

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

**Friday, April 14, 2006 – 12:00 Noon
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A102**

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Doug Christensen called the April 14th, 2006, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board at 12:06 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Chairman Doug Christensen, Warren Strandell, Dorette Kerian, Gary Malm, Dick Grassel, and Paula Lee (Proxy for Rob Kweit).

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

Guests present were: Wayne Lembke, Grand Forks City Traffic Engineer; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks City Planner; and Joe Martin & Janelle Mulroy, Brady Martz.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Chairman Christensen declared a quorum was present.

APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 10TH, 2006 MINUTES

Malm referred to the first page of the minutes, and pointed out that Julie Romig, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner, was not shown as being present at the meeting even though she gave a presentation during the meeting.

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY KERIAN, TO APPROVE THE MARCH 10TH, 2006, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD SUBJECT TO THE ADDITION OF JULIE ROMIG, GF/EGF SENIOR PLANNER TO THE LIST OF STAFF PRESENT.

Voting Aye: Malm, Kerian, Christensen, Lee, Grassel, and Strandell.

Voting Nay: None.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Friday, April 14, 2006**

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2005 MPO AUDIT REPORT

Haugen introduced Joe Martin and Janelle Mulroy of Brady Martz, and explained that they were present this afternoon to give a brief overview of the 2005 MPO Audit they recently performed.

Mulroy referred to pages one and two of the audit report, the Independent Auditor's Report, and explained that it states that they conducted the audit in accordance with auditing standards that are generally accepted in the United States and applicable to financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. She added that it also issues an unqualified opinion, which is a clean opinion, and the best opinion they could give.

Mulroy referred to pages three through seven, and explained that this is the section of the audit report that they call the "Management's Discussion and Analysis, which gives management the opportunity to go through, and highlight some of their thoughts of the goings-on within the MPO throughout the year. She pointed out that this section does have some financial highlights, some comparative numbers between 2004 and 2005, economic factors, and comments on next year's budget changes and future events that may affect the MPO.

Mulroy referred to page eight, the Governmental Fund Balance Sheet/Statement Of Net Assets, and pointed out that in the far right column, under Statement of Assets, it shows that the MPO had total assets of \$143,325.00 at the end of 2005, total liabilities of \$70,658.00, and Total Net Assets of \$72,658.00.

Mulroy referred to page nine, the Statement Of Governmental Fund Revenues, Expenditures, And Changes In Fund Balance/Statement Of Activities, and pointed out that in the far right column, under Statement of Activities, it shows that the MPO had total revenues of \$527,992.00, total expenses of \$502,675.00, with a change in net assets of \$25,317.00.

Mulroy reported that pages ten through fifteen are the Notes To Financial Statements, which are all fairly standard notes, and don't need much explanation, however, if anyone has any questions she would be glad to answer them.

Mulroy referred to page sixteen, Schedule Of Revenues, Expenditures And Changes In Fund Balance – Budget And Actual General Fund, and explained that they are required to report the MPO's original budget and their final budget, which, in this case, was the same, so there are no changes between the first two columns. She then pointed out that the third column is the actual results of operations, and the fourth column shows the variance between what is budgeted and the actual results, which, you will see shows that revenues were only \$310.00 short of budget, and actual expenditures were \$35,005 less than budget.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Friday, April 14, 2006**

Mulroy reported that the last two pages of the report are their Government Auditing Report, in which they would list any compliance or internal control issues, none were found.

Christensen referred to page sixteen, and asked about the corridor planning and land use categories, and whether or not any amendments were made to the budget to include the additional items this body approved during the year. Haugen responded that there were amendments made. He explained that what occurred was that the Land Use Plan study was to carry into 2006, however SRF essentially charged the full amount of the contract in 2005, so, while the contract amount with SRF hasn't changed, they received their payment before the product has been completed, although we do still have the 10% retainage that is held back. Christensen asked why we pre-paid for a product. Haugen responded that SRF billed us monthly, and when they submitted December's bill in February, it showed that they had put in a lot of hours in December, putting them over their contractual amount, thus they have essentially been working on their dime to complete the project. Christensen asked if this occurred with both SRF projects, or just the Land Use project. Haugen responded that this occurred with the Land Use project. Christensen asked about the negative amount shown under the Corridor Planning category as well, if that project, too, went over budget, and are we going to need to spend more monies for either of these studies. Haugen responded that the corridor studies are not expected to cost us any additional monies. He added that the East Grand Forks Highway 2 Access Management Study has been completed, and are now finishing up the 42nd Street Event Management Study, so no additional funds are expected to be required for either of these studies. He stated that we are also not spending any more funds on the Land Use Plan Study than what is shown either. Christensen commented that he knows that we approved the Land Use Plan, and have the moratorium in place now for the balance of the year, and now we have to tweak the language in the Land Use Plan, and he is wondering if SRF would be assisting us with this as well. Haugen responded that we have a code revision RFP that the selection committee met on this morning, and a line item in our current 2006 budget to do this. Christensen asked what was budgeted to do this. Haugen responded that we have \$110,000 budgeted, with \$85,000 budgeted for the consultant, and the selection committee does have a recommendation for the MPO Executive Policy Board on which consultant should be considered.

Christensen asked who was on the selection committee. Haugen responded that the committee consisted of himself, Paula Lee, Dr. Lyle Hall, Brad Gengler, and an additional Planning Commission member that was not able to attend, so the four of them met, reviewed the proposals, and have a recommendation. He added that once the consultant is on board, than another committee, which is still being compiled, will assist them with actually doing the code review. Christensen asked if the board would be getting a report on the selection committee's recommendation today. Haugen responded they would.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Friday, April 14, 2006**

Kerian stated that she was interested in Mr. Haugen's comment that SRF "used up their hours early in the process, and are working on their dime", which would mean, then, that they have a contractual obligation to fulfill, and if it costs them more hours they will have to absorb it, and it won't cost us any more money, is that correct. Haugen responded that it was, unless this body would decide to amend their contract to give them more money.

MOVED BY KERIAN, SECONDED BY GRASSEL, TO APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT OF THE FY2005 MPO AUDIT AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Malm, Kerian, Christensen, Lee, Grassel, and Strandell.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT 2007-2010 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that a copy of the Draft 2007-2010 T.I.P. document for Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, which went out for public review fourteen days ago, is included in the packet. He stated that he also distributed copies of updated information regarding the transit system on the Grand Forks side as well.

Haugen said that the Technical Advisory Committee met on Wednesday, and a public hearing was held. He said that no one was present at the public hearing to speak on this issue, nor were any written comments received.

Haugen explained that the changes to the document, which the Technical Advisory Committee discussed at their meeting, did not affect any of the projects or their funding totals. He stated that there were, however, some problems with the breakout on the far right of the tables, specifically as to which staging category some of the project's funds should have been listed under, but no other significant changes were required.

Haugen referred to the transit tables included in the packet, and stated one thing he would like to point out is that it shows a total cost of \$1.8 million dollars for fixed route, dial-a-ride, and senior rider; and, then referring to the new tables he distributed, he pointed out that by consolidating the dial-a-ride and senior rider services, we now show a total of \$1.65 million dollars. He said that they had anticipated a savings once this consolidation occurred, and these T.I.P.s are now reflecting that.

Kerian asked if East Grand Forks' portion was included in these figures. She referred to page one, pointing out that it shows a total of \$1.7 million, and now you are saying it is less. Haugen responded that he is looking at the three individual services. He explained that they used to have \$340,000 alone for dial-a-ride, and now we are showing for a combined demand response a total of \$320,000, and have completely dropped the cost of senior rider, which used to be \$120,000, and while the fixed-route shows a small increase, by showing the impact of the merger, overall there is a cost savings.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Friday, April 14, 2006**

Christensen asked if there was any chance staff could get this report to the City Council, soon. Haugen responded that he would talk to Roger Foster, and get the report to the City Council as soon as possible.

Haugen reported that the only other thing is that there will be a bit of a difference between the North Dakota T.I.P. and the Minnesota T.I.P.. He explained that North Dakota will adopt a fourth year for projects in 2010, but Minnesota will not, so their 2010 projects are shown as Illustrative Projects. He added, however, that next year both North Dakota and Minnesota will adopt four year T.I.P.s.

***MOVED BY GRASSEL, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT
FY2007-2010 T.I.P..***

Voting Aye: Malm, Kerian, Christensen, Lee, Grassel, and Strandell.

Voting Nay: None.

**MATTER OF AMENDING THE GRAND FORKS FUNCTIONAL
CLASSIFICATION MAP**

Haugen reported that Grand Forks has constructed, and will be constructing this year, some of the collector system on the southern portion of Grand Forks. He stated that back in 2003, the MPO Executive Policy Board approved an updated Functional Classification Map, primarily after the U.S. Census and the adjustment of our urbanized area and our federal aid boundary, and we showed these collector streets at that time as future collectors, so now that they are in, or are being constructed, we need to update the map to reflect the fact that they are existing rather than future collector streets.

Haugen referred to the information in the packet, and commented that you will notice that the original request that came from City staff was to possibly delete one collector road system, Adams Drive. He stated that in talking this issue over with staff, it was decided that more thought needed to go into this before deleting it, therefore we are not asking for approval of that request at this time.

Christensen asked why we would want to delete Adams Drive from Belmont Road to 62nd. Haugen responded that Adams Drive extends to the Mayor's house, and further south, therefore most of it is located on the wet side of the flood protection system, which is a consideration in this issue. Christensen asked, again, why staff would want to delete it. Haugen responded that when looking at the map to determine what changes needed to be made, Adams Drive seemed to be an issue because most of it is located on the wet side of the flood protection, and now would be the time to delete it if that is what we want to do, but as they discussed some of the ramifications involved with this, it was agreed that staff wouldn't seek this change, but instead would study it further, and present it to the City Council for action before bringing it to the MPO Executive Policy Board asking for it to be deleted. Christensen asked what the detriment would be to Mr. Adams, and the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Friday, April 14, 2006**

other property owners along this roadway if it were deleted. Haugen responded that that was his concern to staff, that if it is deleted, it would no longer be eligible for federal aid, although its being on the wet side of the flood protection may also make it ineligible for federal aid as well. He stated that this is why this needs to be researched more thoroughly.

Kerian commented that, as she understands it, the City is interested in moving ahead with 40th Avenue, that there seems to be some interest in doing that because of the building that we want to do, so why mix in something that needs more work at this time. Haugen agreed, adding that we do need to make the changes from future to existing, and we need to do it to coincide with the construction activity that is taking place, therefore we do need to approve this updated map without the deletion of Adams Drive.

MOVED BY KERIAN, SECONDED BY LEE, TO APPROVE THE UPDATED FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION MAP WITHIN THE MPO AREA ON THE NORTH DAKOTA SIDE.

Malm stated that his only concern is that Map 1 is hard to understand, that the legend is hard to figure out, and therefore, he would suggest that a better map be drawn.

***Voting Aye: Malm, Kerian, Christensen, Lee, Grassel, and Strandell.
Voting Nay: None.***

MATTER OF THOMPSON BRIDGE FUNDING OPTIONS

Haugen referred to the staff report included in the packets, and reported that as requested, staff worked with the Counties of Grand Forks and Polk to identify funding options available to replace the Thompson Bridge. He said that Warren Strandell; Gary Malm; Richard Onstad, Grand Forks County; and Rich Sanders, Polk County; and himself met a couple of times, and developed a list of possible funding sources, which are shown in the staff report.

Haugen commented that both Counties have expressed a desire to keep the Thompson Bridge in its current place. He added that, while many of the funding sources listed already have projects identified, it was the first step in identifying to both sides what options they might have to co-mingle their funding sources together to get this bridge replaced.

Haugen stated that a report done a year ago estimated just the bridge structure itself would cost \$5.2 million, however since then the Polk County Engineer reviewed those costs, and came up with a revised replacement cost estimate of \$7.2 million, which included approaches and other items as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Friday, April 14, 2006**

Haugen reported that this information was presented to the Technical Advisory Committee, and they were not able to identify any additional funding sources, so this report was forwarded on to the MPO Executive Policy Board as the most viable funding sources available.

Grassel asked what elevation this bridge would be built to. Lee also asked if it would be built high enough that it wouldn't be closed during high flood events. Haugen responded that the design flood height would be just above the identified 100-year flood height. Lee said, then, that it would be higher than it currently is now. She added that it would seem that if you were going to take the time and money to redo this bridge, you might as well make it usable during high flood events. Grassel agreed, adding that you may as well put a flood proof bridge there because, let's face it, there will never be another bridge built in the City's of Grand Forks and East Grand Forks. He said that this has been going on long enough, and we talk about a bridge at Merrifield, but that is over twenty-five years away, and as far as a bridge being built between the two communities, you may as well forget it. He added that what they should have done was not to agree to do anything with the Point Bridge, but instead just let it fall into the river, because now we are spending a lot of money that could have been put aside, added to, and a new structure built at that location, especially since there will never be anything built further south.

Christensen suggested we get to the basics here, that Grand Forks has a ward system, and East Grand Forks has whatever system they have over there, and the bridge Mr. Grassel is talking about will either be on 32nd, 47th, or 62nd, and when we all start cooperating around here, and start identifying, and having a collective effort, and East Grand Forks doesn't go out and build a \$2.3 million dollar arena when Grand Forks has a \$100 million Alerus Center, and now Grand Forks has a problem up in Manvel with their proposed land-fill site, and East Grand Forks cuts and runs to take their garbage someplace else; you get a little excited, which causes me to get a little excited. Grassel responded that they have never cut and run on any garbage, but they have to protect their own people over there. Christensen stated that Grand Forks has 53,000 people, and East Grand Forks has 8,300, don't you think we can work together on a few of these issues. Grassel stated that East Grand Forks has never said they wouldn't cooperate with Grand Forks on the garbage issue. Christensen added that Grand Forks also has a wastewater treatment plant that is begging to be used, and they have \$34 million dollars in that deal, which could be used by East Grand Forks, and which would eliminate their need to do something with American Crystal waste. He suggested that they get together on a few of these things because he would like to see East Grand Forks get a bridge too. Grassel responded that it will never happen. Christensen said that it can happen if we work collectively.

Christensen asked why East Grand Forks would want to knock down the Point Bridge. He stated that he is downtown every day at 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., and sees the traffic going through, and they aren't using the Point Bridge, and there is a reason for that, and that is because East Grand Forks' people live in the north end of town, not the south end, otherwise they would use the Point Bridge. Grassel responded that their south end is

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Friday, April 14, 2006**

growing faster than their north end. Christensen asked, why, then are they using the Sorlie Bridge instead of the Point Bridge. Grassel responded that it is because Grand Forks' Minnesota/4th Street is hammering the heck out of cars. Christensen stated that if that is it, then that is a simple deal. Grassel said that it isn't a simple deal, that the MPO went through this issue before, and it wasn't a simple deal.

Grassel explained what occurred on this issue. He stated that the State of North Dakota was going to give Grand Forks the money to widen Minnesota/4th so it could at least be improved, and then the neighborhood petitioned against having anything done, and they won because they didn't want the Granitoid destroyed. He added that the State had even come up with ways to preserve some of the Granitoid, but it never went through.

Christensen suggested that they start planning a little here instead of just talking about spending \$150,000 on land use. He stated that maybe they should look into trying to do something with Minnesota/4th again, especially since there is a different council now than there was then, and we don't have Bob Bushfield, we have Brad Gengler now, so it might be a little bit different now than it was then. Malm commented that Bob Bushfield supported doing something with Minnesota/4th, it was the neighborhood that killed the project. He said that the neighborhood went beserk, and three people in particular, took it all the way to the State to stop it. Kerian commented that she doesn't think that politic has changed. Malm stated that those three individuals are no longer living in that neighborhood, but there would still most likely be some resistance in that neighborhood. Christensen said, however, that this City Council may support it this time.

Lee commented that there would still be the issue of concern with increased traffic going by a school. Christensen responded that you are talking about a school, while you would be talking about the schools on 32nd, and you are also talking about a school that is running out of kids as the demographics of this City change. Lee said that she is just expressing the emotion from the neighborhood. She added that she understands their concern when you look at how people don't stop at crosswalks, and you teach kids to cross at certain locations, then no one stops to let them cross safely, she can understand why they would react negatively to the possibility of increased traffic, and that is the emotional end of this issue.

Kerian stated that, getting back to the issue, we have a Point Bridge that we need to maintain. She asked if that was an issue that we need to revisit. Christensen responded that the bottom line is that nobody is using it, and we need to see what we can do to make them use it, because he can see what is happening with traffic on DeMers, that traffic is backed up two and three blocks at times, so we need to do something to improve the usage of the Point Bridge, and Minnesota/4th, and if it takes the removal of the Granitoid, then let's take it out.

Grassel commented that if they are going to do anything with the Point Bridge, in order to fix the Minnesota side they have to extend the approach, and if they do any major work

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Friday, April 14, 2006**

then they have to comply with ADA requirements, and that would mean the addition of pedestrian walkways on both sides of the bridge, which would have to be handicap accessible, so now we would be looking at a lot more money. He said, then, that we need to decide if it is better to leave it as it is, take the \$2 million we programmed to maintain it, set it aside and add to it until we can build a new bridge. Christensen responded that that would make sense if it was going to be used, but if it isn't, then we need to just maintain it.

Haugen reported that the key here is that not too long ago we identified investing money in the Point Bridge because traffic will be using it. He added that if we never build another bridge, projections are that traffic will equal the amount of traffic that is currently on the Sorlie Bridge, which is why they identified two additional bridges to the south. He stated that maintaining the Point Bridge will cost \$2 million dollars, but by doing that we have invested as much as we need to in that bridge for the next 20-years, so we have a structure between both communities that will last for a relatively inexpensive investment, and which allows us, now, to look at the other locations. He reminded everyone that they identified Merrifield first, then 32nd Avenue South, and now the Thompson Bridge, for which we have listed some funding sources.

Christensen stated that, we can study all this stuff, but this is just common sense, we don't need a quarter of a million dollars spent to study stuff any longer, it's just a matter of getting some political will behind a project, and get on with it. He added that we studied the Thompson Bridge merely as a courtesy to those people, as it isn't even in our purview. Grassel agreed, adding that if we are going to do something, and if it needs to be at the Thompson Bridge, then let's do it, but let's get it so that it is usable during high water. Christensen asked, then, why bother with a bridge at Merrifield. He said that we have a choice here, we do Merrifield or we do the Thompson Bridge.

Grassel commented that the reason we were thinking of putting a bridge at Merrifield was to get a farm-to-market bridge in to get some of that traffic out of the downtown area, particularly trucks and equipment. He stated that it was suggested that the Merrifield Bridge could be used a by-pass for trucks coming from the west, north, and south to go east. Kerian asked if a new Thompson Bridge would do anything to take care of these same issues. Strandell responded it would. He added that their road, from the Thompson Bridge to Crookston, was just redone a couple of years ago, at a cost of \$4 million dollars.

Christensen asked which bridge Polk County would rather have, the Thompson Bridge or the Merrifield Bridge. Strandell responded that the Polk County Board wants the Thompson Bridge retained.

Malm commented that, getting back to the issue of Minnesota/4th, he would agree with Mr. Grassel that it needs to be fixed if you want people to start using that corridor. He

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Friday, April 14, 2006**

added that since 1997 it has been quite difficult to get to Minnesota Avenue, what with all the road closures, and detours, so that may have some affect on usage as well.

Christensen asked what Mr. Grassel wants to do. Grassel responded that he is not really in favor of dumping a lot of money into the Point Bridge. He stated that that bridge never should have been built the way it was, but we can't do anything about it now.

Christensen commented that Grand Forks never should have sited Manvel as their landfill site, but they did, and they are living with that mistake now. He added that twelve years ago some council members made some decisions based on some information they got from somebody, and now we are paying for that.

Grassel stated that, getting back to the garbage issue, he was involved twelve or more years ago, back in 1992 or 1993, in all the meetings regarding the Grand Forks landfill issue because they knew they would be needing a new site someday in the future. He said that East Grand Forks has always been a part of the Grand Forks landfill, and they wanted them to be involved, but when they heard that Grand Forks might have to close it's landfill before a new landfill is ready, and they would probably need to take their garbage to Gwinner, East Grand Forks started looking at where they might be able to take their garbage for the lowest cost. He added that they still want to be part of the Grand Forks landfill, and part of the operation, but has Grand Forks approached them about this issue, no they haven't. He said that John Thompson has been in discussions with Todd Feland, but no one has formally approached them about any of this. Christensen stated that the landfill example was purely for illustrative purposes only, as the MPO is for street issues, but there are plenty of projects for us to get our arms around as a community. He asked if anyone wanted to be bold enough to suggest that we have a brief study, for about 12-cents, to determine what we should do with Minnesota/4th.

Malm responded that we have all the studies ever done on this corridor available, so he would just suggest bringing the issue up for a vote again. Christensen asked that Brad Gengler, City Planner, get this issue of improving Minnesota/4th on the Planning and Zoning agenda.

Lee commented that she would still expect that the Minnesota/4th neighborhood would not be in favor of improving this corridor. Kerian agreed, but added that the whole process needs to be followed, and the issue needs to be brought up again.

Christensen stated that when improving the bridge, we can perhaps improve the access to it as well. He added that he is actually thinking that that study should come from DeMers all the way to the bridge to determine if the road needs to be widened as well.

Discussion ensued, and consensus was that the issue concerning the Point Bridge, and the Minnesota/4th Corridor, be further discussed, and acted on later on the agenda.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Friday, April 14, 2006**

MOVED BY KERIAN, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO GRAND FORKS AND POLK COUNTIES TO PURSUE THE FUNDING NECESSARY TO REPLACE THE THOMPSON BRIDGE, AND THAT IT BE BUILT TO A HEIGHT ONE-FOOT OVER THE 100-YEAR FLOOD LEVEL.

Voting Aye: Malm, Kerian, Christensen, Lee, Grassel, and Strandell.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF 42ND STREET EVENT TRAFFIC PLAN UPDATE

Haugen reported that they have produced the final plan, in draft mode, and have included the key things that have happened since the last time the Executive Policy Board saw it. He added, however, that the one thing that hasn't happened, and they have been working with Mr. Duquette's office to arrange a meeting with CanadInn, but that hasn't occurred yet, although there have been several attempts made.

Haugen commented that another thing was, if you will recall, back in December we were looking at 17th Avenue extending west of 42nd Street, and then building 43rd as a complete access with a driveway for the south lot. He stated that at that time the cost estimate was for a full-bore concrete street, but we have now included in the packet an estimate for a more temporary roadway section, at half the cost of the other at \$260,000.

Haugen referred to the last page of the information in the packet, and reported that it shows the improvements at 38th Street and 32nd Avenue, and is a more refined concept than we previously showed. Kerian asked what is being done with this, other than what looks like some stripping. Haugen responded that they are adding an additional lane for the south-bound traffic.

Haugen stated that this draft was presented to the Technical Advisory Committee, and they recommend approval. He added that they have not had a chance to give this last draft to the Alerus Commission, nor to CanadInn at this time, so staff would ask that the Executive Policy Board receive and file the Technical Advisory Committee's recommendation until those two entities have a chance to review the document, at which time he would then place it on the May agenda for final approval.

Kerian asked where the funding for this will come from. Haugen responded that some of the costs, such as 38th Street and 32nd Avenue South, could be federally assisted because they are functionally classified roadways, and the improvements are not only benefiting the Alerus Center. He went on to explain that for the 11th Avenue access return lanes, staff was directed to work up budget sources for those, and the 43rd Street/17th Avenue temporary roadway wouldn't be eligible for federal aid, although because 17th Avenue is a functionally classified roadway, that portion may be, otherwise the remainder would be locally funded.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Friday, April 14, 2006**

Christensen asked if he was correct that this would be forwarded to the City Council for approval after the meeting with the Alerus Commission and the CanadInn. Haugen responded that that was correct.

Malm stated that he understands what is being proposed, and doesn't have a problem with it except that it creates a worse problem south of 32nd, as you would now be putting all of that traffic onto a street that nobody can figure out which side to drive on. He pointed out that the turn lanes are hard to understand, so someone may want to look into getting this street to function correctly. He added that if you do what is being proposed, you would have potentially two lanes going onto a one-lane street, so this should be looked at by the City. Lee pointed out that it appears that there would be enough room to widen the street in order to accommodate the additional traffic if needed. Christensen said that he agrees with Mr. Malm, that he avoids this street whenever possible. Haugen commented that the additional turn lane for right turners only, separating them from the through movements, and separating out the left turns from people coming from the north will help out this intersection a lot. Malm stated, again, that this intersection is just a mess, and if you are going to look at this, you should look to see what kind of improvements might be necessary, and he is talking about the City doing this as this is not the MPO's concern, we dealt with Alerus traffic problems, and the City needs to deal with this problem, but you have motels down there, and you have people that will move that direction, and rather than going on 32nd they will continue going south, and we laid this street out wrong in the first place.

Christensen stated that he agrees with what Mr. Malm has said, and you have Lowes and Target back there already. Malm added that we also have someone coming in behind Lowes now as well, a whole new commercial area behind Lowes that is coming in. Christensen said, then, that we should be considering taking that whole street and making it a collector street through that whole area. Malm commented, again, that you have hotels, restaurants, businesses, etc., there, and you are developing a whole new commercial area back there. Lembke reported that 32nd Avenue is controlled by the NDDOT, and he has been working with Bismarck to reevaluate some of the signal timings for this intersection, as well as 34th and 31st, to try to help alleviate some of the traffic problems as well. Christensen asked what Mr. Lembke wanted them to do with this plan as it goes forward. Lembke responded that this is one of those things in which we need to look at how we can program some of these improvements, and he would like to compare this to what the DOT comes up with with their evaluation because they are obviously looking more at the mobility of 32nd Avenue rather than getting traffic to and from events, so he will have to try to work with them as well as trying to come up with a plan to implement this plan so it works best for everybody.

Christensen said that we probably won't implement the plan until we get the second half of the plan figured out. Lembke agreed, adding that we will want to look at the larger picture of all three of these intersections to make everything work. Christensen stated that this will be a Planning and Zoning issue as well. Kerian asked if they were saying

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Friday, April 14, 2006**

that we wouldn't implement the north half of this plan until clearing up the problems with the south end of the plan. Christensen responded that that is correct, that if you do you would be dumping all those people into a real mess. Kerian commented that you would, however, also be allowing people going west to go west, so she isn't convinced that it would be a mistake to implement the plan, that it would make it better by allowing people who want to go straight to do so without being stuck behind people who want to turn. Lembke agreed that the plan does what it is supposed to, it gets people out of the parking lots and onto the roadways. He stated that, although you will still have some restrictive points that will cause some issues, with different signal timings during events we can keep people moving, and get them cleared of the area and disperse them faster, which is what the plan does, so we will need to figure out the details later.

Malm asked when the plan would be implemented. Haugen responded that it would be done as soon as the City can schedule it. Malm asked how long, if it is approved, before it would go in. Lembke responded that it could be implemented as soon as funds are available, that it could be built this summer if it needed to be, but he doesn't see that occurring as it hasn't been included in the budget, so as soon as it is budgeted, it can be done. Malm stated that the reason he asks is because when the CanadInn is completed you will have a mess, so it should be done as soon as possible.

MOVED BY LEE, SECONDED BY GRASSEL, TO APPROVE THE FINAL 42ND STREET TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN REPORT.

***Voting Aye: Malm, Kerian, Christensen, Lee, Grassel, and Strandell.
Voting Nay: None.***

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DRFT UPDATE TO THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN (PPP)

Haugen reported that originally Marissa Champion, MPO Intern, was going to give a presentation on the PPP, but other commitments have prevented her from being able to attend today, so he will begin, then possibly Julie Romig will be able to fill in.

Haugen stated that this is one of the new SAFETEA-LU requirements, that we have to do to broaden our Public Participation Plan, so we have been working with the Federal Highway, and the State's to come up with what it is that we need to address, and basically we need to consult with more special interest groups, and give them more opportunity to be involved in our planning processes. He said that this plan tries to address that by identifying who those people are. He added that we have also incorporated additional environmental justice issues as well.

Haugen said that this really just lays out, ahead of time, what it is that we've been doing all along, public involvement, by now giving a little more focus on some of the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Friday, April 14, 2006**

environmental groups, human services groups, so that they are more involved, more often, in the process.

Haugen commented that if you approve this draft today, it will then be put out for a 45-day public comment period, and, after receiving any comments from the public, and incorporating them into the final document, it will be brought back to the Executive Policy Board for approval.

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY KERIAN, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT MPO 2006 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN.

Voting Aye: Malm, Kerian, Christensen, Lee, Grassel, and Strandell.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF AWARDING AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY CONTRACT

Romig reported that the MPO received four proposals to perform the aerial photography for the Cities of Grand Forks and East Grand Forks. She stated that the best, and least expensive was Mark Hurd Company, at a cost of \$36,980,00. She said that the MPO budgeted \$25,000.00, so we are about \$10,000.00 short.

Romig commented that if we do go ahead with photography, Mark Hurd Company is the firm the selection committee is recommending we have do it. She stated that they are anxious to get started, as there is a very short window in which to do the shoot because it needs to be done before the trees have leaves.

Romig stated that they have solicited other departments to see if they can help with defray any of the \$10,000.00 shortfall, but haven't heard from anyone yet. Haugen commented that the City of East Grand Forks has agreed to contribute an additional \$2,000.00, and we have a similar request in to the City of Grand Forks and the Airport Authority. He said that the MPO would seek approval from the Executive Policy Board, and will work out getting the additional funds, including moving funds from other projects if necessary, as this body has indicted that this is a priority.

Christensen asked if the MPO feels this is a priority. Haugen responded that it is a nice thing to have, but is it a priority, no. He added that the MPO would have preferred to wait until next year when the flood protection project would be more substantially complete, but the discussion at the Technical Advisory Committee, and the MPO Executive Policy Board when we approved the 2006 budget was to keep it in, and do it this year.

Christensen asked if City staff felt the same way. Gengler responded that he would agree with Mr. Haugen, that it would be nice to have. He added that they are using 2003 imagery right now, and it would be nice to have more up-to-date information. Brooks

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Friday, April 14, 2006**

pointed out that, not only do the Planning Departments use this imagery, but the Assessing Departments, and consultants use it as well, and those are the ones that are contacting the MPO for more updated imagery. Christensen asked, again, if they want it now or do they want to wait for a year or so until the flood protection projects are more complete. Brooks commented that he thinks this year works. He added that he doesn't think there will be that much of a difference with the flood protection projects next year. Romig pointed out that if we wait, then we are working with images that really old, and these really should be updated every two years. Gengler stated that he would prefer to have it done this year.

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY KERIAN TO APPROVE AWARDED THE ORTHOPOTOGRAPHY CONTRACT TO MARK HURD TO PROVIDE 2006 AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY SERVICES FOR THE MPO AREA, CONTINGENT ON FINDING ADEQUATE FUNDING WITHIN THE CITIES.

***Voting Aye: Malm, Kerian, Christensen, Lee, Grassel, and Strandell.
Voting Nay: None.***

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE SCOPE OF WORK FOR THE SCHOOL SAFETY STUDY, AND TO AMEND THE MPO'S CONTRACT WITH ATAC

Haugen reported that the Safe Kids Coalition has received a grant from FedEx to do a safety study at three elementary schools. He explained that back in 2004 this same study was performed at Century School, and this one would look at Ben Franklin, Viking, and Kelly Schools. He explained that the MPO would essentially be acting as a pass-through agency for the funds to do this study. He stated that we have a contract with ATAC in place, which we will need to amend, then SafeKids will give us the money they receive to cover the cost of this work, and we will pay ATAC to do the work for them.

MOVED BY KERIAN, SECONDED BY LEE, TO APPROVE THE SCOPE OF WORK FOR THE SCHOOL SAFETY STUDY, AND AMEND THEE MPO'S CONTRACT WITH ATAC TO COMPLETE THE STUDY.

***Voting Aye: Malm, Kerian, Christensen, Lee, Grassel, and Strandell.
Voting Nay: None.***

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Minnesota/4th

MOVED BY KERIAN, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE MPO STAFF SEND A LETTER TO THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS REQUESTING ACTION ON RECONSTRUCTING MINNESOTA/4TH AVENUE.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Friday, April 14, 2006**

Voting Aye: Malm, Kerian, Christensen, Lee, Grassel, and Strandell.

Voting Nay: None.

2. Reschedule Traffic Incident Management Course

Haugen explained that the Traffic Incident Management Course that was scheduled to occur on April 6th, was postponed due to the flood. He stated that they would like to reschedule it for the week of May 15th, and asked that people let him know which date would work best.

After some discussion it was determined that Thursday, May 18th, would work best.

3. Update on Street/Highway RFP

Haugen reported that they are in final negotiations with URS Consulting Group, to perform out Street and Highway Update.

4. Update on Land Development Code RFP

Haugen reported that the Selection Committee met this morning, and are recommending hiring SRF Consulting Group to perform the Land Development Code Update. He commented that they did budget \$85,000.00 to do this update, however SRF is proposing just above \$95,000.00, and the Selection Committee is recommending that we try to work towards a \$90,000.00 to \$91,000.00 cost range with them to help us update the Grand Forks Land Development Code. He added that if the Executive Policy Board is willing to approve this increase, you could also authorize staff to negotiate with SRF not to exceed \$92,000.00.

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY KERIAN, TO APPROVE STAFF ENTER INTO NEGOTIATIONS WITH SRF CONSULTING GROUP TO PERFORM THE UPDATE TO THE GRAND FORKS LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$92,000.00.

Christensen asked if at the last meeting we did not agree that a committee would be appointed to help the consultant with this update. Haugen responded that we did agree to form a committee that will help shepard the code revision through, along with the consultant, and that committee does need to be formed. He added that Paula Lee is working on determining the make-up of that committee.

Christensen asked what the consultant will do. Haugen responded that they will take the existing Land Development Code and rewrite sections of it to meet the Land Use Plan's suggested changes, particularly how we treat our rural areas; the difference of how we do our PUDs, which, right now are our base zoning, and for which we will create overlay zones for the corridors of concerns; and take the concepts we have in the Land Use Plan

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Friday, April 14, 2006**

and put them into code text and graphics. He stated that we will take our existing code, which does not mirror our Land Use Plan, rewrite the code with the assistance of this committee, to come up with a code that matches the plan in order to be able to implement the concepts we agreed we want done through the planning process.

Christensen said that how he sees this is that it is a governmental function, where we have a PUD process in our code right now, and he just heard that there will be a review of the process, and perhaps some fundamental changes. Lee commented that the recommendation was made that, the way we do it now you cannot look at a PUD and know what the underlying zoning is, because this PUD has this, and that PUD has that, and another has something else, so the advice we got was to leave a base zoning, whether it be R-2, or I-2, or I-3, or whatever, and then put the PUD on top of that as an overlay so that someone can always look at the underlying zoning and know immediately what type of PUD it is. Kerian added, however, that we may change some of that zoning as well, correct. Lee responded that this may be possible, but the zoning and the PUD would be clearer when looking at it, but this committee will need to flesh that out.

Christensen asked who would be on the committee, adding that his concern is that there be elected people involved in this rather than appointed people because the elected people have to stand and take the heat. Lee responded that, just as a first draft they ended up with two city council members, three planning and zoning commissioners, a county representative, and a park district representative, as they want to get different constituents involved. Kerian commented that she feels this is kind of an extension of the committee that shepherded the Land Use Plan through, because you are really finalizing some decisions that were made in that process, and making recommendations as to what needs to be done to update the code. She added that it would still need to come back to the elected officials for approval, but that group has already been shepherding the process through, and would continue to do so.

Christensen stated that there are two issues here, one is to determine a consultant to assist with the update, and then to determine who will assist the consultant, and that isn't on the agenda at this time, correct. Kerian responded that that is correct. Christensen said, then, that we are only voting on the hiring of a consultant to assist the yet to be determined group of people to review our land use policies.

Kerian commented that the difference from the original staff recommendation is the increase in the cost. Christensen stated that there is also an additional \$72,000 in revenue that has been carried forward from 2005, so there are monies available to do this.

Voting Aye: Malm, Kerian, Christensen, Lee, Grassel, and Strandell.

Voting Nay: None.

Christensen asked if this now moves forward, with the consultant selected, is it now out of the MPO's process. Haugen responded that the MPO will just pay the bills, work with

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Friday, April 14, 2006**

the committee chosen, and work with staff to get it done. He added that they will look to Paula Lee to form the committee since she is the President of the Planning Commission. Christensen responded that they also have a Mayor, and a President of the City Council. Lee said that if anyone has any suggestions regarding the make-up of the committee, please let her know. She added that she agrees that it would be logical that this is sort of an extension of the Land Use Subcommittee. Christensen commented, however, that that is a very small body. Lee said that the committee shouldn't be very large, with either five or seven members. She asked if Mr. Christensen was interested in being on the committee. He responded that he may be, but he is more interested in making sure they have some staff involved. Lee stated that the issue of staff was discussed, but it was felt that they would be more of an advisory group. Christensen said that he understands this, but also feels that staff is smart and can offer a lot.

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO AJDOURN THE APRIL 14TH, 2006, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:33 P.M.

***Voting Aye: Malm, Kerian, Christensen, Lee, Grassel, and Strandell.
Voting Nay: None.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis
Executive Policy Board