

No sign shall require a cyclist to dismount from his or her bicycle, except where a locality has adopted an ordinance prohibiting cycling on the specific sidewalk or sidepath.

Absent such an ordinance, VDOT does not have legal authority to require cyclists to dismount.

No sign should advise or warn a cyclist to dismount from his or her bicycle, except where site conditions are so constrained that a competent cyclist would not be able to safely traverse the area without dismounting.

No sign shall direct or advise a cyclist to ride on a sidewalk or sidepath, except where cyclists are prohibited by law from using the roadway.

Cyclists are usually permitted to travel on either a roadway or its adjacent sidewalk or sidepath. Each cyclist may make his or her own independent judgment about where to ride and whether to dismount, considering his or her skill level and site conditions, and recognizing that a sidepath may have more hazards than the adjacent roadway.

Signs advising of riding location may interfere with this judgment, and may inaccurately imply to motorists that cyclists are not permitted to use the roadway.

CENTERLINE MARKINGS

Sidewalks and sidepaths should not be marked with a centerline.

Path users are usually permitted to travel in both directions on a sidepath. However, research has shown that cyclists are more likely to be involved in collisions when riding in the direction opposite adjacent roadway traffic. This is often because motorists crossing the path on a driveway or intersecting roadway do not expect cyclists to be approaching from a direction opposite nearby motor vehicles. A sidepath centerline may encourage riding against traffic, which may increase cyclists' risk.