

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2006 – 1:30 p.m.  
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-102**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2006, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:36p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Greg Boppre, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks City Planner; Wade Swenson, NDDOT-Grand Forks; James Bittman, MNDOT-Bemidji; John Thompson, Grand Forks City Traffic Engineer; Kent Ehrenstrom, MNDOT-Bemidji; Lane Magnuson, Grand Forks County Planner; Steve Solwei, (via conference call), NDDOT-Bismarck; and Mark Johnson (Via conference call), FHWA-Bismarck.

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

Guests present were: Mark Aubol, Grand Forks Street Maintenance Supervisor; Troy Schroeder, NWRDC; Jason Carbee, URS Consultants; Craig Johnson, Corps of Engineers (St. Paul District); Mohammad Naser, ATAC-NDSU; Jason Baker ATAC-NDSU; Diomo Motuba, ATAC-NDSU; Shawn Birst, ATAC-NDSU; Jerry Skyberg, EGF Building Inspector; and Randy Gust, EGF Fire Chief.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

When meeting convened at 1:36 p.m. a quorum was not present, therefore agenda was suspended for discussion.

**SUSPEND AGENDA**

Haugen stated that he would suspend the agenda to hold discussion on Agenda Item VI.

**MATTER OF STREET AND HIGHWAY PLAN UPDATE**

Haugen referred to information contained in the packet, commenting that it is that section of the plan that covers crash analysis data. He stated that this body has already received copies of the goals and objectives, has seen the issues map and level of service information previously, therefore that information was not included today's packet. He added that everyone was also alerted to the fact that the draft report of the existing conditions was available for review on the MPO's website.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

Haugen reported that this information will be presented to both City's Planning Commissions in order to allow us additional public input. He stated that Jason Carbee, URS, is here today to give a brief power-point presentation (which is available for review on the MPO's Website).

Presentation/Discussion ensued.

Haugen referred to the crash analysis summary, and pointed out that when they did the Access Management Study for Highway 2 in East Grand Forks, the crash analysis information shown for the Kennedy Bridge segment was part of that study, and when they looked at the data for that segment they thought there may be some coding errors taking place, so they are concerned that the data may indicate more of a problem than there really is. Carbee stated that these are GIS figures, and could be incorrect, so he will do further research to ensure the correct numbers are shown.

Carbee commented that the next steps will include finalizing the existing conditions evaluation, which is currently shown in draft form; developing future traffic conditions, for which they are currently wrapping up the allocation of future housing and employment growth for the study area; and reviewing potential improvement alternatives.

**RESUME AGENDA**

Haugen welcomed Lane Magnuson, and stated that because a quorum was now present, he would resume the agenda.

**APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 8<sup>TH</sup>, 2006, MINUTES FOR THE MPO TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY EHRENSTROM, SECONDED BY SWENSON, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 8<sup>TH</sup>, 2006, MINUTES FOR THE MPO TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF 2007-2008 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM**

Haugen referred to copies of the 2007-2008 Unified Planning Work Program, and the staff report, that were included in the packets, and pointed out that staff did solicit requests from both Cities for work activities. He stated that they did receive City Council approval of activities to be considered in our Work Program from both Cities.

Haugen commented that copies of, what are our assumed funding tables are for two years, were distributed previously. He said that the Draft Work Program was submitted to our State DOT personnel for their review and comments, and those comments are included in this draft.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

Haugen said that the big items for 2007 include completion of the Street and Highway Plan Update and bringing our Alternative Transportation Modes Plan up to SAFETEA-LU compliance. He referred to Page 29 of the document, and pointed out the various projects that we will be undertaking; explaining that we will continue with the Bridge Closure Incident Management Study in 2007; will try to determine how best to provide transit service to the South 42<sup>nd</sup> Street and Industrial Park areas; will do a study of East Grand Forks' Central Avenue; will do an unsignalized intersection study for Grand Forks; will take a look at some school safety issues, including trying to develop a more metro-wide uniform approach on how to control traffic around our schools; and will maintain the MPO's T.I.P. to ensure that all federal requirements are being met.

Haugen went on to explain that most of our focus in 2008 will be to perform some related studies which we are anticipating coming out of our Street and Highway Update, including a Columbia Road Corridor Study; a 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Interchange Justification Report; a Minnesota/4<sup>th</sup> Avenue Corridor Study; and an Arterial Signal Optimization Study that will pick up from where we left off a couple of years ago when we did Washington Street from Gateway to 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue.

Haugen stated that he would like to hear whatever comments the Technical Advisory Committee might have, and would like to forward on the Committee's recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board for their action. He asked if there were any questions or comments on the draft submitted. There were no questions or comments submitted.

***MOVED BY THOMPSON, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD TO APPROVE THE 2007-2008 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE ALTERNATIVE  
TRANSPORTATION MODE PLAN**

Haugen referred to the staff report, included in the packet, and explained that they are trying to bring the transit portion of the Alternative Transportation Mode Plan up-to-date. He reported that the Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan, developed by the MPO, has been approved and adopted by both Cities, and the MPO, and now needs to be incorporated into the Long Range Transportation Plan, so, in the event we are ever awarded any JARC/New Freedom funds they are in compliance with our Long Range Plan.

Haugen commented that another thing we are doing is, in our Transit Plan, prior to the passage of SAFETEA-LU, 5307 allocations were relatively flat, and now with the passage of SAFETEA-LU, and the authorized levels they are projecting, we are amending our financial plan to incorporate a 5% increase in the 5307 program.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

Haugen stated that staff is requesting preliminary approval of the proposed amendment from this body, after which it will be forwarded to both Planning Commissions and City Councils for their approval and adoption, and will then return to this body for a final recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board.

***MOVED BY EHRENSTROM, SECONDED BY GENGLER, TO GRANT PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION MODE PLAN – TRANSIT SECTION OF THE 2030 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF 2008-2011 T.I.P. PROJECTS**

- a. Schedule
- b. North Dakota Transit 5316 and 5317

Haugen reported that, via an e-mail that he sent to most present, as well as in the staff report included in the packet, discussion was held between the MPO, City Staff, and NDDOT concerning a request that the City of Grand Forks made asking for an extension for submittal of their street and highway projects of one month, which NDDOT has indicated they will grant.

Haugen commented that because of this request, where we normally would have a very thick packet of information to approve at our December meeting, we will not be doing so until our January meeting, which, as indicated in the staff report, is also when Minnesota's projects need to be submitted for approval as well. He added, however, that there are still a couple of projects that need to be submitted to the MPO Executive Policy Board for action at this time.

Haugen explained that North Dakota has requested applications for the 2006 JARC and 2006 New Freedom Transit monies. He said that the City of Grand Forks has gone through their approval process and have three projects they would like considered: 1) Extend fixed-route service to the 42<sup>nd</sup> Street/Industrial Park area, with a request for \$85,000 in federal funds; 2) Start Saturday service earlier. He explained that about ten years ago, when there were some financial issues plaguing the Public Transportation Department, it was determined that we would delay the start of Saturday service until 10:00 a.m., this proposal will allow for the Saturday Service to begin at the same time it does Monday through Friday for both the fixed-route and dial-a-ride systems, with a request for \$29,000 in federal funds; and 3) Implement Sunday service, taking the service we provide in the evening, from 6:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m., with a one-hour headway loop fixed-route system, with demand response, and run that during the bulk of the normal work day on a Sunday, with a request for \$19,000 in federal funds.

Haugen commented that, as part of the action you just took, to preliminarily approve the amendment to the Alternative Transportation Mode Plan, the City Council is requesting we forward these applications on to the NDDOT for consideration. He stated that staff is recommending approval.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

Haugen reported that the other application we have before us is from the Grand Forks District Office, and involves some transportation enhancement activities. He referred to a map, and explained that we normally react to urban requests for transportation enhancements in North Dakota, however a couple of years ago we received our first District request, which competes for a different pot of funds which are separated out from the enhancement program. He said that at that time the District was successful in getting funds for an enhancement feature at Gateway Drive and 55<sup>th</sup> Street, and now are again submitting a request for funding to do some enhancement activities along I-29. He referred to the maps that were included in the packets, and went over the proposed projects. He stated that the cost of these projects is estimated at \$120,000, with a 90/10 split.

***MOVED BY SWENSON, SECONDED BY THOMPSON, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD TO APPROVE THE REVISED SCHEDULE FOR THE T.I.P. PROJECT SUBMITTALS, TO APPROVE THE JARC/NEW FREEDOM PROJECTS AND THE NDDOT-GRAND FORKS DISTRICT TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT PROJECT AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND TO GIVE PRIORITY RANKING.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE GRAND FORKS ACCESS  
MANAGEMENT STANDARDS**

Haugen reported that MPO staff has been working with the City of Grand Forks, under our 2006 Program, to help them do some code revisions on how they regulate land uses. He stated that one of the things we have been working with them on is to modify their Access Management Standards. He explained that Grand Forks has a long history of controlling accesses inside the City, which has worked fairly well for urban spacing, and over the past couple of years there has been a lot of rural growth taking place, and trying to have urban accesses in a rural setting was not working, so we have been working on helping them create a separation of urban access spacing and rural access spacing.

Haugen referred to a map, commenting that it is available on the City's website, and essentially uses the City's Land Use Plan to project areas they feel will be urban areas in the future (shown in a darker grey). He stated that they are maintaining the City's current urban access spacing requirements, which essentially set a 150 spacing on the some of the lower volume roadways, 660 for medium volume roadways; and 880 for higher volume roadways. He said that everything else that is under the City's control, out to the four-mile line, falls under rural access spacing requirements, with 660 for lower volume, 1320 for medium volume, and 2640 for high volume roadways.

Haugen stated that another thing staff worked with the City on was to separate out access control from functional classification. He explained that in the past, the City needed MPO, State, and Federal Highway approval for functional classification changes, and this needed to be addressed.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

He added that based on the City's desire for more access control, where previously two separate functional classification maps were developed, we devised a way of separating out access control management from functional classification. He pointed out that a copy of this map was included in the packet.

Haugen commented that now, when the City of Grand Forks wants to manage their accesses differently on the different roadways, they are able to use an internal City amendment process rather than having to formally request approval from the MPO, NDDOT, or FHWA to do so.

Haugen reported that the first formal public input meeting was held just last evening on these changes, as well as how rural development will be managed. He added that staff would also like to get a professional reaction from this body on these proposed changes as well.

Bittman referred to the map, and asked how access was being provided for smaller parcels of land, if access would be provided from the backside of those properties. Haugen responded that that would be correct, that the preference would be to provide rear access to those properties. He added, however, that they are not proposing to close any existing access at this time, but as development occurs they will try to modify access as needed to meet the spacing guidelines set.

Information only.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**MATTER OF BRIDGE CLOSURE INCIDENT MANAGEMENT PLAN**

Haugen thanked A.T.A.C. for being present today to give an update on the Bridge Closure Incident Management Plan. He asked that everyone introduce themselves as there were many new people present.

Shawn Birst, A.T.A.C., distributed copies of an agenda for today's presentation (a copy of the agenda and presentation are included in the file and available upon request), and gave a brief overview of the Bridge Closure Traffic Management Study Project. He stated that he would appreciate any and all input.

Presentation ensued.

Birst reported that the primary purpose of the study is to provide safe and efficient traffic flow during special events, also known as bridge closure events. He stated that this is not only for the general public's sake, but more importantly for the emergency management personnel to be able to get where they need to be in a timely manner. He added that the primary reason for a bridge to close is spring flooding, with three of the six highest crests having occurred in this area since 1996, with each event requiring several days of bridge closures and road closures. He

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

commented that the U.S. Highway 2 Access Management Study, which was conducted by HDR and Floan-Sanders, the U.S. Highway 2 Access Management Study, showed that River Road was closed for over 150 days over an eight year period, which is pretty significant period of time.

Birst stated that they also want to address maintenance activities as well. He explained that any time a bridge needs to be closed for maintenance, traffic issues occur, so we need to have a plan in place to deal with those issues.

Birst said that the final purpose of the study is to develop a plan to deal with major incidents such as severe crashes.

Birst explained that the study objectives include: 1) evaluate and improve traffic management and operations; 2) develop protocols for closing and reopening bridges; and 3) develop traffic management strategies for various bridge closure scenarios.

Birst stated that today the primary objective is to gather information from the stakeholders in terms of what each agency's authority is, and whether or not they have any documented policies and procedures they follow during each closure event. He said that Mr. Haugen did forward him some documents, including one for the Corps of Engineers that addresses flooding events on a global scale; but they would like to get similar information from other agencies involved as well.

**DISCUSSION/COMMENTS:**

Birst asked that each agency explain which bridges, if any, they close during a flooding event; whether or not they provide any traffic management plans, as far as detour routes, etc., are concerned; is that information disseminated over public radio, or by some other manner; etc..

Thompson responded that during the last flooding event, communication was an integral part of their efforts, and he felt that everything went quite well.

Aubol commented that when they do bridge closures, in the past, because the Point Bridge closes first, they look at the forecast to determine when it might reach the closure stage, waiting until the last minute, then they alert the public, media, etc., that it will be closed on this date, at this time, and then they coordinate the closure with East Grand Forks. He stated that the Sorlie Bridge is the next bridge that closes, and they basically follow the same procedure with it as well.

Birst asked if there was a public works team that is activated during flooding events. Aubol responded that as soon as spring hits, we activate the Emergency Management group, meeting at least once a week to keep everyone updated, and continue until the event is over. Birst stated that he would assume, with the Sorlie Bridge, that staff is in contact with MNDOT and NDDOT as well. Aubol responded that they are in contact with both entities.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

Thompson commented that there is always a lot of pressure to keep the bridges open as long as possible, however, with the new flood walls it works better if they can close them a little earlier than they used to. Birst asked how long it takes, on average, to put the flood walls up.

Thompson responded that it depends on how high they need to put them in. Boppre referred to a copy of a map of East Grand Forks, and explained that basically the City is divided into two islands during flooding events. He said that they meet as an emergency management team, and take all issues into consideration before making a decision on when to close a bridge site. He added that there is always some political pressure involved, both during the closure process when they want the bridges left open as long as possible, and during the reopening process when they want them opened as soon as possible, so they just have to do what they feel is safest and best for everyone.

Gust stated that during flood events they do pretty much the same thing as Grand Forks does, holding meetings at least once or twice a week prior to flood stage, and then once it hits flood stage they open up the Emergency Operation Center and meet every morning, and a lot of decisions are made at that time. He added that they do try to include their City Councilmembers and the Mayor in these decisions, but they understand that there are just some things that staff needs to do to keep everyone safe.

Haugen said that it might be a good idea to clarify for everyone why we are doing this study. He explained that the MPO was asked, when two of the three bridges closed during the last flooding event, and Gateway Drive became extremely congested, to determine if there is a better way to manage traffic during such incidences. He stated that staff agreed they could do this as they have some tools, and have a contract with an agency, A.T.A.C., who could assist us in developing a better management plan for traffic flow, so a scope of work was developed to inform A.T.A.C. what it is we would like them to do for us. He said that one of the first things added was to not only manage the traffic, but also to help develop a coordination plan between the two Cities, MNDOT, and NDDOT.

Boppre commented that he felt that last spring's communication between the two cities was the best they ever had, partly because of the Corps project, but also because they have closure plans available on both sides, so if there were communication gaps, he would think it they were more on the political side, not from staff. Aubol agreed, adding that on ground level, he felt everything has gone quite well the last two years, but added that there may have been some issues behind the scenes, politically.

Birst stated that it appears that a lot of what occurred during last year's flooding event was people just kind of taking it upon themselves to contact the appropriate staff, as there is nothing really documented in terms of who contacts who when. He said that on the Grand Forks side the Corps had a table that indicated that when the water level hit a certain stage, this action should be taken, and on the East Grand Forks side there was a map that basically said the same thing, but the bridges are at different elevations on each side, so the Corps' table might suggest closing a bridge on the Grand Forks side, while the East Grand Forks map may not say to close it on their side at that time, and you can't close only one side, so you need to coordinate that and close it

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

according to the elevations on the lowest side of the river. Aubol responded that they do have such a document, that this information is all included in their flood plan, showing the elevations on the East Grand Forks side as well. He stated that he would get him a copy of this document.

Discussion on signage, and detour routes ensued.

Gust commented that East Grand Forks is somewhat lower than Grand Forks, but each City may have different areas of concern at different times, therefore signage is imperative on both sides to alert the public of what may be occurring on one side or the other. Aubol agreed, adding that Grand Forks may never need to put their flood wall up at the Point, but will put up signage alerting the public that the bridge is closed on the East Grand Forks side.

Birst said that it appears, then, that all the bridges are close by the Cities. He asked if the DOTs are involved. Bittman responded that the DOT should be the entity, at least on the Sorlie, Kennedy, and Mallory bridges, to make the final decision on whether or not to close one of those bridges, at least traffic wise. Aubol said that they contact the Les Noehre, NDDOT, and let him know that this is the day the City is closing a certain bridge, thus coordinating it with them as well. Bittman commented that in terms of reopening a bridge, the DOT should be doing an inspection of that bridge before it is reopened, thus the politicians should have no say as to when a bridge should be close or reopened.

Boppre asked if MNDOT would participate on getting signage for the Mallory Bridge in the event it would need to be closed. Bittman responded they would.

Birst stated that this is why it is such a good idea to have a coordinated document that lists the procedure to be followed for any type of event requiring the closing of a bridge, whether it is a flooding event, maintenance, traffic incident, or something else.

Birst asked if there was a joint media center that alerts the public as to what is occurring during any kind of event. Aubol responded that Grand Forks lets the City's Public Information Office know what is occurring, and they in-turn alert the media. Gust said that the East Grand Forks Police Department faxes this kind of information out to the media. Aubol added that both Cities alert each other as well.

Birst asked if anyone had anything else to add, as far as agency protocols are concerned. He pointed out that some agency members were not present today, particularly the BNSF representative, and he wondered if there were times when the rail operations might affect detour routes during events, and if they should contact BNSF to see if something could be worked out during those times. Aubol responded that BNSF has closures on their main track, so when the water level reaches a certain point they have so much time to get the track out in order to allow the City to be able to put their flood walls up in those areas. Birst asked, prior to that occurring, when the Point and Sorlie Bridges are closed, and traffic is re-routed, does their rail activity really impede traffic flow, particularly in the downtown area. Thompson responded that there

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

really isn't a problem in the downtown, but there is a spur near the Kennedy Bridge that causes problems at times, so that might be something to look at changing.

Haugen asked if, on the north point of the Louie Murray Bridge, when the Point Bridge is closed, at 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, just south of US Business 2, does that track cause traffic flow problems. Boppre responded that it does. Gust added that anytime a train crosses at that point it causes traffic problems as the Louie Murray is a main access point for the two schools located in the Point Area. Aubol commented that even during non-events trains cause traffic problems, and you can write letters asking them to work with the Cities, but they just won't comply, and it doesn't seem to matter if there is a flood, or an emergency of any kind, they just don't care.

Haugen reported that they did invite Peiter Hjertstadt, the Yardmaster for Grand Forks, and he did visit with him about the State Mill area, not really thinking about the problems East Grand Forks has at that time, and he said that they have a scheduled train run with the Mill, but if they know they shouldn't be running they will work with the Mill to change the run times if possible.

Birst asked if during flooding events do the Cities just inform the Corps of what they are doing, or does the Corps give some initial guidance, or just as requested. Johnson responded that the Corps attends both City's meetings, and since they have been building the flood control project, they have incorporated it's features into each City's flood plans, and work with each City during these events to ensure everyone is informed as to what is occurring and when.

Birst thanked everyone for their comments and input, and stated that they would take this back and put together a summary of what has been shared today. He added that they would also contact some of those agencies that were not present today to get their input, and include that as well.

Haugen commented that one of the things that would really help would be for everyone to get all useful information concerning this issue to MPO staff. Aubol stated he would get a copy of Grand Forks' plan after the meeting. Bittman stated that he would mail a copy of MNDOT's manual as well.

Birst continued with the presentation, specifically discussing various bridge closure scenarios, traffic management plans, and detour routes available for each area affected.

Hampsten asked if the schools were in session during flood emergencies, as, taking Sacred Heart for example, when you set up detours you would have increased traffic around the school on both sides, which would be a safety issue. Haugen added that half of the elementary age children attend school on the south end of East Grand Forks, and the other half attend on the north end, so people are crossing bridges to get their children to school, and that needs to be taken into account when determining detour routes as well.

Discussion on detour routes ensued.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

Boppre asked if this plan would also provide funding options to help with the purchase of additional signage required to implement it. Haugen responded that this may be a good use for HSIP program, the safety program. Boppre asked how much funding was available each year. Haugen responded that to apply for these funds the first thing that would need to be done would be to develop a strategic highway safety plan, and neither state has one developed yet, so that would need to be done. He added that in order to do that local agencies, the MPO, etc., need to be involved in the development of that plan, which would be the time to ask that they include flood fighting, and flood routes a part of that plan, as well as signal timing.

Skyberg asked if there would be any way to address the people living in the Point Area, to try to get them to use the Mallory Bridge, and come up 5<sup>th</sup> to get to Grand Forks and/or the north end schools. He stated that it is hard to educate them to the fact that that may be the fastest route for them to use during events, but it would be nice if we can attempt it somehow. Birst responded that they can look at including the Mallory Bridge in the plan.

Hampsten asked if transit service was provided in East Grand Forks during flood events. Haugen responded it was.

Birst stated that the next step would be to finalize the detour routes, so they will make a couple more runs to determine the effects of the various bridge closures, run that information by the stakeholders one more time to make sure everyone is in agreement as to what the best scenarios are, then they can look at estimating the travel time impacts because of these closure events, and then develop the timing plans for the selected detours. He added that they will also provide some guidance on traffic control devices, such as at Mallory Bridge.

Birst commented that a key component for the stakeholders is the timeline for implementation of the plan. He said that they are now in the process of gathering information from various agencies, then we will need to decide how that information impacts each side, and then provide a draft coordinated plan for both sides of the river by March, with a final plan in May.

Birst stated that they also have a stakeholder training event planned, whereby they will come up with a couple of mock scenarios and see the agencies go through them using the document to determine if it is of value. Bittman suggested that some kind of sign-off sheet for all agencies involved would be good, indicating that they approve of the plan. Haugen stated that this is sort of a sub-group of the Technical Advisory Committee, and this will go through the TAC's approval process, which the DOTs are members of, so we would have to assume that if the DOTs are approving it at the TAC level, it should mean that it is an approved document from their perspective, so when we approve it at the MPO Executive Policy Board level, we already have the buy-in from the DOTs and the stakeholders involved.

Bittman stated that he would still like to see some kind of official sign-off on the plan, that what your talking about, procedures for closing bridges is not just a matter of approval at a meeting, there should be an official buy-in by our district engineer that they agree as well. Haugen responded that the flood protection manual should be the document that is being approved by

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

everyone, but it is the incident management and maintenance schedule that might need to be signed-off on.

Thompson commented that there may be a need for a supplemental decision making document that says that when the water gets to a certain level, and predictions are that it will get to a higher level, at that point we do this no matter what actually occurs. Aubol stated that he thinks the reason for doing this is, whether we are doing maintenance, or there is a flood event, we can flip open our manual and say that this is how we are going to set up our road closures, here is where we are going to put our detour route, and it is approved by everyone as being the best scenario for that particular event at that particular area. Boppre agreed, but added that what he thinks John is trying to say is that anytime you have a flood, and a prediction of, say 44-feet, East Grand Forks personnel will meet on a daily basis, Grand Forks personnel will meet on a daily basis, because the flood levels change each spring, so we just adjust based on our reactions to what is occurring each spring, so he doesn't think there is a "true guideline" that will say we do this here, and here, and here, but instead we will be getting guidance as to how we should react at that time. Aubol agreed that we react each day, but the whole thing is that when you walk out of that meeting that day, and the forecast is that the level will go to 42-feet, and we have agreed that we are going to close a bridge at 42-feet, we know where we are going to put our detours at that time, and we go out and implement that plan using a coordinated effort.

Information only.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis  
Executive Assistant