

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 14, 2004 – 1:30 p.m.
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A102**

Lane Magnuson, GF/EGF MPO Planner, Senior, called the meeting to order with the following members present: Dean Wieland, EGF City Engineer; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks; Dan Jonasson, GF City Engineer; Paul Benning, NDDOT-Bismarck (via speaker phone); Mark Johnson, FHWA-Bismarck (via speaker phone); Dennis Potter, GF City Planner; and Ryan Brooks, EGF City Planner; Staff present were: Cindy Voigt, GF Assistant City Engineer; Mark Engel, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Administrative Specialist, Senior.

Initially a quorum was not present, however, once the phone line was established, Paul Benning and Mark Johnson (via speaker phone) did complete a quorum.

INTRODUCTIONS

Magnuson introduced Mark Engel, GF/EGF MPO Intern, and asked that everyone please introduce themselves for his benefit.

SUSPEND AGENDA

Magnuson said that because of problems with the speaker phone we are unable to get through to Mr. Benning and Mr. Johnson, therefore, until this problem is solved, he would like to suspend the agenda in order to hear discussion on those items that do not require action.

MATTER OF BIKE/PED PLAN UPDATE

Magnuson referred to the document included in the packet, and went over it briefly. He explained that there have been a couple of recent events dealing with the Bike/Ped Plan Update, the first of which was a public open house, which took place at the Campbell Library in East Grand Forks on July 1st. He stated that the purpose of this open house was to basically kick-off the process and give the public an idea of what is in the current plan, and to give them the opportunity to give input on what kinds of changes they would like to see in the update. He added that twenty people attended the open house, and several written comments were submitted, copies of which were included in the packets for today's meeting. He stated that copies of the draft goals and policies were available at the open house, and in today's packet. He added that these goals and policies were developed in conjunction with the Bike and Pedestrian Committee, which, you may recall, is basically the Greenway Technical Advisory Committee, who approved them at their June 2004 meeting.

Magnuson stated that another recent development is the addition of the unpaved trail section. He explained that the Greenway Technical Advisory Committee has been studying an unpaved trail

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 14th, 2004**

plan for the greenway for a couple of years now, and it basically provides opportunities closer to the river without the worries of maintenance, and are designed to accommodate different users, such as joggers and snowmobilers.

Magnuson reported that copies of a preliminary map was also included in the packets, and shows the corridors for the unpaved trails.

Potter referred to the Bike/Ped Plan, under the “Adopt a manual for bicycle/pedestrian facility design standards” objective, and pointed out that a reference is made to utilize FHA design standard guidelines, AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle and Pedestrian guidelines, and MnDot design standard guidelines, but there is no reference for North Dakota, or do we even have a North Dakota design guideline standard. Magnuson responded that he would have to check on this, that he doesn’t know if North Dakota has a design standard or not.

Potter again referred to the plan, under the “Adopt uniform bicycle/pedestrian traffic control devices” objective, and pointed out that a reference is made to utilize MnDot Manual on traffic control devices, and the Uniform manual on traffic control devices, but that, once again there is no reference to a North Dakota control device, and he would like to know if North Dakota has any. Magnuson responded that he would check on this as well.

Potter referred to Goal #6, “Finance the Transportation System in a fiscally responsible manner”, and commented that the standard listed is to use Bikeway Maintenance funds to supplement cost of trail construction, and he would object to that; and he isn’t sure if you can legally allow developers to use Park Dedication fees, because that money goes to the Park District, if you want money, raise the fees. Brooks asked if some of the bikepaths aren’t actually owned by the Park District, such as the one east of Century School. Magnuson added that the path in the King’s Walk development is also owned by the Park District. Potter said that there are a couple of things with that statement; the first is to allow developers to use park dedication fees, that developers never have park dedication fees, those belong to the Park District, and so it would really be up to the Park District to make that decision, not developers. Magnuson responded that it would allow developers, when they pay the fees, to be able to use those fees, and, yes, it would be the Park District’s decision. He added that he is assuming that whoever is doing the bike planning, would make the decision as to whether or not the fees can be used or not. Potter stated that this needs to be looked at a lot more closely, and that should be done here, not down at your group.

Brooks asked if the intent of the statement was to allow a developer to put in a bikepath in lieu of paying park dedication fees. Magnuson responded that the intent was, if there was a planned bikepath, in, through, or on the perimeter of the development, to allow the developer to use park dedication fees to build that bikepath. Brooks added, if a bikepath were planned across a

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 14th, 2004**

developer's site, currently, on the site plan, doesn't the Planning Department require a developer to put in a bikepath. Potter responded that the Planning Department does not require developers to put in bikepaths. Voigt stated that the Engineering Department does, that the Planning Department might not, but the Engineering Department does. Brooks went on to explain that what he was getting at was, if this is the case, then the developer may feel like he is being hit twice, and in some ways, because the bike paths do provide connections to parks, this may be a good idea. Potter said that he isn't objecting to this, but is saying that the current ordinance does not allow that to happen, so you are going to have to change the ordinance, and that requires participation from the Park Board, and the Park Board may not want to do it. He added that, if you are looking for money, his advice is, don't go in and try to slice the existing pool of money thinner, say you have to have additional sources of revenue, and do it, and that is to either require the developer to put it in, point blank, right out of the chute; or find another revenue source, but don't slice the pie thinner, and same thing with the bike maintenance money, don't put in there that you like the idea of using Bike Maintenance for construction, that is counterproductive, the money is there to maintain what we have, not slice it thinner. Magnuson asked if requiring the developer to put the bikepath in, point blank, is realistic in Grand Forks. Potter responded that he doesn't know. He added that, if the developer says no, we don't have a leg to stand on. Magnuson responded that this is the whole point of this, to provide someplace for you to refer to to get developers to put bikepaths in. Potter stated, just recommend it then.

Brooks commented that the Park District does have representatives on the committee, does it not. Magnuson responded they did. Brooks asked if they had anything to say on this. Magnuson responded that they approved it. Voigt stated that what they need to do is to work on the policy portion of the update, to get the policies straightened out. Magnuson said that he would talk with Mr. Mullally to try to address this issue.

Magnuson asked if there were any concerns regarding acquiring right-of-way, and such. Potter responded that they already do right-of-way. Magnuson asked if they didn't do easements. Potter responded that they do easements or right-of-way, that it doesn't make any difference.

Magnuson said that the issue of putting responsibility on the developer, and figuring out which avenue to take, whether it be the Park District or not, should also be looked at more closely. Potter suggested it be put in there that way to see where it flies, but all he is saying is don't try to slice the existing pool of money thinner, and if you need more money, just say so up front, and go after it. He said that he has no problem with that at all, but don't try to slice the existing pool of money any thinner than they already are, that is what he objects to, which is why he doesn't want to see any reference to taking trail maintenance money for construction, because there is a pitiful amount of money now. Magnuson stated, then, that they shouldn't use the term "trail maintenance money", but should instead use the term "park dedication". Potter responded that they will have to find out from the Park Board if they are willing to do that. Magnuson said that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 14th, 2004**

he would look into this. Brooks asked if he was also suggesting that they not use bike maintenance funds, but to either come up with another fund, or come up with another source. Potter responded that this would be correct.

Potter asked if Mr. Benning had looked over the Bike/Ped Plan document yet. Benning responded that he had looked it over somewhat. Potter asked if the State of North Dakota has a manual on traffic control devices. Benning responded that they use the AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle and Pedestrian Guidelines. Potter asked if they also use the AASHTO on traffic control devices as well. Benning responded that they use the MUTCD guidelines. Potter asked that, whatever they are using, be included under the “Adopt Uniform Bicycle/Pedestrian Traffic Control Devices” objective. Jonasson pointed out that the second one already listed, is the MUTCD guideline. Brooks commented that maybe a note could be added explaining that North Dakota uses those two manuals, to help clear things up. Potter stated that he wants it up there where Minnesota is. Brooks asked if he wanted it listed before Minnesota’s. Potter responded that he didn’t care about that, that he just wants it in there so it clearly says that there is a standard used. Brooks pointed out that it is already listed there as “utilize uniform manual on traffic control devices. Potter asked if that was what Mr. Benning was referring to. Jonasson responded it was. Potter, okay.

Magnuson reported that the final event that took place, our most recent event that took place on the Bike/Ped Plan Update, was the completion of the Trail Usage Study. He explained that this was accomplished through the use of trail counters, at different locations throughout both Cities, doing user counts for sixteen-hour periods, collecting data such as the number of users, age, mode, helmet usage, etc.. He said that they attempted to compare the results of this study with the 1999 study that was done, however there were several issues, such as the different methodologies that were used, the weather, and time of year, which were all variable that caused the comparison to be irrelevant because some sections showed a decrease in usage up to 67%, and other sections showed an increase of up to 55%, so he feels we really need to look at using a more uniform method of doing counts.

Magnuson pointed out that helmet usage numbers were taken, and this is valuable information for the Safe Kids Coalition, as they do a lot of bicycle safety programs throughout the area, and those numbers were turned over to them.

Magnuson reported that a complete draft of the plan update is scheduled to be submitted to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee in August, and to the Technical Advisory Committee in September for preliminary approval.

Noehre referred to the written comments included in the packet, and commented on the one referring to the possibility of making the Kennedy Bridge more bike/ped friendly. He stated that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 14th, 2004**

he read that one, and would like to point out that in the fairly recent past, MNDOT just rebuilt their portion of Highway 2, and did not put any sidewalks in, so doing something like that on the bridge would be pointless. Magnuson added that there are a couple of other comments similar to this, that he explained would require considerable construction and funding, so would most likely not be done, especially when there are two pedestrian bridges going in soon.

Voigt commented that she would like to relay a suggestion from Al Grasser, City Engineer, regarding public meetings. She explained that he requested that some form of minutes be compiled at these public meetings, something that can be distributed easily, and could be published if necessary. She stated that what they are interested in is information that is given to the public so that everyone is aware of what was said, and different information isn't given out later. She said that this could be done with comment sheets, and/or a summary of comments made.

Information only.

RESUME AGENDA

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Moved by Potter, seconded by Brooks, to approve the June 9th, 2004, minutes of the Technical Advisory Committee, as read. Motion carried unanimously.

MATTER OF REVISION OF THE GRAND FORKS PROJECT SUBMITTAL LIST FOR 2005-2007 T.I.P.

Magnuson reported that the City of Grand Forks has requested a revision of their previous project application for federal funding in the 2005-2007 T.I.P. He explained that the revisions neither increase nor decrease the amount of federal funding that was applied for, that it moves funding from one project to another project. He said that this shift is made possible by shortening the area for one project, and expanding the other project. He stated that the funds will be shifted within the Urban Roads Program only, so it will not affect any other projects at all, however, the local funds would also be shifted in order to maintain the local match requirement.

Magnuson said that the two revised projects are the 47th Avenue South Project, from Cherry Street to Washington Street, which was previously projected to go from Belmont to Washington Street; and the other is the 48th Avenue South Project, from 20th Street to Reummele, which was previously projected to go from 20th Street to Columbia.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 14th, 2004**

Magnuson reported that, included in the packet was a copy of the Grand Forks City Council Staff Report, and a letter from Mr. Jonasson. He asked if Mr. Jonasson had anything else to add.

Jonasson stated that the only thing that he would like to change is, if you look at the City's project submittal list, under the Rehabilitate Point Bridge project, he would like to clarify a couple of the numbers, that the Minnesota Federal share should be \$375,000, and the East Grand Forks City Share should be \$694,500. He said that it is still the same numbers, but he didn't have it matching the actual T.I.P. document. He added that he would put together a revised sheet to illustrate this change.

Moved by Potter, seconded by Brooks, to approve the revision of the Grand Forks Project Submittal List for the 2005-2007 T.I.P. Motion carried unanimously.

MATTER OF CENTURY SCHOOL SAFETY STUDY

Brooks reported that he did meet with the Grand Forks Pedestrian Safety Task Force, which looked specifically at the Century School Safety Study, and they did ask for some changes. He said he hoped that everyone had looked the document over, and, if not, let him know and he will get a copy to them.

Brooks referred to the document and explained that changes were to the south parking lot, that it is apparently quite tight in there, and this wasn't conveyed to the consultant that did the study, so they are asking that a "No Left Turn" sign be placed there, which is actually something that the School District will have to take care of. He added that they also want to widen the south access, and if necessary, remove parking stalls; and they wanted to include the cost of the south parking lot changes in the summary. He said that the next issue was the parking on 34th Street, for which they suggested a "loading and unloading" area be put in. He commented that he did talk to Mr. Jonasson about all of this, but he thinks a little more fleshing out needs to be done first, although it wouldn't get done until the School District looks at doing some of the things they need to do on the site, but what the Task Force really said was that they didn't want to see loading and unloading blocking any of the accesses on the south side. He stated that on the north parking lot, they want handicapped parking spots located, which would have to be included with any site plan that would be submitted for the new parking stalls, and they want visitor parking stalls designated. He pointed out that the last issue involves some notes that they wanted included on safety education, including information about the open house, and education of students. He added that there were some text changes, but nothing that would cause a major change to the document.

Jonasson stated that the only thing he would like to see added to the report is regarding the parking on the east side of 34th Avenue South, maybe putting in a note that states that the City

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 14th, 2004**

will consider it, contingent on the School District saying that they will put that parking lot in, as he doesn't want them putting parking signs, drop-off and pick-up signs, there as their solution to the problem. Brooks added that that probably wouldn't solve the problem anyway, so they can add this note to the document as well.

Brooks said that he would like to meet with Mr. Jonasson sometime to determine, for the recommendations, which costs, for signage would be the City's, and which would be the School's. He added that he would also need to look at the one on Baron Boulevard, to determine if that one would be split between the Park District and the School District. Jonasson responded that anything that is in the right-of-way would be paid for the City.

Brooks stated that he would get these changes to A.T.A.C.

Moved by Jonasson, seconded by Brooks, to approve the Century School Safety Study, subject to the changes discussed. Motion carried unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

A. Matter of Changing August Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Date

Magnuson reported that because the Mid-Year Reviews are being held on August 18th, it is being suggested that the TAC also meet that day rather than on August 11th. He explained that the Mid-Year's will run from 8:30 a.m. to 12:00 Noon, with the TAC meeting at 1:30 p.m.. Consensus was to change the date to August 18th, 2004.

ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Brooks, seconded by Potter, to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Administrative Specialist, Senior