

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

**Wednesday, September 6, 2006 – 12:00 Noon  
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-102**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Doug Christensen called the September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2006, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:10 p.m.

Christensen then welcomed Art Bakken, who has been appointed to replace Dorette Kerian on the MPO Executive Policy Board.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Chairman Doug Christensen, Punky Beauchamp, Dick Grassel, Steve Gander, Gary Malm, Warren Strandell, Rob Kweit, and Art Bakken.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; David Hampsten, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Marissa Champion, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF Executive Assistant.

Guests present were: Emily Hatfield, GF Engineer and Brad Gengler, GF City Planner.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Chairman Christensen declared a quorum was present.

**INTRODUCTION OF NEW MPO STAFF MEMBERS**

Haugen reminded everyone that the MPO did hire two new staff members in July. He introduced David Hampsten, and explained that he would primarily be working in the Grand Forks office. He added that David is a native of Grand Forks, has a graduate degree from UND and from Portland State, and came back here from Portland where he was most recently employed.

Haugen reported that the MPO's other new employee, Nancy Ellis, had a family emergency to attend to so is unable to be here today. He stated that Nancy is the former Polk County Planner, so many of you may already know her. He added that she will be working mostly out of the East Grand Forks office, and will be handling the East Grand Forks City Planning issues.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

**APPROVAL OF THE MAY 5<sup>TH</sup>, 2006, MINUTES**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY KWEIT, TO APPROVE THE MAY 5<sup>TH</sup>, 2006,  
MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Beauchamp, Grassel, Gander, Malm, Strandell, Kweit, Bakken, and  
Christensen.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2007-2010 T.I.P.**

- A. Adopt T.I.P.
- B. Certify Planning Process
- C. Long Range Transportation Plan Currently Held Valid
- D. Civil Rights Assurance

Haugen referred to the staff report, and pointed out that it states that the only major change made since the April Draft T.I.P. was presented was to move the 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue South project from FY 2008 to FY 2007. He added that there were also some minor cost adjustments made to various projects, and that future amendments may be necessary after further implementation of SAFETEA-LU.

Haugen commented that one other thing to note is that Minnesota is only adopting a three year T.I.P., with their 2010 projects being listed as illustrative projects, while North Dakota is adopting a four year T.I.P.. He added that this will change when we do the 2008-2011 T.I.P., as Minnesota will also adopt a four year T.I.P. at that time.

Haugen reported that, as noted in the Agenda, when we adopt a T.I.P., we also do several other things: 1) we certify that the planning process is in accordance with federal regulations; 2) we verify that our Transportation Plan is currently valid so that the projects are consistent with it; and 3) we do a Civil Rights Assurance to ensure we are keeping up with those programs as part of our funding obligations.

Haugen stated that the Technical Advisory Committee held a public hearing at it's last meeting, at which time no one was present for comments, so both the Technical Advisory Committee and staff recommend approval of the Final 2007-2010 T.I.P.. He added that, as a last note, this is also the program of projects document for the Grand Forks and East Grand Forks Transit Operators. Christensen asked what was meant by "Transit Operators". Haugen responded that each city is a federally designated transit operator, which directly receive federal funds, and they do have the option of having their own program of projects document, but have opted to combine them into one document, which we have to announce.

***MOVED BY KWEIT, SECONDED BY BEAUCHAMP, TO APPROVE THE FINAL FY2007-  
2010 T.I.P..***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

*Voting Aye: Beauchamp, Grassel, Gander, Malm, Strandell, Kweit, Bakken, and Christensen.*

*Voting Nay: None.*

**MATTER OF APPROVAL PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN UPDATE**

Haugen reported that the MPO was required to update its Public Participation Plan, and Marissa Champion, MPO Intern, has been working on that update, and is here today seeking approval.

Champion reminded everyone that a Draft Public Participation Plan Update was presented to them in April, and was approved at that time. She stated that this updates the 1994 plan, and will put the MPO into compliance with SAFETEA-LU.

Champion explained that a 45-day comment period was posted in May and June of this year, and communication was held with the MPO's Stakeholders, with very little response, but the comments they did receive were from Development Homes, the Northeast Human Service Center, and the ARC Upper Valley. She said that these three entities actually commented on our transit services, not on the Public Participation Plan itself, and she has been working with them on their issues, therefore she wouldn't recommend any changes be made to the plan based on their comments.

Champion reported that one major comment received was from the State Engineer, who recommended that we add Federal, State, and Local Water Managers as stakeholders, whom we do consult with during our planning processes. She stated that staff did make that change, and it reads as follows: "consult with Federal, State, and Local Agencies responsible for land use management, water resource management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation and historic preservation". She pointed out that this line was actually already in the plan, but that it did not include the words "water management".

Champion stated that staff would recommend approval of the 2006 Public Participation Plan Update.

***MOVED BY BEAUCHAMP, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE FINAL PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN UPDATE.***

*Voting Aye: Beauchamp, Grassel, Gander, Malm, Strandell, Kweit, Bakken, and Christensen.*

*Voting Nay: None.*

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO THE GRAND FORKS LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE**

Haugen reported that the MPO is working with the City of Grand Forks to make recommended changes to their Land Development Code, specifically any zoning ordinances and subdivision regulations that need to be updated in order to make them more in-sync with their new Land Use

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

Plan, which we helped them with earlier. He explained that during the review process some issues arose concerning other sections of the code that we did not have SRF under contract to review, so the study review committee asked that the MPO consider amending the Scope of Work with SRF to help us work through some of these issues.

Haugen referred to the staff report, and pointed out that it states that City Staff and MPO staff reviewed the scope and determined that sharing the added cost of \$14,800.00 should be split 50/50 between the MPO and the City of Grand Forks. Kweit asked, then, if he was correct that the MPO would be paying \$7,400.00, and the City of Grand Forks would be paying \$7,400.00. Haugen responded that that would be correct, and that a letter from the City of Grand Forks indicating this was included in the packets.

***MOVED BY GANDER, SECONDED BY BAKKEN, TO APPROVE AMENDMENT  
NUMBER 1 TO THE GRAND FORKS LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE UPDATE.***

***Voting Aye: Beauchamp, Grassel, Gander, Malm, Strandell, Kweit, Bakken, and  
Christensen.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON HUMAN SERVICES COORDINATED TRANSIT PLAN**

Haugen reported that development of a Human Services Coordinated Transit Plan is a requirement of SAFETEA-LU. He explained that a couple of years ago, when we were updating the Transit Development Plan, one of the things we identified at that time was an increase in federal transit funds flowing to the State of North Dakota, which congress did approve, however the monies were placed in programs that require that we prepare a locally developed coordination plan between Public Transportation and Human Service Agencies. He explained that Marissa Champion, MPO Intern, has been working on developing a plan for the MPO, and is here today to give a brief overview. He added that staff has presented a draft copy of the document to both the Public Safety Committee of the Grand Forks City Council, and to the East Grand Forks Working Committee to alert them of the document, as well as the need to it in order to make us eligible for federal funds that we could apply projects to.

Champion then gave a brief overview of the plan, explaining that it makes the MPO area eligible for three additional transit programs: Section 5310 – Elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities; Section 5316 – Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC), from which Grand Forks did receive some monies to start up their night bus service in 2000; and a new program called “New Freedom”, which is for projects that are beyond ADA requirements.

Champion reported that this project requires very extensive public participation, and instead of consultation it requires coordination, and in order to achieve this the MPO has been working with an extensive list of stakeholders the past few months to develop this plan. She pointed out that a list of those stakeholders was included in the packet.

Champion referred to the staff report and pointed out that it lists the group’s five prioritized strategies, giving a brief overview of each strategy:

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

- 1) Ongoing Coordination Council
- 2) Implemented Marketing Plan
- 3) Enhance existing services
- 4) Expansion of services
- 5) Uniform Reporting

Champion reported that the next step in the process is, in order to make the entire area eligible this plan needs to be approved by both Cities and the MPO. She stated that this would be approved as a separate plan, outside of our current Transportation Development Plan, and will allow us to apply for federal funds from the States of Minnesota and North Dakota. She commented that there are two pots of money in each State, one for the urbanized area and one for the rural area, and we have been working with the State of North Dakota to see what their distribution process would be, and what type of application timeline they might have. She added that they are currently projecting that they will have funds available for distribution January 1, 2007, and would include both 2006 and 2007 funds. She commented that they have identified some projects that they would like considered. She stated that this coordinated plan will guide us for the next five years.

Champion explained that the projects they identified include:

- 1) Marketing – use funds to do some marketing in order to increase usage - \$60,000 for a plan and \$60,000 to implement the plan.
- 2) TDP Planned Activity to split Routes 8/9 on the Grand Forks side – allows us to serve the Industrial Park and the 42<sup>nd</sup> Street Corridor using Job Access Funds and the New Freedom Funds, with an estimate of about \$160,000, and a 50/50 match
- 3) Mobility Manager – heavily promoted by the State of Minnesota to use funds for a Mobility Manager - \$46,000 annually with an 80/20 match.

Haugen stated that staff is not asking for final approval of this plan at this time, but will do so at the October meeting. He added that once a plan is in place, then we can determine which projects we want to apply for funding for.

Christensen referred to the powerpoint slides and pointed out that the first slide states that the 2005 Transportation Bill, “SAFETEA-LU” requires locally developed coordinated plan to be eligible for three FTA funds. He stated that this tells him that if we don’t have a plan in place we won’t be eligible for these funds. Haugen responded that that would be correct. Christensen asked if we were getting any of these funds now. Champion responded that we were not getting any of these funds currently. She added that other communities receive JARC funds now, but they have to have an Access to Jobs plan, or something similar that doesn’t include the two other funding sources. She said that this new requirement of SAFETEA-LU makes sure that we include the three new programs in one coordinated plan.

Haugen explained that rather than just giving the current 5307 program transit operators, like our two operator’s are, an increase in funds, congress specified that those monies will go into these

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

programs, which have a very targeted group that they are hoping to serve, and to further ensure that they are reaching those targeted groups they are requiring that we develop a coordinated plan with those groups. He said that this would mean that everyone would be eligible for the funds, not just the 5307 operators.

Christensen stated, however, that we already have the money now to take care of our transit services, and we aren't losing any grant money are we. Haugen responded that we are not, but added that we do have expansion needs, which are indicated in our TDP, and the only way we can do that is through these programs.

Bakken asked for clarification. He said that it is his understanding that we have the funds necessary to run our service now, but in order to add to our existing service we need these additional funds, and to get them we need to adopt this plan. Haugen responded that this is correct, that our current plan is to add those services. Christensen said, then, that he is hearing that we don't have a bus going down 42<sup>nd</sup>, so we would be adding a route. Haugen responded that this would be correct. Christensen asked if we have enough buses to do this, and how much will it cost. Haugen responded that it will cost about \$160,000, and we need to find a way to fund 50% of those costs as it isn't currently included in the budget, so by approving this plan we would be able to obtain the federal funds necessary to operate that route. Champion added that if you want to improve the efficiency of the current system, these funds could be used to do that, to do more marketing in order to increase ridership, and to hire a Mobility Manager.

Bakken asked what ridership has done over the last four years. Christensen responded that it hasn't gone up much, if any. Champion stated that East Grand Forks has decreased. Haugen added that it decreased because, as part of our streamlining, we stopped doing the school trippers, so the ridership numbers have been going down primarily because we dropped the school trippers. Bakken stated that he has a concern with adding to our program, especially if we aren't utilizing what we already have, although he does understand that it is nice to have access to funds, so we probably should adopt a plan in order to get that access. Christensen added that he also sees having to add another staff person, so he wants to know how we split the costs, 50/50 with East Grand Forks. Haugen responded that there is a fully allocated cost model that is used to determine how the transportation services are split between the two communities. He said that currently it is based on the peak vehicles being operated, with nine buses running, so Grand Forks is paying 8/9<sup>th</sup>'s of the costs and East Grand Forks is paying 1/9<sup>th</sup> of the costs for personnel. He pointed out, however, that if you do the 8/9 split, then we would have 10 buses running, so the division would be 9/10<sup>th</sup>'s and 1/10<sup>th</sup>. Christensen asked if the purpose of doing the 8/9 split would be to get a bus to go to the Industrial Park. Champion responded that we currently do not have a bus going to the Industrial Park. Christensen pointed out, however, that people are still getting out there.

Discussion on pros and cons of offering bus service to the Industrial Park ensued.

Bakken asked what the timeline is for the 80/20 match. Haugen responded that SAFETEA-LU will be in effect until 2009, and what Congress will do after that point is anyone's guess, but they

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

started this program, and have invested a lot of time and funding, so it would be unlikely that it would end even after 2009.

Christensen stated that what concerns him is that we have these stakeholders, some of which have two buses, who are free to attend any of our meetings and choose not to do so, but in any event it seems like we have something now that works, and now we are going to add another advisory group, which is fine, as far as advice is concerned. Champion commented that you also have to understand that these entities are just as capable of applying for these funds as we are. She stated that this isn't necessarily about us extending our service and having a financial commitment to it, because they could, with this plan, go ahead and get one or more non-profits working together to do a service. Christensen responded that that would be a real good idea for the non-profits to engage in, to find this money and provide access for the handicapped to the Industrial Park. Beauchamp stated, however, that they would still need to have this plan in place for them to do so as well.

Haugen explained that when the MPO does it's T.I.P. solicitation, beginning this fall, we will do a solicitation for these funds, and, let's say Grand Forks wants to apply for some money and Development Homes wants to apply for some money, we, as an MPO would prioritize those applications and submit them to the State so there would be a competition not only between City Departments, but also between the non-profits and human service agencies for these programs. He stated that right now this is new to those agencies, so they aren't identifying, nor are they able to determine which projects they could do with these funds, but the money is there so we identified some projects that were already approved in the TDP that would be eligible, that we were told would be done once Canad Inn was completed, and the splitting of 8/9 is one of those projects. He added that we can certainly not do any of these projects, and we can work with the human service agencies to submit some projects, but that means that unless they get their projects in place by December, we won't get funding for 2006 or 2007, and will be waiting until 2008 to get funding from these programs.

Christensen asked, if we do this, how do we avoid hiring an additional staff person, as he doesn't feel we need a Mobility Manager on the Grand Forks side. Kweit responded that we don't have to hire an additional staff person under any circumstances, that that is just one of the options that the stakeholder's laid out for us. He stated that it seems to him, especially if staff is going to be developing a plan, that we need to put that plan into place which would provide options for us or the non-profits down the road. Christensen agreed, adding that by doing so we would be facilitating their mission, and they can do it themselves once we facilitate their access to funds. He added that he doesn't think, however, that there is much of an appetite right now in the council to mess with our transportation plan because this is the second year of our combined system. Haugen responded that this wouldn't be messing with it, it would simply be fulfilling what we said we would do in the TDP.

Christensen asked, if we approve the concept, and council approves it, would staff still be required to come to the council for approval of projects. Haugen responded that there are two separate issues here, one is to approve the plan, then once the plan is in place projects can be submitted, and those projects that are being submitted by city departments would need to go to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

the City Council for approval, and if they don't get approved by Council, then they don't get to the MPO for ranking.

Bakken stated that he feels approving the plan is fine, that having access to funds is a good thing as we will eventually want bus service on 42<sup>nd</sup>. Christensen agreed, adding that he is interested in getting service to the Industrial Park for people who need help getting there. Grassel asked, then, if he was correct that if we adopt the plan, we aren't committed to hiring an additional staff person. Champion responded that that would be correct.

***MOVED BY BAKKEN, SECONDED BY GRASSEL, TO APPROVE THE HUMAN SERVICES COORDINATED TRANSPORTATION PLAN.***

Haugen stated that staff was not seeking approval of the plan at this time. He added that a final draft document will be submitted for approval at that October meeting.

Motion and second withdrawn.

**MATTER OF FHWA FINDINGS ON MPO PLANNING**

Haugen reported that earlier this spring he informed this body that Federal Highway was going to be conducting a review of the MPO process, and he did include a copy of the questions they would be asking. He referred to the packet, and pointed out that a copy of the report from FHWA was included. He explained that they did state that we are in accordance with requirements we are supposed to follow, but did highlight some things they felt we were particularly strong in, including how we develop our work program by soliciting ideas and activities we can do, our efforts to improve communications and coordination in safety and security issues, and our effort to fulfill the new SAFETEA-LU requirements. He said that they also remind us that SAFETEA-LU requirements will take some extra work to accomplish, and that operation and maintenance cost will need to be more fully considered in our financial planning. He pointed that they also listed some suggested improvements, which we aren't required to do, but which we are encouraged to consider. Bakken stated that he would assume we would try to implement some of these suggestions over the next three years. Haugen responded that, again, while these are not requirements, we will most likely want to have some discussion on whether or not we want to implement any of these suggestions over the next three years. Bakken commented that his experience is that even though these are only suggestions now, when the DOT comes in and audits us in the future, if we haven't done any of them the review gets way worse.

Kweit referred to the statement regarding Title VI, and asked if the last discussion they had about establishing a committee of Social Service Providers would help us with this issue. Haugen responded it would.

***MOVED BY KWEIT, SECONDED BY BAKKEN, TO RECEIVE AND FILE THE FHWA MPO PLANNING REPORT AS SUBMITTED.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

*Voting Aye: Beauchamp, Grassel, Gander, Malm, Strandell, Kweit, Bakken, and Christensen.*

*Voting Nay: None.*

**MATTER OF DISCUSSION ON 2008-2011 T.I.P. SCHEDULE**

A. N.D. Transportation Enhancement Solicitation

Haugen reported that although we have just finished completing the 2007-2010 T.I.P., we are now beginning the 2008-2011 T.I.P. process. He stated that he did issue a notice for the transportation enhancement project on the North Dakota side, which are due November 1<sup>st</sup>.

Haugen stated that, as part of this process, Dr. Gander asked that, for his scheduling purpose, we layout some suggested meeting dates for the MPO Executive Board's action, so the last three pages of the packet are a complete T.I.P. schedule to show when projects are due to us, when the Technical Advisory Committee will meet, when public hearings are scheduled, and when the MPO Executive Policy Board needs to make decisions. He referred to the last sheet, and explained that it suggests, based on the preceding schedules, when the MPO Executive Policy Board will meet, which typically occur immediately following a Technical Advisory Committee in order to meet the deadlines set. He went over the schedule briefly.

***MOVED BY GRASSEL, SECONDED BY BEAUCHAMP, TO APPROVE THE TENTATIVE MEETING SCHEDULE FOR THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD.***

*Voting Aye: Beauchamp, Grassel, Gander, Malm, Strandell, Kweit, Bakken, and Christensen.*

*Voting Nay: None.*

**OTHER BUSINESS**

1. **POINT BRIDGE PAINTING PROJECT**

Grassel asked if during previous discussions anything was mentioned about not painting the light standards. Hatfield responded that new standards have been ordered, however they are on back-order, and will be put in as soon as they arrive, sometime in October.

2. **UPDATE ON SOUTHEND PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE**

Haugen stated that at the August 28<sup>th</sup> Grand Forks City Council Meeting Curt Kreun asked if someone could report on the status of the southend pedestrian bridge, specifically what is happening on the East Grand Forks side of the bridge. He said that Greg Boppre, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer, told him that the trail in East Grand Forks will be completed by the end of September, so that bridge should then have a connection at that time.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

3. FUNDING FOR ONGOING MAINTENANCE OF GREENWAY

Christensen asked if there was anyway the MPO could help locate funding necessary for the ongoing Greenway maintenance in both cities. He stated that Grand Forks has already developed a fund for this, but any additional assistance would be greatly appreciated.

Gander commented that East Grand Forks is currently in the process of hiring a Parks and Recreation Superintendent, and Tim Schroeder, a Professor of Recreation and Leisure at the University of North Dakota, and an East Grand Forks resident came to speak to them about some of the parameters they should look for in a Parks and Recreation Superintendent, and something he did during that visit was to point out the shoddy maintenance of their trail system. He said that he also commented on the fact that Grand Forks has guard receptacles, benches, etc., and East Grand Forks does not. He added, however, that they are caught in the middle because at one time the DNR was going to take over their Greenway, including the maintenance, and now that isn't going to happen so they are now in the process of having to put together a plan to add those elements into their Greenway, as well as their maintenance costs, so it would be nice if they could get some funding to do all of this.

Christensen stated that he spent some time in Fargo last week, and, as you know he likes to run on the trails, and they have a real nice system of maintaining their trails, so if we could find some additional funding to help us do the same it would be most appreciated, so he would like to request that staff look into the possibility of finding funds to do this.

4. INFORMATIONAL LUNCHEON MEETING ON ESTABLISHING A QUIET ZONE FOR TRAIN HORNS

Haugen reported that two dates have been suggested, either Monday, September 25<sup>th</sup>, or Wednesday, September 27<sup>th</sup>, at 12:00 noon, to have a meeting to provide information on what Quiet Zones are, how you can establish them, the costs involved, and the advantages and disadvantages of doing them.

Beauchamp asked if BN would be attending this meeting. Haugen responded that they had been invited, but they haven't responded yet. Beauchamp suggested that they might want to consider funding some psychological evaluations on some of their engineers, because there is one that starts out by Mallory, and he grabs the horn for miles. Gander commented that he talked to someone from BN and he said that they have the technology to monitor their conduct before, through, and after each intersection, and if they are two seconds short on what should have been a fifteen second blast they are written up because federal guidelines mandate the duration of a signal. Beauchamp asked if they get written up for blowing the horn too long as well. Haugen responded that they can. He added that there is also a complaint process available as well.

Haugen reported that there are two key elements to implementing a Quiet Zone; 1) they require you have at least a one-half-mile buffer on either side of the crossing in which you have the train quieted, and because intersections in Grand Forks and East Grand Forks are less than a half-mile apart, the question is whether or not the State Line truncates that half-mile difference; 2) if you

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

have one Quiet Zone in a community, and you want to establish another Quiet Zone you have to have at least one crossing between those two Quiet Zones that isn't part of a Quiet Zone. Gander asked if there could be one large Quiet Zone. Haugen responded there could.

Beauchamp asked if the crossing had to have cross-arms on them. Haugen responded that they did. He explained that we have parallel streets located close to the crossings, in the downtown in particular, that the only real solution would be quad-gates so there are gates on both sides, and then, because you are having four arms come down you have to have vehicle protection inside in the event a vehicle gets stuck inside. Gander asked if you would also need a pedestrian closure as well. Haugen responded you would, adding that you would also need to have a pedestrian escape route, and you would need to fence in-between the two crossings because they are so close together, so it is a very pricey venture.

Haugen stated that you can have partial Quiet Zones, which would mean not allowing any crossings between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.. Christensen asked if that would mean we have to build overpasses. Haugen responded that you just don't allow anyone to cross at 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> in Grand Forks and Central, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> in East Grand Forks.

Malm commented that unless BN is present, this would all be rather fruitless because they change the rules all the time. Haugen responded that these are not BN's rules. Malm stated that Fargo put up every barrier available to stop the noise. Haugen responded that the Federal Railroad Rule was not in place when Fargo was going through their Quiet Zone application. Christensen asked if this was a new rule. Haugen responded it was. Gander asked if there would be some kind of cost share involved with the railroad for this. Haugen responded that there is a cost share component, although it is quite minimal.

After some discussion it was determined that the meeting be held on Wednesday, September 27<sup>th</sup> at 12:00 noon.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY KWEIT, SECONDED BY BEAUCHAMP, TO ADJOURN THE SEPTEMBER 6<sup>TH</sup>, 2006, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:20 P.M..***

***Voting Aye: Beauchamp, Grassel, Gander, Malm, Strandell, Kweit, Bakken, and Christensen.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis  
Executive Assistant