

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2007 – 1:30 p.m.  
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-101**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2007, meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 1:30 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: John Thompson, Grand Forks Assistant City Engineer; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks City Planner; Charles Durrenberger (proxy for Brad Gengler), Grand Forks Planner; Dean Wieland, East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Traffic Engineer; Jim Bittman, MNDOT- Bemidji; and Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks; Kent Ehrenstrom, MNDOT-Bemidji; Lane Magnuson, Grand Forks County Planner; Dale Bergman, Cities Area Transit; and Stacy Hanson (proxy for Paul Benning), NDDOT-Bismarck.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, MPO Executive Director; Ali Rood, MPO Intern; Teri Nelson, MPO Planner; and Peggy McNelis, MPO Executive Assistant.

Guests present were: Marie Baker and Steve Grabill, Ulteig Engineers; Tim Mitchell, FHWA-Minnesota; Cindy Carlsson, MNDOT-St. Paul; and Mark Johnson, FHWA-North Dakota.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Haugen declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 10<sup>TH</sup> AND NOVEMBER 14<sup>TH</sup>, 2007,  
MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

***MOVED BY WIELAND, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 10<sup>TH</sup>  
AND NOVEMBER 14<sup>TH</sup>, 2007, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF NORTH DAKOTA TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT  
APPLICATION PRIORITIZATION**

Haugen reported that back in November the priority order was different than what is being suggested today. He explained that when this item was presented to the MPO Executive Policy

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2007**

Board one of the Grand Forks members asked that the Grand Forks City Council be allowed to reconsider the priority ranking of the projects that they previously adopted.

Haugen referred to the packets and pointed out that the staff report that city staff submitted to the Grand Forks City Council is included. He explained that previously the South Washington project, which is a separate multi-purpose path from 47<sup>th</sup> to 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue, was ranked first, and the English Coulee path, which involves the reconstruction of the path from 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue South to a point just north of 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, was ranked second. He stated that this has now been reversed and is being brought back to this body for concurrence of the council's decision.

Haugen stated that staff recommends the Technical Advisory Committee approve the North Dakota Transportation Enhancement Applications as being consistent with the Long Range Transportation Plan, and identify the priority ranking as submitted by the City of Grand Forks.

***MOVED BY THOMPSON, SECONDED BY DURRENBERGER, TO APPROVE THE NORTH DAKOTA TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT APPLICATIONS AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND IDENTIFY THE PRIORITY RANKING AS SUBMITTED BY THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF NORTH DAKOTA 2009-2012 T.I.P. PROJECT SUBMITTALS**

Haugen reminded the committee that according to the T.I.P. process projects have to be submitted in December for consideration in the next T.I.P., so we are now considering projects for 2009 through 2012. He reported that the staff report lists those projects that are either new, or have substantial financial changes. He added that on the North Dakota side they also request projects for the fifth year on the regional system be identified as well.

Haugen stated that he does have some scoping worksheets for these projects, however not for all of them at this time. He referred to the staff report and went over it briefly. He added that Minnesota's deadline for project submittals is January, so we will be going through this next month as well.

**URBAN ROADS PROGRAM**

**Fiscal Year 2009 Projects:**

Haugen reported that under the Urban Roads Program the first project listed in the staff report is the rehab of the lift station at the intersection of Columbia and 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South. He pointed out that the cost of this project has increased substantially, from \$260,000 with \$208,000 being federally funded to \$540,000 with \$432,000 being federally funded. He added that the portion of this project that is on the Regional System went from a request for just over \$1,000,000 in federal funds to just over \$1,700,000 in federal funds. He added that the reason for this cost

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2007**

increase is due to the fact that the City of Grand Forks just recently bid out a similar lift station project and the result of that bid indicated that the numbers shown for this project were considerably low.

Haugen stated that in the project submittal list that Grand Forks fills out for the DOT, listed as Page 62 in the packet, because of the cost increase of this project in 2009, at the advice of NDDOT the city has labeled their current Cherry Street reconstruction as a pending project in 2009. He explained that if the bid prices come in at a reasonable amount, and sufficient programmed monies are available, the project will be done in 2009, however if that is not the case then that project may be moved back to 2010.

**Fiscal Years 2011 and 2012 Projects:**

Haugen reported that in both 2011 and 2012 the City of Grand Forks has identified a request for intersection improvements, although they have not specified which intersections will be improved. He said that this is something that Bismarck has done for a number of years in their T.I.P.. He added that when they get to the annual element they then identify the specific intersection and amend their T.I.P. to show that project in more detail. He explained that what this does for the City of Grand Forks is allows them to capture \$400,000 of Urban Roads Program funds for those two years, and allows them access to those funds for intersection improvements.

Haugen commented that another new project for 2012 comes from a request from NDDOT Grand Forks District and the City of Grand Forks to upgrade the downtown traffic signals. He stated that the cost of this project is estimated to be about \$1,000,000, with the federal amount being split 50/50 with half from the Urban Roads Program and half from the Regional Highway Program. Noehre said that this is still being worked out, adding that there could still be more coming from one or the other.

Haugen referred to the City Staff list and pointed out that there are some projects shown that are already in the current T.I.P. which didn't have a significant enough cost increase or description change to be noted, but they are being carried forward for the next T.I.P. go around as well.

**REGIONAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM**

**Fiscal Year 2009 Projects:**

Haugen reported that one new project for 2009 is a slurry seal of 5<sup>th</sup> Street (U.S. Business Highway 2) from Gateway to University Avenue. He said that this project has an estimated cost of \$200,000 with \$160,000 being federally funded. Noehre stated that there is one correction to this project. He explained that it should actually included that portion of U.S. Business Highway 2 from Gateway to the Sorlie Bridge, or the entire 1.2 miles.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2007**

Haugen commented that the next project on the Regional System is the lift station at 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South and Columbia that was discussed before.

Fiscal Years 2010 and 2011 Projects:

Haugen stated that one new project for either Fiscal Year 2010 or 2011 is the repair or replacement of a pier for the Kennedy Bridge. He said that the estimated cost of this project is \$1,000,000 with an assumed 50/50 cost share with MNDOT.

Fiscal Year 2012 Projects:

Haugen commented that one of the 2012 projects is the updating of the downtown traffic signals, which was already discussed previously.

Haugen stated that the other 2012 project is a request from the NDDOT Grand Forks District, along with the City of Grand Forks to complete two projects on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South. He explained that the first segment is a reconstruction/rehabilitation project between 31<sup>st</sup> Street to 37<sup>th</sup> Street, with a cost estimate of \$1,800,000 and \$1,620,000 being federally funded; and the second segment is a rehabilitation of the pavement between 15<sup>th</sup> Street and 25<sup>th</sup> Street, with a cost estimate of \$2,150,000 and \$1,935,000 being federally funded.

Thompson said that he would make these changes on the staff submittal list and redistribute it at that time.

**HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

Haugen commented that later on we will be discussing the Minnesota H.S.I.P. Program, but at this time he is not aware of any H.S.I.P. application process for North Dakota.

**DISTRICT INITIATED T.E. PROGRAM**

Haugen stated that in Fiscal Year 2011 the NDDOT GF District is requesting a landscape project for a segment of Gateway Drive between the Airport and 55<sup>th</sup> Street at an estimated cost of \$300,00, with \$240,000 being federally funded. He stated that this project will be in conjunction with an overlay project in 2011 and will compliment the entrance feature the city installed at the intersection of Gateway and 55<sup>th</sup> Street. Noehre commented that the project will actually go out to just past the Airport entrance. He reported that there was actually an error on the map he provided as well and therefore he would recommend striking the first part of the third sentence of the project description that states that this project will be in conjunction with an overlay project in 2011 because the overlay project is actually in 2010. Haugen added that he would also suggest that the split in cost share should actually be the Urban Aid Boundary instead of the MPO Urban Boundary. Noehre commented that the cost share is actually what has been requested, not what has been approved at this time.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2007**

Haugen reported that the last thing, as he mentioned earlier, is that North Dakota requests that on the regional system an additional year of project information be included. He said that Mr. Noehre is submitting a project that is similar to what is already programmed to occur on Gateway Drive. He said that it will include the rehabbing of Gateway Drive between I-29 and 55<sup>th</sup> Street, with an estimated cost of \$3,500,000 and \$2,800,000 being federally funded. Noehre pointed out that the spreadsheet shows the estimated cost of this project as being \$2,300,000 while the staff report shows \$3,500,000. He said that the scoping report he submitted shows it as being \$2,300,000.

Haugen stated that for information purposes on the Urban Program side the city has identified three projects: 1) intersection improvements being carried into 2013; and 2) some work at Columbia Road. He said that these projects are not being formally forwarded to the NDDOT at this time.

Haugen pointed out that he did state that the project worksheets would be attached, but that did not occur because he did not receive all of them but if anyone is interested he would be happy to provide copies of what he does have available at this time.

***MOVED BY THOMPSON, SECONDED BY NOEHRE, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PROJECTS, WITH NOTED CHANGES, AS BEING CONSISTENT, AND TO GIVE THEM HIGH PRIORITY RANKING.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF MINNESOTA H.S.I.P. PROGRAM**

Haugen reported that MNDOT has released its H.S.I.P. Program application for Fiscal Years 2009 and 2010. He referred to a copy of that announcement, as well as supporting materials, that were included in the packet and explained that Mr. Bittman would be going over that information briefly.

Bittman stated that MNDOT and FHWA have had many conversations on this and have finally come to an agreement as to how they operate this program. He explained that their ATP has been ahead of the curve a little by actually soliciting for projects for this last year, however there were not any projects submitted at that time. He said that they hope to get more interest this year.

Bittman explained that in the past they were just given a dollar amount that they were supposed to set aside and dealt with through the ATP, but this is now being handled by the Office of Traffic, Safety and Operations (OTSO).

Bittman reported that in the past there were three separate programs: Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), High Risk Rural Roads Program (HRRRP) and Central Safety Fund. He said that in an effort to simplify the process one application with one deadline will be

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2007**

used and the MNDOT Selection Committee will evaluate those applications, prioritize them, and determine the best funding source for each. He then gave a brief explanation as to how the monies will be distributed to each district. He added that because our area has the lowest percentage of fatal crashes, we get the least amount of monies from the program.

Bittman commented that currently the emphasis for rural areas in Minnesota is to look at 30% reactive types of projects and 70% proactive types of projects. He added that one stipulation is that these have to be stand-alone projects, whereas in the past we were able to count dollars within bigger projects as H.S.I.P., that is no longer the case. He also pointed out that he did not see anything in the new regulations that would prevent East Grand Forks from applying for some of these dollars.

Bittman stated that right now they are soliciting for projects for 2009 and 2010. He said that every two years they will come out with a new breakout of dollars versus accidents so they will have to set that aside within their ATP, as was done in the past.

Haugen referred to the staff report and pointed out that on page one of MNDOT's announcement, bullet three makes reference to the Strategic Highway Safety Plan, and if you look at the Strategic Highway Safety Plan it basically states that the MPO areas are to develop their own data driven process, and result in recommendations. He said that you will see from our data that on our Minnesota side, and this shows up in the Highway 220 North Corridor Study that we do have a couple of intersections that have a high critical crash rate, so from our data, reactive projects would most likely include those two intersections. Bittman commented that when you look at doing the intersection projects on 220 North, he would think they are viable projects, but he would recommend that you work with Mike Kamnikar on the ICE evaluation.

Haugen stated that the deadline for submittal of projects to the Central Office for consideration is February 1<sup>st</sup>. He said that he didn't notice anywhere where the MPO had any sort of signature that indicates it is consistent with its planning efforts or not, so he isn't sure what role we have prior to submittal in February, but he is sure that whatever application is submitted it will utilize a lot of our information.

Information only.

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON SCHOOL CROSSING TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE  
STRATEGY STUDY**

Haugen stated that back in the fall the Technical Advisory Committee and the Executive Policy Board approved the RFP for this study. He said that after the RFP was approved, it was sent out, submittals were received and the Selection Committee met, interviewed, and selected Ulteig Engineers to do the study. He commented that the first Steering Committee meeting was held just prior to this meeting, and introduced Steve Grabill and Marie Baker, from Ulteig, who were present to give a brief update on the study.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2007**

Grabill stated that this is a very interesting and needed study for this community. He added that Grand Forks is not alone in the issues it faces regarding school safety. He said that almost any community you go into the signing and traffic control decisions were made over time, made by multiple individuals, some were made for technical reasons, some for political reasons, and because of this you end up with many different kinds of traffic control devices and signs, and he isn't criticizing what has been done, just making an observation.

Grabill reported that this study is really intended to take a look at the overall use of school traffic control around the schools in order to determine what is currently out there and then to help develop strategies for future implementation of traffic control around those same schools. He stated that this study is somewhat unique in that most other studies that the city or MPO are involved in, such as a corridor study or project concept report in which you have a specific project in mind, and your analyzing all these individual sites, while this study will not involve going into a site by site analysis. He explained that one reason for not doing that is because there are a number of schools, and it would be a very exhaustive and significant effort to do that. He said that the way the RFP was set up, and the Scope of Work was set up requires that they will essentially be using the MPO's and City's data bases, specifically their GIS resources, and use it to identify some of what is going on out there today, and use that information to serve as a reality check so that as they start to develop strategies they can see what kind of implications those strategies will have.

Grabill commented that, as Mr. Haugen stated, they met with the Steering Committee earlier and presented their current efforts. He said that they started on the study in October and to-date have been working with the inventory available, although they have had some trouble with it. He explained that the inventory does not document the pavement marking so when you open up the aerial photography it is very difficult to see where the pavement markings are, so since they started the MPO has gone back into the GIS data base and have started to document where some of the existing pavement markings are, specifically crosswalks.

Grabill stated that when you are working with a study area this large, and you are trying to look at the data base, when you focus in on intersections there are a lot of signs at those intersections, and when they shrink it down to a plottable map some of those signs overlap and actually disappear, so as they have started to look at your inventory they have had a few problems in recognizing exactly what is out there, but they are working with the MPO and the Steering Committee to try to identify where they might be missing information, or to help them understand what is there.

Grabill reported that what they have identified to-date is that there are a lot of conditions out there, including having more than one type of cross-walk. He referred to a map and pointed out that by looking at the top and bottom cross-walk layout you will see that there is a mixture of things going on today. He said that if you consider just the pages in the Manual of Traffic Control Devices, which is their main guideline and which was adopted by both federal and state entities, and is the first resource they look at when trying to determine what should be out there from a signing, marking, and traffic control point. He added that they will also be using the ITE

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2007**

website and other resources as well to try to bolster their understanding of what is the state of the art and what is the state of practice.

Grabill stated that their intent is to use those resources to help tell us what shall be done or what may be done, and then from there, once they have identified best practices, they will move forward and try to develop some strategies on how these best practices should be implemented in the City of Grand Forks for all of the schools. He pointed out that we do need to recognize that because we have elementary, middle, and high schools, we may have some different strategies that will apply to each. He commented that they have everything from mid-block crossings, school speed zones, and other types of traffic control issues that these strategies are going to attempt to address.

Grabill said that the biggest challenge, and this was discussed with the Steering Committee, is that some may feel that when they develop these strategies they don't go far enough and some may feel they go too far, but when you look at the federal guidelines and the state of the practice there is a lot of wiggle room, and when you try to develop strategies to help eliminate some of that wiggle room things get complicated. He said that one of the things they heard from the committee today is that if you have too many cross-walks people become desensitized, which they agree is true, and they do plan on addressing that, but then the question becomes how do you put that into a strategy, which will be their hardest task, to try to develop strategies that in some cases will be guidelines or rules of thumb, while in other cases they may be a more stringent rule the city may choose to use as a criteria from which to make decisions.

Grabill referred to a power point presentation that was included in the packets, and stated that what they will be using at tonight's open house will be very similar. He said that they want to be able to explain to the public that when you are talking about school zones, you need to be aware of the many different types of signs used such as stop signs, pedestrian crossing signs, speed limit signs, flashing beacons, etc.. He stated that they talked about four different types of traffic control strategy with the Steering Committee: 1) pavement marking or cross-walks; 2) signs, which have a narrow application; 3) flashing beacons – which have an even narrower application; and finally the most narrow application 4) innovative traffic control devices.

Grabill reported that one of the things they understand led to the request for this study is the fact that there are always new ideas coming out, everything from in-pavement crosswalk markers to changeable message speed control signs to different types of signals, so there are a lot of types of control and without a strategy it is very difficult to make a decision to implement any of these devices because we are always concerned with setting a precedent. He stated that it is hoped that this study will help you make a decision so that you can consider what type of precedent you are willing to set, and then as you re-evaluate all of your existing school sites you can use these strategies to help you make decisions that are consistent and in conformance with state and federal rules and guidelines.

Grabill stated that they are on scheduled, and are meeting with the public this evening at 5:30. He said that this is the first opportunity for the public to come and give their input on this. He

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2007**

added that after this they hope to have a draft report available as early as this time next month, which will actually be about a month ahead of what was anticipated, so things are going well.

Bittman pointed out that the cost shown for the in-pavement marker is much lower than what the cost of putting one in in East Grand Forks was. Grabill responded that the costs shown in the packet is strictly for materials only at this time. He added that their intent is to have implementation costs for everything in the final report.

Haugen stated that a couple things he would like to add is that we know we have some signs that were in compliance with the manual when they were installed, but they are no longer in compliance and need to be removed by 2011. He said that this is all part of the strategies they are trying to develop, to try to reduce the number of signs that have to be replaced, and to identify signs that do need to be replaced as well. He commented that the Steering Committee is a great group of people who are active in Safe Kids Coalition Pedestrian Safety Task Force, and he thinks that by having this study done they can observe and understand a little better all of the decisions that have to go into providing school safety.

Information only.

**MATTER OF DRAFT DOWNTOWN PLAN SCOPE OF WORK UPDATE**

Haugen reported that in the MPO's Annual Unified Work Program it was identified that we would be updating the downtown plans for both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks. He explained that prior to issuing, and having the Technical Advisory Committee and Executive Policy Board decide on the RFP and final Scope of Work included in that, he thought it would be a good idea to present a draft Scope of Work for discussion and comments. He stated that, assuming everything is okay, a final RFP would be presented for approval in January.

Haugen referred to the staff report and pointed out that it states that both cities have a document called the Riverforks Plan, which is still a sort of downtown governing plan done in 1994, but of course since the 1997 flood occurred, part of the issue this update is trying to address is the fact that many different downtown plans have been developed for both cities, and while there are some consistencies between these plans, there are a lot of inconsistencies as well, and those need to be addressed. He added that in 2003 the MPO did a traffic circulation study of the downtown area, so this update will try to combine everything into one document again.

Haugen referred to the Scope of Work and pointed out that there are four points they are trying to address: 1) Transportation; 2) Land Use, 3) Urban Design, and 4) Organization. He stated that within that scope of work they have listed things that are common to both cities and things that are unique to each city. He reported that this draft scope of work was developed by working with city, planning and urban development staff from both sides.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2007**

Haugen stated that he put this on the agenda in order to remind everyone that this is a work activity that is scheduled to be done in 2008, and this is the draft scope of work that they will be following in order to accomplish it.

Haugen commented that for those of you who may have noticed, there are some subtle differences from the MPO's past RFP format. He explained that through the work of the DOT and Federal Highway on the North Dakota Side, particularly because of some DBE issues, they asked that all three MPOs use a standard RFP format, and this is part of that new format.

Haugen stated that he would need comments submitted by January 3<sup>rd</sup> so that he would include them in the January meeting packets.

Haugen pointed out that this update will benefit one of the T.I.P. projects we just discussed, that it will help flush out the Downtown Traffic Signal Update scope as well.

Durrenberger asked if there will be any valuation or potential strategies to help reduce the commercial vacancy rate downtown. Haugen responded that that is something the economic developers are trying to get into the demographic and landuse section. He stated that housing is a big issue in the downtowns. He explained that it is basically prohibited on the ground floor in both downtowns, however both cities have been approached by many to amend that, and, of course with housing there would be different transportation issues as well. He added that in Grand Forks he thinks the windows have to be three feet above the street level, but in East Grand Forks nothing is allowed on the ground floor at all, but by allowing residential in commercial buildings the issue of vacancy would be addressed to some extent.

Durrenberger asked if they would be looking at doing some different assessments for the different types of land uses that are going in the downtown. He stated that he thinks the use of Grand Forks zoning is probably 1950s. Haugen responded that the specific Grand Forks question on land use is downtown market research for housing commercial. He stated that after the flood of 1997 there was a study done on this and the will be looking at that data and updating it as well.

Information only.

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON CENTRAL AVENUE CORRIDOR STUDY**

Ellis stated that they are winding down our Central Avenue Corridor Study, and have received most of the final documents from SRF, who is a sub-consultant for JLG, who was the primary consultant on the study.

Ellis reported that they had a Steering Committee meeting on November 26<sup>th</sup>, at which they discussed the traffic report and the information contained SRF's Urban Design Memorandum, which was included in the packet, and which basically looks at the corridor from a non-vehicular standpoint.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2007**

Ellis referred to the Urban Design Memorandum and went over it briefly. She explained that the objective is to develop improvement recommendations for the purpose of enhancing the aesthetics of Central Avenue and creating a vibrant commercial corridor. She said that in order to do this they broke it into three parts: 1) mainline highway; 2) frontage road; and 3) private sector. She referred to the diagram illustrating the issues and opportunities for each of the three parts and went over each briefly.

Ellis stated that the frontage road is where we will see quite a noticeable change as they addressed a lot of issues currently experienced there. She explained that some of those issues are excessive parking, outdoor storage, lack of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and lack of landscaping. She pointed out that some of the opportunities they are recommending include reducing the frontage on each side to twenty-six feet; adding an eight-foot trail on the east side and a ten-foot trail on the west side; adding landscaping, and improving the transit stops.

Ellis said that one of the comments they heard at the very beginning of the study was that there is a lot of cement, a lot of asphalt, and not a lot of green on this corridor so this would provide some enhancements landscaping wise, as well as provide a much needed pedestrian and bicyclist movement on the corridor. She added that another issue that was brought up was the fact that the high school is on one side of the corridor, while most of the food establishments are on the other side of the corridor, so we are having kids crossing in the middle of the road, which is a very big safety concern, so sometimes landscaping will direct pedestrian traffic to the intersections. She stated that they also addressed some intersection improvements including lighting, different signals, stepping up the crosswalks, creating a median island, etc..

Ellis reported that when she referred to private parcels, which is at the end, they talk about stepping up their architectural design by removing some of the metal buildings, and more strict enforcement of our zoning regulations. She stated that this is a more difficult one to address since this is an older corridor, and a lot of the businesses already there, as well as those looking at locating there are looking at this in an economical fashion, not an architectural one, so to take those non-conforming buildings, or non-conforming uses that have been there since the early 1970s is very difficult to accomplish. She said that they do hope to change or adopt this into our zoning ordinance so that all future projects have a more uniform feel.

Ellis stated that the memo also includes some dialogue she had with Mr. Bittman in regard to some concerns she has with the recommendations. She explained that the main one involved the frontage road on the west side as they are not only looking at reducing the size, but actually moving it over as well, which to her doesn't seem very cost effective, so she has been addressing this with SRF. She said that another issue involves when to implement, and the different types of programs out there that are available, one being the MNDOT Landscaping Partnership Program which provides monies to put in the landscaping, and then you install and maintain it once it is in. She said that the problem is that they don't really discuss any other options such as Transportation Enhancement monies, Minnesota ATP monies, etc..

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2007**

Ellis referred to the Traffic Report document from SRF and explained that the only changes from the last months report, which was e-mailed to everyone are those requests by MNDOT for further clarification and changes to their final report. She stated that they did address what Mr. Haugen discussed earlier, and they added the high crash intersections. She referred to page 12 of the document and explained that one of the things that MNDOT pointed out to them was that they were using the overall MNDOT crash data, which includes all of the crashes in the State of Minnesota. Bittman stated that they were actually using their District Crash Data, which is much different than the statewide data. Ellis said that they did make this change.

Ellis commented that in regard to traffic control they were pretty specific on how they were going to do traffic control, whether it be signals or right-in/right-out, and the idea was that there needs to be more study done before you just say that this is what is going to happen here, before implementing these decisions. Haugen referred to page 29 of the report and pointed out that the highlighted section describes ICE, or intersection control evaluation, which is what is being discussed.

Ellis stated that this does address those intersections where we have some problems and where we may need to look at some right-in/right-out accesses, and it addresses access management north of 23<sup>rd</sup>, and the possibility of looking at 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> where we have some issues as it turns into DeMers.

Ellis said that now that we have these two draft reports, and we have the presentation, which is on-line, they will meld all three documents together into one final report that we should receive within the next five days. She stated that she will e-mail that final report to everyone for review as soon as she receives it. She added that they hope to present the final document in January.

Haugen pulled up the presentation on the MPO Website, and explained some of the things illustrated on it. Ellis commented that the presentation illustrates the corridor today, the issues we are facing, where we would like to see the corridor (broken down into the three sections: Mainline Highway which includes the traffic report, pedestrian crosswalks, intersections, etc.; Frontage Road which looks at some transit operations, bike/ped pathways, landscaping, etc.; Private Sector which looks at zoning issues, some architectural design standards, further greening of the private parcels, etc.). She stated, again, that she hopes to get a finished product that will list those projects that will cost the least and those that will cost the most, as well as a timeline for when these projects could or should be done.

Haugen commented that he would also like to point out that SRF used information from a website called "walkscore.com". He explained that what this website attempts to do is to assess the walkability of an area. He referred to the website and pointed out how it accomplishes what it does, adding that this particular corridor did not receive a "bad" rating from them. Bittman stated, however, that this website does not take into account whether or not sidewalks are there, it only takes into account the proximity of people versus nearby amenities, so what they are saying is there is justification for putting a sidewalk or bikepath in this area.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2007**

**OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Reminders

Haugen reminded everyone that January 3<sup>rd</sup> is the deadline for submittal of Minnesota Projects and for any comments on the Downtown Study. He added, again, that everyone is welcome to attend the school crossing traffic control open house this evening from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. in the Grand Forks City Hall Council Chamber.

HAPPY HOLIDAYS!

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY NOEHRE, TO ADJOURN THE DECEMBER 12<sup>TH</sup>, 2007, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 2:50 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis  
Executive Assistant