

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, November 9, 2005 – 1:30 p.m.  
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-102**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Julie Romig, GF/EGF MPO Planner, Senior called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

1. Welcome and Introduction of New Members
  - a. MnDOT Representative

Romig reported that, although he is not present here today, J.T. Anderson will be the new MnDOT Representative on the Technical Advisory Committee. Mr. Anderson is replacing Mike Kamnikar.

- b. Grand Forks Planning Representative

Romig reported that Brad Gengler has been appointed as the Interim Grand Forks City Planner, replacing Dennis Potter. She welcomed Mr. Gengler on behalf of the Technical Advisory Committee.

2. Letters of Appreciation for Mike Kamnikar and Dennis Potter.

***Moved by Wieland, seconded by Ehrenstrom, to approve Letters of Appreciation be drafted and presented to Mike Kamnikar and Dennis Potter for the service they provided the Technical Advisory Committee. Motion carried unanimously.***

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll, the following members were present: Ryan Brooks, EGF Planning; Kent Ehrenstrom, MNDOT-Bemidji; Brad Gengler, Interim GF City Planner; Dean Wieland, EGF City Engineer; Richard Onstad, GF County Engineer; Wayne Lembke, GF Engineer; Dave Leftwich (Proxy for Paul Benning – via conference call), NDDOT-Bismarck; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks; Mark Johnson, FHWA-North Dakota; and Lane Magnuson, GF County Planner.

Staff present were: Julie Romig, GF/EGF MPO Planner, Senior; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Executive Assistant.

Guests present were: Larry Zitzow, UND.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

A quorum was present.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, November 9, 2005**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

*Moved by Brooks, seconded by Wieland, to approve the October 12<sup>th</sup>, 2005, minutes of the Technical Advisory Committee, as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.*

**MATTER OF FY 2007 NORTH DAKOTA TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT  
(T.E.) APPLICATIONS**

Copies of an updated staff report were distributed.

Romig referred to the updated staff report, and reported that the MPO received applications from the City of Grand Forks for three Transportation Enhancement projects; a 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue Bikepath project, a landscaping project along the perimeter of the Public Works Maintenance building, and a landscaping and tree screening project at the northwest corner of DeMers Avenue and Washington Street. She stated that the recommended action is to approve the Grand Forks 2007 Transportation Enhancement applications as being consistent with the Long Range Transportation Plan, and to endorse priority ranking consistent with the Grand Forks City Council action of November 7, 2005, with the caveat that alternatives for different types of bicycle facilities be considered during the project development phase of this project.

Brooks asked for clarification on the priority ranking of these projects, if the 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue Bikepath was ranked first, the landscaping project at the Public Works Maintenance Building second, and the landscaping project at the corner of DeMers and Washington third. Gengler responded that he visited with Cindy Voigt earlier about this, and it is his understanding that the 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue Bikepath was ranked first, the landscaping project at the corner of DeMers and Washington second, and the landscaping project at the Public Works Maintenance Building third.

Brooks stated that he tried to discuss this with Mr. Lembke earlier, but it is his thought that the landscaping and screening project at the corner of DeMers and Washington would certainly help somewhat, but there would still be the issue of the billboards that are located there, so he wonders if some thought might be given to the removal of those billboards during the project development. He added that if the intention is to retain the billboards, the three trees planned to the north of the billboard may not have much effectiveness, unless they are flushed out more during the development process.

Brooks referred to the project listing, pointing out that the local costs include right-of-way costs, and he was wondering if right-of-way may be federally eligible. Johnson responded that it is his understanding that if the right-of-way is already purchased, you may be able to use it, but he would need to double check on that. Brooks stated that this may be beneficial as it would allow for savings on the local side. Johnson said that he would check on this and e-mail the response to Mr. Haugen. Leftwich commented that they don't pay for right-of-way, that they only pay for construction costs with their T.E. program. He added that this is a matter of policy, and it isn't necessarily about whether or not it is eligible. Johnson stated that the question was whether or not they can use right-of-way as their local match. Leftwich responded that it could be used as soft match, but they prefer the hard cash right up front, that is the preferred method as it creates a

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, November 9, 2005**

a lot of extra paperwork the other way. Brooks said that they may be able to flush this out during project development, as using it is local match would be beneficial for us. Leftwich responded that they certainly can look at doing that.

Noehre stated that he would like to speak out as being in opposition to the landscaping and screening project at the corner of DeMers and Washington because, he would guess that doing any landscaping, before it actually is an effective screen, would be in the ten year neighborhood, and he would hope to have a regional project in that area, for that structure, before ten years, so we would be spending federal and local dollars on a project that's not even going to reach the life where it is effective, so why do it at all. He added that they would most likely be replacing the structure, adding some turn lanes, and that would obviously create a need to widen the pavement, thus making it necessary, most likely, to have to remove the screening and landscaping that this project would be putting in. Romig commented, however, that it is her understanding that they are talking about using mature trees for this landscaping project, so it would actually create a more immediate screening.

Brooks asked if Mr. Noehre thought the regional project would be done in ten years or less. Noehre responded that his preference would be to do it as soon as possible. Brooks commented that a regional project was actually programmed at one time, but was removed. Noehre stated that the problem, of course, is not knowing when the City Council would like to see this project occur, as well as when the funds to do it would be available, but he would really like to see it advanced along so they can look at the whole intersection of Washington and DeMers when the underpass project is done.

Johnson said that, given this information, FHWA would have concerns with the use of federal funds to construct this project, particularly since it may need to be removed shortly after putting it in. Brooks commented, then, that it wouldn't be a matter of re-ranking the priorities, but would instead be a matter of actually removing it as an option. Noehre responded that that would be his recommendation, and added that he would be voting against it.

Johnson asked if there was another project that the City could advance in the meantime, and put this project as a placeholder, so that once the regional project has been completed, you could then do this project at that time. Brooks responded that one of the problems with that is that this T.E., then, is going to get ranked amongst the whole state, so if we advance a project that may be temporary, how is it really going to come out in the rankings of the Governor's Task Force. Johnson responded that he is talking about locally, so if you take this project out, do you have another project that you can put in it's place, but then put this project in for funding in, say, 2009 or 2010. Brooks asked if they would still have to go through the Governor's Task Force. Noehre said that he would even be willing to do this as a State sponsored T.E. project, with the District's recommendation. Brooks asked how much local dollars does the State sponsored projects have, does the State pick up the local on those projects. Noehre responded that it would be the same, but it wouldn't go to the same committee for approval, it goes to a committee of three from the DOT. Leftwich added that the funds come from a different pot of money, and there would be a pretty good chance of it being approved with one of their State projects.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, November 9, 2005**

Lembke stated that when this was originally brought to the City Council for approval, staff only had two projects listed for consideration, and the Council itself requested that this project be added, therefore, staff would still like for it to be considered.

Noehre commented that there is always the possibility that if this project were to be approved, and receive funding, you may be asked to reimburse those monies in the event the project has to be removed during construction of the regional project.

***A MOTION WAS MADE BY BROOKS TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD TO APPROVE THE GRAND FORKS FY 2007 NDDOT TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT APPLICATIONS AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, BUT TO GIVE THE PROJECTS PRIORITY RANKING AS FOLLOWS: 1) 17<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE SOUTH SHARED-USE PATH; 2) LANDSCAPING PUBLIC WORKS MAINTENANCE BUILDING; AND 3) LANDSCAPING DEMERS/WASHINGTON NW CORNER.***

***MOTION DIED FOR LACK OF A SECOND.***

***A MOTION WAS MADE BY NOEHRE, SECONDED BY ONSTAD, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD TO APPROVE THE GRAND FORKS FY 2007 NDDOT TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT APPLICATIONS AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, TO GIVE THE PROJECTS PRIORITY RANKING AS FOLLOWS: 1) 17<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE SOUTH SHARED-USE PATH; 2) LANDSCAPING PUBLIC WORKS MAINTENANCE BUILDING; AND TO REMOVE THE LANDSCAPING DEMERS/WASHINGTON NW CORNER PROJECT FROM THE LIST.***

***MOTION CARRIED WITH LEMBKE AND GENGLER VOTING NAY.***

Magnuson stated that he had a question, for clarification purposes, regarding the 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue South Shared-Use Path project, and whether or not the widened curb lanes be done in addition to the side path. Brooks responded that he thinks that it flushes out in the project development process. Romig agreed, adding that the original enhancement application for the bikeway on 17<sup>th</sup> refers to the old plan, but, as you know, the MPO has since updated that plan, so they recommend going forward with the project, but also recommend re-examining the details at project development time, including the sidewalk widening, etc.. Magnuson asked if it would then be one or the other, or both. Lembke responded that it would be one or the other. Magnuson asked if there was a side path on either side of the project, correct. Lembke responded that there is a sidewalk on either side of the project. Romig commented that during project development, they are asking that all alternatives that might better serve the community be considered.

Romig reported that one more thing about T.E. applications is that the Minnesota T.E. applications are out, and are due no later than February 6<sup>th</sup>, which means they need to come to the Technical Advisory Committee at their January meeting, so they need to be submitted to the City Council in December. She added that these applications are for 2009 and 2010 monies.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, November 9, 2005**

**MATTER OF INTERIM 42<sup>ND</sup> STREET EVENT TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN**

Romig reported that Rick Lane, with SRF, will be giving us a brief overview on the Interim 42<sup>nd</sup> Street Event Traffic Management Plan.

Copies of the Interim Traffic Plan Summary (a copy of which is included in the file, and available upon request) were distributed, and, referring to that document, as well as a power point slide presentation, Mr. Lane, via conference call, proceeded to give a brief overview of the plan, and explaining that they have been working, at this point, on an interim plan that could be used during the construction of the CanadInn development. He added that the total study also includes a final plan that will look at both in-bound and out-bound access to the Alerus lot after construction has been completed.

Overview continued.

Lane referred to the four graphics, and went over them briefly. He explained that there is a difference shown between football and non-football events. He pointed out that just south of the Alerus facility, there are several areas, which have been highlighted. He explained that these are the different assigned parking areas, including the tailgating area. He commented that in working with the Alerus, they were informed that those patrons who purchase season tickets do get preferential parking, located in the highlighted areas, and do discharge differently, so portions of these areas go out the Alerus Drive entrance, as opposed to going south as is the case with the other parking areas. He added that they were also informed that parking in those highlighted areas is not as efficient as parking in the west lot.

Lane referred to the two graphics that illustrate football events, and pointed out that they show the locations, both at the site and away from the site, for parking attendants and police officers. He stated that the intent is to try to maximize the flow out of the entrances, with the biggest difference from what is currently being done is the use of 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, so with the additional traffic control people, with the additional use of 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, and the additional access point out of the site at 11<sup>th</sup>, it is felt that the site can be cleared of traffic in 45-minutes for a full-sized event.

Lane commented that in order to make this plan easy to use they included some tables, with Tables 3 and 4 being included in the packets. He referred to those tables, and explained that they are called the traffic control staff summary matrix, with the intent being that if you use Table 3 along with the four graphics, that would be the handout you would give to your traffic control people to help them understand what they need to do during events.

Lane stated that they also included some more detailed layouts, which were attached for coning, specifically to help with the layout of coning during events in order to obtain the maximum traffic movement through the area.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS:

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, November 9, 2005**

Wieland asked if the final plan would include an underpass at 42<sup>nd</sup>. Lane responded that it would not, that they were told to use the roadway system as it currently exists.

Zitzow asked if the University of North Dakota has been involved with this study process, particularly the parking issue. Lane responded that they have been working with Jeremy Lindstad, who has met with UND, and with Ray Tozer, who does a lot of the signing for the Alerus parking lot. He stated that there is not a UND representative on the review committee at this time, but he knows that Mr. Haugen had hoped to have someone on board originally, but because of some personnel changes, that did not occur. He added that Mr. Haugen and Mr. Lindstad did meet with personnel at UND a couple of times, however, he was not involved with those meetings. He said that the biggest issue is whether or not any UND lots would be available for parking during non-UND events. He stated that this will need to be addressed before the final document is completed.

Zitzow stated that the point he would like to make is, Ray Tozer is a UND employee, but he is not a spokesperson for UND, so they need to incorporate somebody in the plan, of what the plan proposes. Lembke commented that he was with Mr. Haugen at a UND pre-football meeting where they did present the plan, and, although he does not remember the name of the UND employee that was present at that meeting, he can get it, but they were told that that person would be the prime contact for parking issues. Zitzow said that he would like to know who that person is. He added that either himself, or someone from his office would certainly be willing to represent UND on this committee.

Zitzow said that the other issue he would like to bring up, and this is more of an information item, is the fact that they are experiencing a growing stormwater problem on the golf course, and, as you pave more and more area along 42<sup>nd</sup>, that problem will continue to get worse, and this needs to be addressed. He added that he will be contacting someone from the City to see what can be done about this issue, and he hopes that there will be some planning done to help alleviate the problem.

Lane stated that he would take measures to make sure that UND is included in the process.

***A MOTION WAS MADE BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY LEMBKE, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD TO APPROVE THE INTERIM PLAN FOR THE 42<sup>ND</sup> STREET TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF DRAFT E.G.F. GATEWAY DRIVE ACCESS MANAGEMENT STUDY**

Item tabled.

**MATTER OF INFORMATION ON SAFETEA-LU**

Johnson reported that Mr. Haugen contacted him, and requested that he give a brief presentation on SAFETEA-LU, and that copies of the presentation slides were included in the packets (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request).

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, November 9, 2005**

Johnson explained that SAFETEA-LU stands for the Safe Accountable Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act of the Twenty First Century – A Legacy for Users, and that the bill sets record spending levels, providing \$286.4 billion in guaranteed spending over six years, which is a 38% increase in guaranteed spending. He added that we already have two years of the bill completed, 2004 and 2005, so we only have four years left before another bill will need to be approved.

Presentation ensued.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***A MOTION WAS MADE BY BROOKS, SECONDED BY WIELAND, TO ADJOURN THE NOVEMBER 9, 2005, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:30 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis  
Executive Assistant