

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE  
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Thursday, November 9<sup>th</sup>, 2006 – 12:00 Noon  
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-102**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Doug Christensen called the November 9<sup>th</sup>, 2006, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:12 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Chairman Doug Christensen, Punky Beauchamp, Craig Buckalew (proxy for Dick Grassel), Steve Gander, Gary Malm, Warren Strandell, and Art Bakken.

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

Guests present were: Ryan Brooks, GF City Senior Planner.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Chairman Christensen declared a quorum was present.

**APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 6<sup>TH</sup>, 2006, MINUTES**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY BEAUCHAMP, TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 6<sup>TH</sup>, 2006, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE FINAL 2006 HUMAN SERVICES COORDINATED TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

Haugen reported that the MPO is seeking approval of the Final 2006 Human Services Coordinated Transportation Plan, which has been submitted, and approved by both City Council's. He stated that Ms. Champion is here today in the event anyone has any questions or comments on the plan.

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

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that copies of information concerning funding options was included, as well as a copy of a Resolution that this body needs to approve be signed by himself and the Chairman.

***MOVED BY GANDER, SECONDED BY BEAUCHAMP, TO APPROVE THE FINAL 2006 HUMAN SERVICES COORDINATED TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND AUTHORIZE THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD CHAIRMAN, AND THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIGN THE RESOLUTION STATING SUCH.***

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

*Voting Nay: None.*

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FINAL DRAFT OF THE GRAND FORKS DOWNTOWN PARKING STUDY**

Haugen commented that, although Mr. Brooks is no longer an MPO employee, he has carried through on the completion of the Grand Forks Downtown Parking Study, and is here today to give a brief presentation of the study.

Brooks referred to a slide show presentation, and gave a brief overview (a copy of which is included in the packet and available upon request).

Presentation ensued.

Brooks reported that the process, assuming the MPO Executive Policy Board approves the study today, will be to finalize the report and contract, submit the report to the City of Grand Forks for their consideration and approval, and if approved the recommendation set forth in the staff action would be to implement the plan with further council action as necessary, amend the contract with NDDOT, and close out the contract.

**QUESTIONS/COMMENTS:**

Beauchamp asked how much the parking ramps are currently utilized. Brooks responded that for the most part they are utilized more during the day, but still only at about 50% utilization, and are really underutilized in the evening. Beauchamp asked how many parking spaces there are in the ramps. Brooks responded that there are about 300 to 400 spaces.

Beauchamp asked what it would cost to construct a parking ramp these days. Brooks responded that he doesn't know the answer to that, and it really wasn't even a consideration to construct another in the downtown. Beauchamp said that he understands that, but what he is suggesting is that if they can be made safer using cameras, lighting, security, etc., they may be utilized more. Brooks agreed, adding that they are also looking at recommending moving the reserved spaces to the upper levels instead of using the lower levels, which may help increase the usage as well.

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

***MOVED BY GANDER, SECONDED BY BAKKEN, TO APPROVE THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE GRAND FORKS DOWNTOWN PARKING STUDY.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF SCOPE OF WORK FOR THE TRAFFIC INCIDENT  
MANAGEMENT PLAN BRIDGE CLOSURE OPERATIONAL STUDY**

Haugen reported that staff has been working with A.T.A.C., Advanced Traffic Analysis Center, on coming up with an operational plan as we start closing bridges for flood protection projects, which is what originally how the scope of work was defined. He stated that they have since gone through the Technical Advisory Committee, and they commented that bridges are often closed for other reasons as well, and asked that we amend the scope of work to include other scenarios as well, and we have done that.

Haugen referred to page five of the scope of work document, and pointed out that they added the bridge closure sequence for flood protection, and then you see a table that includes some maintenance scenarios as well.

Haugen stated that with these additional items, staff feels we have a pretty good scope of work to help our communities identify traffic operational issues while bridges are closed. He said that the timeline for this is to have A.T.A.C. complete at least the flood protection closure portion done by the end of March so that it is in place in the event we need to use it this spring. He added that the maintenance portion can be completed by early next year.

Gander commented that, as we all know, community members are generally more intelligent than policy makers, so he was wondering if Mr. Haugen had a position for public input to the process, if that was part of the earlier meetings. Haugen responded that it was. He added that the Technical Advisory Committee also asked that BNSF be represented on the Stakeholder's Group as well.

Gander asked who; if after the first, second, or third closure, operationally we see a better way of doing things, would be the contact to continue tweaking the plan. Haugen responded that that would be part of the coordination that will come out of this study. He added that after you go through an emergency situation you always wonder what could have been done differently to make it work more smoothly, and that is what this study will help us identify.

Haugen commented that both MNDOT and NDDOT officials reminded us that they own two of the bridges, and should be included in the decision making process. Beauchamp suggested that it might be a good idea to set up a conference call every March with MNDOT and NDDOT officials to discuss what measures need to be taken each spring. Haugen agreed, and suggested that this might be something that should become a permanent agenda item on the March Technical Advisory Committee agenda.

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

***MOVED BY GANDER, SECONDED BY BAKKEN, TO APPROVE THE SCOPE OF WORK  
FOR THE TRAFFIC INCIDENT MANAGEMENT PLAN BRIDGE CLOSURE  
OPERATIONAL STUDY.***

Beauchamp said that, while he doesn't know if this is something the MPO can afford, it might be a good idea to look at the possibility of purchasing one of those large reader boards to alert the public to the fact that a bridge is closed, such as the one they used when the Point Bridge was closed earlier this year. Haugen responded that that is actually included in the ITS Plan.

*Voting Aye: Beauchamp, Buckalew, Gander, Malm, Strandell, Bakken, and Christensen.  
Voting Nay: None.*

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE GRAND FORKS FY 2008 NDDOT  
TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT APPLICATIONS AS BEING CONSISTENT  
WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND IDENTIFY AS A  
PRIORITY RANKING**

Haugen commented that this body just approved a T.I.P. document at it's last meeting, and now we have to begin the process of developing next year's T.I.P., with the first program up for discussion is the North Dakota Fiscal Year 2008 Transportation Enhancement Program. He stated that applications were due November 1<sup>st</sup>, and the MPO received one application from the City of Grand Forks, to reconstruct the bikepath on South 20<sup>th</sup> Street from 36<sup>th</sup> to 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue. He pointed out that they are asking for \$188,000 in federal funds, for a total project cost of \$305,000. He said that because this is an existing path, staff felt it was consistent with the MPO's Long Range Transportation Plan, and because it was the only project submitted, it was identified as having priority ranking.

Haugen reported that yesterday at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting there was discussion, and he referred to a map that was included in the packets that illustrates the project, and pointed out that at the very northern part of the map, it is suggesting that there is an existing bikepath north of 36<sup>th</sup> Avenue that runs up to 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, when in-fact there is only a bit of a sidewalk that runs along the west side, so even though the Technical Advisory Committee is not recommending this, staff is recommending that the MPO Executive Policy Board approve the application as submitted, forward it on to the State, and then send a request to the City of Grand Forks that they provide the remaining connection between 32<sup>nd</sup> and 36<sup>th</sup> Avenues South. He added, however, that another way would be to be a little less friendly and say that the MPO Executive Policy Board approves the application, but when it comes time to include it in the T.I.P. document, you want to work with the City to see termini that the project will connect to 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South.

Haugen commented that Grand Forks City staff has looked at that additional four block area, on the east side of 20<sup>th</sup> Street, by Lumber Mart and down past the Success Unlimited Store, and found that a five-foot sidewalk should be there, and that an additional three-feet can be added at a cost to the City of around \$20,000 to \$30,000. He stated that the five-foot sidewalk would be assessed to adjacent property owners.

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

Christianson pointed out that there are already two bikepaths located quite close to each other, within a few blocks, and asked why we wouldn't just tell the City to look for a different location for this bikepath. He referred to the map, using it to explain his reasoning, explaining that he doesn't think we need a path between 40<sup>th</sup> and 47<sup>th</sup> since one is already there. Bakken commented, however, that a path between 36<sup>th</sup> and 40<sup>th</sup> is needed, and that we need to connect it to 32<sup>nd</sup> so people can access it from the adjacent area. Christianson agreed that that would probably be okay, but he would save the City money by taking the money your asking be used for the 40<sup>th</sup> to 47<sup>th</sup> path and do the connection to 32<sup>nd</sup>.

Gander asked if nothing were done with the section being discussed, would someone else do something with it. Christianson commented that it is in about the same condition as those paths along the river. Hampsten stated that it is still rideable. Haugen added that the City sets aside maintenance funds for path maintenance.

Malm said that he agrees with Mr. Christianson, but also feels that you need to connect the path from 40<sup>th</sup> to 32<sup>nd</sup>, and it should all be on the same side of the street, don't criss-cross it.

Haugen stated that what he is hearing is that this body desire different termini, but he would suggest that we submit the application as it is written, and work with the City to adjust the termini before it is put into our T.I.P. document. Christianson responded that we don't want to approve it as it is written. Haugen explained that the procedural problem we run into is that we don't have time to take this back to the City Council for them to agree with our changes, we need to submit it this afternoon to NDDOT. Beauchamp reiterated that we just need to approve it as written, submit it to NDDOT, and then request that the termini be changed before it is included in the T.I.P. it if is approved.

Discussion on funding mechanisms ensued.

Haugen said that what he is hearing is that you prefer the section from 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue to 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South. Christianson responded that that would be correct, so we need to put that in because the City Council might decide to do it. Haugen commented that you need to be awarded money from the DOT first, and then when they announce we have received the funding, then we have the option to change the termini, but first we need to get the money.

Christianson asked if there was a bike committee in Grand Forks who, once this all happens, can determine how to best use the funds in that area. Haugen responded that staff is currently working on re-establishing a bike committee, whether by code or by Mayor Task Force. Christianson stated that we need to do this, and commented that there is still some Greenway funds that may be able to be used for this as well. Gander commented that the nice thing about a broader process is that you can really prioritize, so before you spend money one way, you can look things over to see if there is a better way to spend it.

Hampsten reported that there is currently a metro-wide bikeway committee for the Bike Friendly application, and we are trying to determine if it should be expanded or not. He added that there is, by ordinance a City Bikeway Committee, but it hasn't met for five years.

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

Hampsten pointed out that on the original project description, they did imply that they wanted to run it from 32<sup>nd</sup> to 47<sup>th</sup>, but the proposal, under project description 8 was from 36<sup>th</sup> to 47<sup>th</sup>, and under project description 10, where it describes how this project relates to surface transportation they imply it is from 32<sup>nd</sup> to 47<sup>th</sup>, so he doesn't see how shifting it to 32<sup>nd</sup> would be significantly different than the original proposal. Haugen commented, though, that this body now wants to work with the City to perhaps shift it from 47<sup>th</sup> to 40<sup>th</sup>.

Haugen reported that this application does need to be submitted, but reminded everyone that once approved, it will come back before this body for inclusion in the T.I.P., at which time we can request a change in termini. He stated that that is why he suggested that if you want to be kind and gentle you can just tell the Council that you want to see the path continued to 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, or, if you want more influence, you can say that we will work with the City to change the termini to include these locations. Christianson responded that he would prefer to be more firm, so let's approve it now, and deal more firmly later.

***MOVED BY BEAUCHAMP, SECONDED BY GANDER, TO APPROVE THE GRAND FORKS FY 2008 NDDOT TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT APPLICATION AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, TO GIVE IT A PRIORITY RANKING, AND TO RESERVE THE MPO'S RIGHT TO WORK WITH THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS ON DETERMINING LOGICAL TERMINI.***

***Voting Aye: Beauchamp, Buckalew, Gander, Malm, Strandell, Bakken, and Christensen.  
Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF DRAFT 2007-2008 ANNUAL UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM**

Haugen reported that the MPO does need to prepare a new new work program to cover FY 2007-2008. He stated that, as mentioned in the staff report, we have not formally received from either City staff what projects, in addition to our regular work, they would like us to do, but we wanted to give you an idea of the dollar amount we have available to us so he included copies of the funding tables for 2007 and 2008.

Haugen referred to the 2007 Annual Work Program table, and pointed out that those areas in which we do not have all of the money allocated to specific projects, such as Corridor Planning which has \$171,570 and Special Studies which has \$115,751, are areas in which Grand Forks and East Grand Forks City Staff are trying to work with MPO Staff to identify what additional studies they would like the MPO to accomplish for them. He stated that those request will be made available to the Executive Policy Board prior to the December meeting so you will be aware of what they want the MPO to look at including in their work program.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

1. NDDOT Draft Statewide Transportation Plan Update

Haugen reported that personnel from NDDOT attended the Technical Advisory Committee meeting yesterday, and gave a brief presentation on the Draft Statewide Transportation Plan

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

Update they are in the process of performing. He added that they then held an informational meeting last evening as well.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY BEAUCHAMP, SECONDED BY BUCKALEW, TO ADJOURN THE  
NOVEMBER 9<sup>TH</sup>, 2006, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT  
12:58 P.M..***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis  
Executive Assistant