

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE SPECIAL
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
Wednesday, June 20th, 2007 – 9:00 a.m.
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-102**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the June 20th, 2007, special meeting of the MPO Technical Advisory Committee to order at 9:08 a.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: John Thompson, Grand Forks Assistant City Engineer; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Traffic Engineer; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planner; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks City Planner; and Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks.

Guests present were: Bill Troe and Jason Carbee, URS.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, MPO Executive Director; Nichole Tiggs, GF/EGF MPO Intern; Lucas Rengstorf, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, MPO Executive Assistant.

MATTER OF PRESENTATION ON STREET AND HIGHWAY PLAN UPDATE

Haugen introduced Bill Troe and Jason Carbee, URS, and stated that they were present today to walk us through the process of alternative prioritization.

Power Point Presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request):

MEETING AGENDA:

- Workshop Purpose
- Address Questions/Comments on Prioritization and Costs (Method and Assumptions)
- Alternatives Discussion by Issue (Bulk of Workshop)
- Next Steps
- Other

1. **WORKSHOP PURPOSE**

Troe explained that what they want to do today is to take all of the alternatives they have been reviewing and analyzing, and for which they have also been attempting to come up with cost estimates, and try to determine which of those projects we want to include in the roadway element of the recommended transportation plan. He added that they will most likely develop two lists of those items that ultimately can fit within the funding constraints, and then another list of things we identify as needs, but which fall outside the funding constraints, so that we have

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 20th, 2007**

some additional goals that, as a community, we can try to find additional funding sources for, so that when we go through the next round of the plan update we aren't having to go back and do this all again. He stated that what they will do is create an illustrative, or wish list, so that when the time comes whereby we have identified that a project is truly needed, and not just a want, it is already identified in the plan, so what we want to do today is to go through the remaining projects that were on the list after the first screening, and determine which ones we want to recommend to address a particular issue.

Troe stated that at the last Technical Advisory Committee meeting it was suggested that we may want to weight specific categories such as cost, congestion relief, safety, etc., and although it wouldn't be his preference to do this, as by doing so you open it up for anyone who feels they have standing, or have a certain expertise in a specific category, to weight that category higher in order to award a project a higher rating overall. He said that he feels that the answer should be based on a very broad base of potential impact areas, although in reality, when it comes down to it it is still a local decision, so if locally you feel that safety, congestion relief, cost, although ultimately cost shakes itself out anyway, or local acceptance is a preferred category, or should have some additional weight, then he wouldn't argue against it, as it is your decision.

Troe commented that he would like to spend the bulk of time today walking through the alternatives, and then we can follow-up on where we go from here as we are under some time constraints to get a plan put together. He stated that what he would like to do first is to talk about the scoring methodology, the assumptions, and gather some input from everyone to determine what you want to do.

Troe stated that, per discussion at the last Technical Advisory Committee copies of a table illustrating the original scoring method used, which doesn't include any weighting; and one of a table illustrating the updated scoring method requested, which includes weighting on the categories of safety, congestion relief and cost, were distributed earlier, and, as you can see, the scoring for safety, congestion relief, and cost was doubled with the addition of weighting.

Troe said that he would now like some input from everyone on what you saw as you reviewed this information, specifically what direction you want to go from here. Haugen stated that, first he would like to know how the weighting rearranged the ranking of the projects, how dramatic of a change was there, or wasn't there much of a change at all. Carbee responded that he did see some rearranging within the TSM projects, but overall, as you can see when you rate the TSM projects, and then compare them to the expansion projects, in relative terms there isn't a significant change, so when you are looking at the TSM as a package, and compare it the widening of Columbia Road, you don't see a big change, and he doesn't think it will change the answer that came out of the process.

Haugen stated that if he remembers correctly, that was part of the Technical Advisory Committee's discussion, that there were some who thought weighting would make a difference, while others seemed to feel that what Mr. Carbee just described is exactly what would happen, so he would like to know if those present today feel we should assign different weights to different

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 20th, 2007**

categories, or just accept each as equal weighting on the categories created, which is Mr. Troe's preference. Thompson asked, then, if they would have to add them up at the end if you don't have any weight on them because, in reality, for our plan there are some that are more important than others. Troe responded that he doesn't think the goal coming out of the scoring is to say that the highest scoring alternative is automatically what we want to pursue first, but instead is a way to help get us maybe 70% of the way to a decision, but ultimately cost will become a factor no matter what the ranking of a project is.

Williams stated that she has a question on some of the general descriptions; and referring to the "social" heading, consistency with local/regional plans, asked if in that process itself haven't the things that are on the plan already gone through a public review process, and if so why do we have local support on there again. She commented that those projects that are on the plan already have local and public support, so it appears that the things that are left, the consistency with the local and regional plan, to her it is either a yes or no, it is either consistent or it isn't consistent. Carbee responded that that isn't true in all cases. Williams pointed out that there aren't any sixes in any of those categories. Haugen responded that that is the case because, if you look at the ranking system, and the distinction between a six and four, the six was given if the project was programmed in the T.I.P., but we may have overdid what the requirements of a six might be. Williams stated that that is what she is saying. She added that there are also no zeros shown in that category either. Troe commented that in reality, since these are the things that came out of the first level of the screening, those dogs have already been gotten rid of. Williams stated that she understands, but feels that there still should be a six. Troe asked, then, that she go through each of the projects listed, and rescore them, adding that there just isn't enough time to go through all of that today.

Williams referred to the local support for a project category, and asked what the target area was. She explained that she asks this because if you gave these topics to everyone in the Grand Forks/East Grand Forks area, and asked them to vote, you will get a six on all of them; but if you give them to everyone within a one to two block radius of the project, you will get a zero on all of them, so she is wondering what the target area is for each. Troe responded that that is the one they relied on the committee members to get for them. Haugen stated that what he is hearing is that maybe two of these social comments could be consolidated into one ranking system, or consistency with local or regional plans, and local public support are kind of touching on the same thing. Williams agreed, adding that a project won't be in the plan if you don't have local support, nor will they be if they aren't consistent with the local or regional plan, so it's kind of like getting double duty. Haugen commented that for those projects that are in the regional plan, we are updating the plan so we should acknowledge, and give them some credit, but there are other alternatives in here that haven't been flushed out much in prior plans, so that is why they are ranking them to determine if they are consistent with plans. Williams stated that she understands, but feels they should be scored one way or the other, not both. Troe added that they aren't scoring them to be consistent with just the transportation plan, or previous transportation plans, but also with the land use plan or others as well. Haugen commented that this is also a way to try to help us separate projects, and help us prioritize them by giving us a way to separate them. He cited the 17th Avenue Overpass project, explaining that it is consistent with all the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 20th, 2007**

plans, that it gets a four because it isn't programmed in the T.I.P., but it probably has a lot more public support than other projects that are listed in the transportation plan, such as widening Columbia Road, which people started second guessing as soon as it was included in the plan, so the public support sort of gives us an avenue to degrade that alternative a little bit versus others in the plan, and that is why he feels these two categories are helping us get an idea of the level of separation between the alternatives. He added that this isn't the final say, but it is a guide to help us understand the differences between them.

Williams stated that she also feels that the consistency with economic development activities category should also be either a yes or no as well. Troe responded that he sees levels of grey in all of those things, especially when you are looking at the range of jurisdictions that are included, as he doesn't necessarily think there is always a yes or no for each of the jurisdictions that we have to address through the planning process.

Thompson asked, as a qualitative measure, should sufficiency of right of way, or a need to acquire additional right of way be in the engineering category. Troe responded that it could be, but ultimately it is something that needs to be incorporated into the cost. Thompson stated, however, that sometimes it is a fatal flaw as well. Troe agreed.

Discussion ensued on specific projects. Troe stated that, while it wasn't his plan to do so, if everyone wants to go through and address the second level of the scoring on specific projects, he is willing to do so. Haugen commented that that is what he would like to do. He added that they have had good discussion on this, although it is a bit unresolved, but he thinks that part of what we need to have to really understand the numbers shown is to look at the drawings and cost estimates associated with each project, so he would like to go through the drawings and concepts, then go back to determine action.

Troe commented that there are some things they need to take into account as they are walking through this. He stated that they went through a brief analysis on how much funding capacity they feel they have, and, based on that analysis they are looking at about \$109,000,000 available from North Dakota for the types of projects that would be included within the highway element of the transportation plan, for expansion projects; and about \$25,000,000 from Minnesota. He added, however, that we do need to remove the T.I.P. projects from those monies, which means about \$8,000,000 from North Dakota and \$3,000,000 from Minnesota, thereby leaving us about \$100,000,000 from North Dakota and \$22,000,000 from Minnesota for expansion projects over the course of the transportation planning period.

Williams asked if the DOT has a projection date for the rehab of I-29. Haugen responded that the northbound has been programmed in 2009, but the southbound has not been programmed yet. Williams asked if there would be any rehab in the DeMers area, on the northbound lanes. Haugen responded that there wouldn't, adding that it was just done ten years ago. He stated that the things they have identified include the turning radi on the DeMers ramps, which they will be doing this year; and some slab maintenance issues on the DeMers and Gateway bridges. Williams asked if they would be looking at the acceleration ramps at all. Haugen responded that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 20th, 2007**

they have asked them to do so, and will continue to make that request. Troe asked if there wasn't an acceleration project listed in the T.I.P.. Haugen responded that there isn't one listed in the T.I.P., but that there is one listed as one of our alternatives. He added that it is listed as an alternative because they aren't sure right now that that lane is necessary. He stated that we have heard from the public, and the freight industry in particular, that they would like to have an acceleration lane for the DeMers Avenue northbound on ramp, but with the DOT not being sure that it is necessary, it is showing here as an alternative project.

2. 2035 BASE "CONFIRM" PACKAGE

Troe continued with presentation, explaining that as they move forward, and go through the alternative analysis, you will recall that they had a category, or grouping of projects that they said were included in the existing transportation plan that we said. He added that rather than going through the process of re-evaluating every element, they would confirm whether or not there were assumptions that would change in the socio-economic data or in the traffic that would result in their saying that because there were significant enough changes, we need to re-evaluate them entirely in this plan. He referred to a slide titled "2035 Base "Confirm" Package", and went over the projects forwarded on: 1) Merrifield Road Interchange/River Crossing; 2) 32nd Avenue River Crossing; 3) Central Spine/2nd Avenue NE Grade Separation; 4) 17th Avenue /829 Overpass; 5) 42nd Street Widening – 17th Avenue to 32nd Avenue.

Williams asked if the 42nd Street project included realignment of the roadway. Haugen responded it was not.

3. 2035 BASE CONFIRMED PACKAGE

Troe reported that when you look at where they are at with the cost estimate, with what they call the 2035 Base Confirmed Package, they come up with a total of about \$69,000,000; with \$57,000,000 coming from North Dakota and \$12,000,000 coming from Minnesota. He added that as we walk through things today, and talk about whether or not a particular improvement can fit into the budget, we have to consider that there are two ways of looking at things, one would be to skim these dollars off the top and say that we no longer have \$101,000,000 on the North Dakota side to address on other project, we only have \$44,000,000; or we can say that each of these projects gets thrown into the same hopper and they may end up on the illustrative project list, and they shouldn't necessarily have more priority than any of the others being included within the fund development of the plan.

4. COLUMBIA ROAD CONGESTION – TSM IMPROVEMENTS IN CORRIDOR

Troe reported that in the range of alternatives for Columbia Road, they have included a combination of expansion projects in the corridor, expansion projects in adjacent corridors or influencing corridors, transportation system management improvements or spot intersection improvements within the corridor and in other corridors to hopefully divert traffic out of the Columbia Road Corridor, so they are looking at a very broad range of concepts.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 20th, 2007**

Troe referred to Table 1, pointing out that Columbia Road is Issue Area One, and that it has a range of alternatives from A to H. He stated that he would now like to go through each alternative in order to get input on both the positives and negatives for each one.

Troe commented that what they have done with the whole TSM section is to try to put together a TSM Package, which will be based on the average of the scores for each individual project. He said that this means, from a TSM point of view along the Columbia Road Corridor, they are looking at a score of about 44, and, if he remembers correctly, widening Columbia Road to seven lanes only scored about a 24 without weighting, which is why he would like to go over each alternative separately.

- a. Alt 1A – Columbia Road: DeMers Avenue to 13th Avenue Add Southbound Lane

Carbee gave a brief overview on Alternative 1A, explaining that it has some right-of-way impacts, in that when you set back the sidewalks you go into the hospital's greenspace to do so.

Troe commented that one of the concerns they had with this area is the fact that the hospital is expanding, and one of the alternatives associated with that would be that the internal circulation road would go away, and with the volume on that roadway being about 2,000 vehicles a day we need to ask what happens to those 2,000 vehicles, does it circulate back out to Columbia Road, or is the circulation that happens there today simply happening because the road is there, and a lot of that circulation goes away when the road goes away. He added that, while the hospital expansion plan probably isn't far enough along that you can say with 100% assurance that that road will be gone, when they go through the process of doing a traffic study at that location, and they see that that road is critical to the circulation to the hospital, and that service can't be provided somewhere else on site, that may change the concept.

Gengler asked if, following the meeting we had concerning this issue, has there had been any more correspondence with the hospital. Haugen responded that they haven't received and follow-up requests from SRF for data, or other information.

Williams commented that, using just the basic layout shown, it appears that we will need to acquire right-of-way on both the east and south side of the roadway, and you will need to move all of the existing lighting system located along their now, as well as the traffic signal. Carbee stated, then, that we should be showing a new signal at that location in their cost estimates.

Haugen reported that when the Columbia Road Corridor Study was done, prior to the 2003 Long Range Transportation Plan, this project is consistent with that corridor study, whereas the current plan sort of negates it because it involves widening the whole corridor in lieu of doing these types of TSM projects.

Williams stated that if you don't move the curb on the south side your fine, but if it is moved at all you will definitely need to obtain some additional right-of-way.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 20th, 2007**

b. Alt 1B – Columbia Road: 13th Avenue South/Columbia Road – Add Southbound Dual Left-Turn Lanes

Carbee commented that the 13th Avenue South alternative identified, over the 30 year planning horizon, level of service “E” conditions in 2035, and so, when looking at the options here you will see that we are showing the southbound right turn lane as well, which helps ease congestion, but also because the heavy southbound left turns during p.m. peak they have added dual left turn lanes as well. He pointed out, however, that this alternative will definitely require some right-of-way acquisition, both on Columbia, and on 13th Avenue, although it appears it would be minimal on 13th.

Thompson asked if an operational had been done on this option, because currently, coming from the east there is a through, a right, and a left, and what you are saying is that you will remove the right turn only lane and put that through and to the left again. Carbee responded that, he actually doesn’t think that they should do that. Thompson stated, then, that you will need an additional 12-feet, so you will have a major right-of-way impact to the Perkins site. Williams agreed, adding that you want your left lanes to oppose each other, that you don’t want them off-set.

Haugen stated, then, that it is his understanding that we would be shifting the drawing to the south on 13th Avenue. Carbee responded that that would be correct. Thompson commented that the lines will probably have to be along the sidewalk, and you will be very close to getting into some prime right-of-way. He said, however, that you could also look at doing both sides of the intersection and realign the through movements. Carbee agreed that that might help reduce the cost. Troe pointed out that we do have a potentially amenable client on the west side of the road with the hospital, and ultimately, with their expansion plan it might be a better idea to reconstruct the east and west side, which would mean we would have to pay less money.

Haugen asked if what Mr. Troe was saying was that instead of adjusting to the east side of 13th Avenue it would be adjusted to the west side. Troe responded that you would adjust both sides. Williams added that you would be realigning the centerline to the north.

c. Alt 1C – Columbia Road: Columbia Road/17th Avenue Dual Left Turns All Approaches, Southbound Right Turn Lane

Carbee reported that 17th Avenue is currently at a level of service “E”, and, of course, as the traffic volumes grow, it will become a level of service “F”, so this alternative would add dual left turns on all approaches, which will improve the level of service to “D” through 2035. He pointed out that there are some issues with this alternative, including a need for right-of-way acquisition, problems with the dual left turns restricting the access, at a minimum at the northeast and northwest quadrants, to those businesses.

Thompson stated that he would rank this zero under the impacts categories. Williams added that we will also lose our right turn lane as well. Carbee agreed, but added that it could be retained, however there would be more impact, then, to the north. Haugen stated that we probably do

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 20th, 2007**

want the right turn lane retained. Thompson commented that that is something that will be determined once the operations have been done on this alternative.

Troe asked if, when they did analysis did they assume a separate right turn lane, or did they combine it to try to minimize the cross-section. Carbee responded that they combined to try to minimize the cross-section. Troe asked if there would be a lot of heartburn if they could still maintain a reasonable operation, yet combine the through and right on some of these side streets in order to gain an improvement, but then also try to reduce the level of right-of-way requirement. Thompson responded that the reason those right/through lanes are there is probably because that was all they thought they needed at that intersection at the time it was constructed, they were probably TSMs.

Williams asked how wide of lanes are they looking at. Carbee responded that they are showing 12-foot wide lanes. Williams asked if that was for the outside lanes. Carbee responded it was. Williams asked if they were using truck-turning templates on all of these. Troe responded that they weren't getting into that. Williams said, then that they are going to have to assume a 14-foot lane on the outside curb lane, not 12-feet.

Troe asked if there were any adjustments needed to the scoring for the impacts to the Built/Natural Environment because of the right-of-way, do they need to change it from four to zero. Williams asked if they were looking at medians for that, or just striping. Troe responded that they are assuming four-foot medians. Thompson stated that they should use two instead of zero for impacts.

d. Alt 1D – Columbia Road: Columbia Road/24th Avenue Southbound Dual Left Turns

Carbee pointed out that with the wider roadway on 24th they were able to maintain the eastbound and westbound turning movements. He stated, however, that you can see that they are getting real tight to the bank drive-through, and that's with trying to balance the added right-turn lane that is being constructed right now. He said that right-of-way impacts here are potentially underestimated at this point.

Williams commented that they are currently in the process of reconstructing this intersection. Carbee responded that this information is for 2035, not necessarily for today, so it won't be included on the short-term list, but it is assumed that by 2035 there will be an operational issue, and that is why the alternative is in the plan.

Thompson suggested that the rating be changed from four to two. Troe stated that he already changed it to a two, as he feels the same argument made for 17th can be made here as well, although you are a little more concentrated on the property. Carbee added that it is a pretty drastic operational change for the lane.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 20th, 2007**

Haugen asked, in terms of the southeast quadrant, what is going on with those access points. Thompson responded that he doesn't think there is anything going on there now. Haugen asked if there was going to be a median, or just striping. Thompson responded that they tried to close the northwest access as part of the reconstruction project, but it was referred back and they ended up funding its reconstruction instead.

Haugen stated that as they discuss the right-of-way impacts on this alternative, as well as the desire for medians, he would ask if, in-fact, medians are necessary or would striping be sufficient in order that full movement would still be available. Troe responded that the way they look at this, from a traffic operations standpoint, and access control; would be to recommend eliminating at least the first one, but, because the second is a public street, and has public right-of-way, you could probably get by with striping it, but, again, the first one is closer to the cue, so it would be their recommendation that it be closed or converted to a right-in/right-out with a median.

- e. Alt 1E – Columbia Road: Columbia Road/20th Avenue Extend 20th Avenue South to Connect with Columbia Road

Carbee reported that this alternative has been included in past plans, and was recently included in the Columbia Road Corridor Study. He stated that this alternative essentially continues 20th Avenue South, and at it's intersection with Columbia Road, either adds signalization or converts it to a ¾ access for safety purposes. Thompson asked if the signal is included in the cost. Carbee responded it was.

Williams commented that this is a Catch-22 in that if you signalize that intersection then it immediately gets used, and if you don't it probably will never be warranted, so we might as well make it a ¾ access. Carbee agreed, adding, however that the spacing on the signals would be somewhat consistent with the rest of the corridor. He pointed out that this alternative would relieve some traffic off of 17th Avenue, actually to the tune of about 1,000 to 2,000 a day. Williams stated that she would think the amount of traffic that would be diverted would actually be a little higher than 1,000 to 2,000 just because that would become the primary access to the school.

Thompson asked if the next step with this alternative, should we decide to support a road and signal there, would there be an operations analysis done, and the results of that brought back to this body. Troe responded that that would be the next step outside of the transportation plan, as they wouldn't get into that kind of detail with this plan. He added, however, that if we think things will lead to the need for a signal, which, he would think would require the addition of a left turn lane, we should assume that now in the right-of-way impacts, but if you don't want any more signals on that roadway, then it would be safe to propose it as a ¾ access that won't ever be signalized, which, of course, would reduce the amount of right-of-way required.

Troe commented that of any of the alternatives already discussed, the most likely to run into issues associated with the environmental impacts, and the environmental justice; because of the mobile home park on the south side, this is the one.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 20th, 2007**

Resume Discussion On Columbia Road/17th Avenue South

Troe stated that, based on Mr. Thompson's comments, he would like to revisit the 17th Avenue South alternative. He reminded everyone of Mr. Thompson's comments, and asked if he thinks there is a viable option at this point, at this location, to have lanes to 17th Avenue, or is it fatally flawed, because 17th Avenue is really the lynch pin of the TSM alternatives, and if they can't get an improvement at 17th Avenue that would make it operate reasonably, you can invest in the other TSM alternatives, but he doesn't have a high level of confidence that we wouldn't be coming back in five or six years and talk about widening Columbia Road again, so he feels the discussion for the TSM alternatives along this corridor have to come back to whether or not 17th Avenue dual lefts, which widens the cross-section on 17th Avenue, can occur. Thompson responded that it can occur if you make the point that you are balancing the seven lanes on Columbia Road with the impacts on 17th Avenue.

Haugen commented that it seems to him like 17th Avenue and Columbia is the next DeMers Avenue and Washington Street, at least if we don't do anything, so we either need to widen Columbia to seven lanes, or we need to step up and impact a couple of the businesses there, as well as try to work out some issues with the Park District. He stated that he says this because we missed similar opportunities on Washington/DeMers.

Discussion on funding sources available ensued.

Columbia Road Congestion TSM Summary

Troe stated that, in summary, our goal is to reach at least a level-of-service "C" with the improvements, and at the major intersections of 13th Avenue and 24th Avenue we can do that based on the improvements we talked about. He added that without any of the other improvements in the system, at 17th Avenue we can only get to a level-of-service "D", so we have missed the goal, but we are also looking at other improvements within the adjacent corridors, mainly 42nd Street, so that when we do that combination we can get a level-of-service "C" at 17th Avenue as well. He said that the conclusion we can gather there is that the TSMs cannot stand alone to get us to our goal, but that they can be a major component to a more sub-regional concept for that area that does get us to our goal of a level-of-service "C".

5. COLUMBIA ROAD CONGESTION – EXPANSION/IMPROVEMENTS IN ADJACENT CORRIDORS

f. Alt 1F – Widen Columbia Road To Seven Lanes

Troe stated that this alternative is consistent with what was included in the last transportation plan. He said that some of the things they wanted to point out are that even with seven lanes we are still operating at a level-of-service "E" at 17th Avenue and Columbia Road.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 20th, 2007**

Troe commented that the issue here is that probably less than half of the traffic that either enters the corridor at 32nd or exists the corridor at DeMers makes it all the way through the corridor, therefore traffic is turning off at the cross-streets between those two roadways, which is the extent of the seven lane widening, so if we add that third through lane, we aren't getting as much utilization of that lane because there are so many people moving off of it at the various cross streets, thus you aren't getting as much "bang for your buck" with the additional through capacity. He added that you would actually get about the same "bang for your buck" by adding turn lane capacity, which is included within the TSM alternatives.

Williams asked if the dual left turns on the side-streets mostly done to shorten the left turn phasing time. Carbee responded that that would be correct. Williams asked, then, if the dual left turns were actually warranted by the number of left turning vehicles. Carbee responded that, take 17th and Columbia, one of the turning movements was relatively low for dual lefts, but because it was opposed by a dual left, in order to keep the phasing consistent it is felt there should be dual lefts in each direction.

Haugen referred to the last bullet on the slide, which states that this alternative provides a level-of-service "E" at 17th and Columbia in 2035, but if you have improvements to adjacent corridors, what does that do to the level-of-service "E", does it move it up to a "D". Carbee responded that maybe if you put in a 47th Avenue Interchange, that might move it back to a level-of-service "D". He stated that this doesn't also assume dual lefts at Columbia and 17th, and is assuming that we still have a single southbound and northbound left, and, to get technical you are converting it to a protected only movement because you have three lanes to cross. Troe added that, generally they would recommend that when you go to at least a six-lane, you go to protected only.

Haugen pointed out that one of the arguments against this alternative is the right-of-way impacts involved. Troe agreed, adding that there is both private and public right-of-way involved with this alternative, and because a majority of it is public, they probably should break it out between private versus public right-of-way impacts.

Haugen stated that the point is that with the TSMs, specifically 17th and Columbia, they do achieve their overall goal of a level-of-service "C", but here we are probably not going to be able to achieve that. Troe agreed, adding that in order to achieve a level-of-service "C" here they would probably have to go with dual left turn lanes as well, which would mean seven lanes with dual left turn lanes at 17th. Haugen stated that that would make this a hard choice.

Troe referred to the scoring table, and asked if anyone thought adjustments needed to be made to this alternative. He commented that they probably underestimated it's consistency with the whole plan as it is included in the local plan, so they are probably tweaking it a little because they understand the level of second guessing that may have gone on once the plan was adopted. Carbee added, however, that it wasn't consistent with the corridor study either.

Williams stated that she has an adjustment she would like made to the 20th Avenue Extension alternative. She pointed out that under environmental they had trip generation shown as zero,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 20th, 2007**

and if they are going to be shortening the length of trip with this alternative, it should be reflected. Troe responded, however, that in reality when you look at this from the macro-scale in the transportation plan, it doesn't influence the VMT or VHT on a regional basis much at all, and you don't get a lot of bang for the money. Carbee commented that the projects that triggered that threshold were those projects that were approaching the half percentage or one percentage change on a regional basis for either the VMT or VHT or both. He added that, just to give you a little background on the scoring, that is another category where nothing had a six because there wasn't anything that had an across the board great improvement involved. Williams stated, then, that she doesn't understand how you are scoring this because why would lane widening do anything then. Troe responded that it would reduce VHT, reduce congestion.

Haugen asked if the cost estimates for this will be adjusted. Troe responded that it should be adjusted for the right-of-way impacts. Carbee added that it was suggested that they use a 1.7 multiplier based on whatever each parcel is assessed. Haugen asked if the \$10,000,000 cost estimate for widening included that a third lane be constructed, or for the construction of a complete cross-section. Carbee responded that it is based on the Long Range Plan constant. Haugen stated that he asked this because total reconstruction is identified for this same corridor strip, and they have kind of a cost comparison adding these TSMs with reconstructing it as it exists. Troe said that they could subtract whatever the rehab costs would be from the expansion project. Haugen responded that that would be fine, but that they should also add in the TSM costs with the basic rehab project as well.

Troe asked if there was any preference as to whether or not they should continue to consider either the TSM package or the widening of the corridor to seven lanes, or should they not carry either. Haugen responded that he feels it is too early to cut anything at this point.

Troe commented that he would also like to note that they are also looking at improvements to other areas along the system that would divert traffic out of the Columbia Road Corridor.

g. Alt 1G – 47th Avenue South/I-29 Interchange

Carbee reported that this alternative includes extending 47th Avenue and reconstructing it so that it connects the interchange to the rest of the system. He stated that this alternative does provide relief from the corridor by about 5,000 to 8,000 vehicles per day, which is significant.

Carbee stated that another alternative brought up in the last study, and he did illustrate this, is the construction of an overpass at 47th Avenue South and I-29. He said that this alternative offers significantly less diversion off of Columbia Road, and there isn't much growth planned there by 2035, so there are some pretty limited benefits from this alternative.

Haugen commented that this alternative was the "either/or" alternative, involving either the widening of the road or constructing an interchange here, where our options now are either widening Columbia Road in conjunction with this, or doing the TSM alternatives. Troe stated that this alternative could be grouped with either the TSM group or with the widening of

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 20th, 2007**

Columbia Road. Haugen agreed, but added that he doesn't remember this alternative being a part of the other adjacent corridor improvements that got the TSM up to the level-of-service "C". Carbee responded that it would do that. Haugen asked, however, if the others mentioned, such as an overpass at 17th and 42nd, do they alone achieve this, or does this need to be in to achieve that goal. Troe asked what kind of reductions were realized with the other alternatives mentioned. Carbee responded that with the widening of 42nd Avenue they would be looking at a small reduction; and with the 17th Avenue Overpass they would be looking at a reduction of about 2,000 vehicles per day. Troe stated, then, that of all the other improvements discussed, this is probably the most significant, therefore you would want to look at it as a potential element of either the expansion or the TSM, and is an element for both that results in achieving the goal of a level-of-service "C".

Haugen commented that the importance of an interchange is the interplay it has with the Interstate to carry traffic north. Carbee agreed, stating that it also affects all of the development plans adjacent to the Interchange, and to the south even over the next twenty-year planning horizon. Troe added that he thinks it becomes even more significant as they are looking relative to 2030, going out to 2035, because the development is marching that much further to the south, and getting that much closer to being able to benefit from a 47th Avenue South Interchange, or overpass on both the north and south side, therefore he would think, and maybe this is one of those we want to make a decision as to whether we want an interchange, including the connections back to the arterial systems, with improvements to 47th Avenue, or do we want to look simply at an overpass at 47th Avenue. He stated that he feels they would conclude from the analysis is that simply adding the overpass does not give us the benefits we desire, therefore he would suggest eliminating the overpass only alternative.

Noehre stated that at some level this isn't appropriate for a long range transportation plan, but when you get to the end everything will be grouped, and packages selected, so that is why he is happy that the dollars coming into the City weren't split out as urban, regional and interstate. He added that something like this, although he can't guarantee, and would be shocked if it were awarded a 90/10 interstate fund split, as it really isn't an interstate capacity issue. Troe commented, however, that he thinks you might be able to argue that it improves operations at 32nd Avenue and I-29, which, from a North Dakota standard, would indicate that it does serve the purpose of improving an existing interchange location, and the operations added. Noehre agreed, but added that he wouldn't agree to the point of it being a 90/10 split.

Williams asked how many miles away from 32nd Avenue South this would be. Haugen responded it would be 3 miles to the Merrifield overpass.

h. Alt 1J – 34th Street – Restripe as a 3-Lane Roadway

Carbee commented that 34th Street is, overall, a decent corridor and serves a good role as a minor arterial collector, but there are some places, likely closer to 24th Avenue, where it might benefit from having a left-turn lane. He said that one concern is that there is on-street parking through there as there are a lot of apartments, so we would have to look at removing parking from one

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 20th, 2007**

side of the street, which probably wouldn't be very popular with local residents. He added that this alternative is also one that probably wouldn't be modeled very well in the travel model, and we would most likely get limited diversion, and limited benefit and impacts as well.

Williams referred to the evaluation criteria, and explained that it indicates there are only five residential driveways, but in reality there are only five single-family driveways, therefore it should indicate that there are five single-family driveways instead.

i. Alt 1I – Widen 42nd Street to a 5-Lane Roadway

Carbee reported that this alternative was basically included in the base-confirmed package, and continues the grid of four-lane arterials across the city, and as 42nd continues to develop more development will occur across I-29, and there is also the 17th Avenue connection across as well. He stated that right-of-way is pretty sufficient through there, and because there hasn't been a whole lot of development, so there limited right-of-way impacts as well. He commented that, depending on whether or not 42nd realigns straight into the interchange, or if it remains on the 38th Street alignment, there is a little sensitivity.

Carbee stated that this alternative is based on what was discussed last week, specifically the fact that this might be a candidate for consideration of on-street bicycle lanes. He added that it will provide some diversion from Columbia Road as well, however, on it's own it wouldn't get 17th Avenue South to a level-of-service "C", even with the TSM improvements. Haugen commented that he thinks that on-street bicycle lanes, or as a route would be consistent with the bike plan.

Troe asked if there were any changes needed to the overall scoring of this alternative. He stated that it does score well, and, in-fact is one of the highest scored alternative.

j. Alt 1K – Merrifield Road Red River Crossing

Carbee referred to a slide, and pointed out that it illustrates the alignment of the alternatives for the Merrifield Road Bridge over the Red River. He said that if you look at this in combination with an interchange at Merrifield, these projects together are predicted to divert about 3,000 to 4,000 vehicles per day from the Columbia Road Corridor.

Noehre questioned the cost estimate for this alternative. Carbee responded that he would go back and check on this to make sure it is correct.

k. Alt 1L – 32nd Avenue Red River Crossing (Option 1-3)

Carbee stated that this alternative would also divert about 3,000 to 4,000 vehicles per day off of the Columbia Road Corridor. He added that it also addresses one of our big neighborhood issues as it helps divert some of the traffic out of the Minnesota/4th Avenue Corridor as well. He commented that this alternative has been under consideration for many years, but it is not included in the City of Grand Forks' Comprehensive Plan.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 20th, 2007**

6. DEMERS AVENUE/WASHINGTON STREET CONGESTION

Troe referred to a slide illustrating the range of retained improvement concepts and explained that those shown in green are TSM, or smaller scale improvements to the corridor, and those in red are expansion improvements to the corridor.

Troe referred to a slide illustrating at grade improvements for the corridor, and stated that he would be walking through the scoring and composite of each alternative.

a. Alt 2A, 2B, 2C, and 2D – DeMers Avenue/Washington Street -
Add Third Through Lane

Carbee explained that they are looking at these as four separate improvements, and in order to get some kind of acceptable traffic operations, all four need to be incorporated. He explained that Alternative 2A involves the addition of an eastbound through lane; Alternative 2B involves adding a third lane for eastbound and westbound approaches; Alternative 2C involves adding a third lane for southbound traffic; and Alternative 2D involves adding a third lane for northbound traffic. He added that the TSM package involves adding three through lanes on all approaches.

Carbee reported that when you start carrying the additional twelve-feet of pavement, while still trying to maintain some semblance of a sidewalk setback, particularly to the south, you will start impacting businesses. He stated that this will mean that from a planning level, you will have to assume that you will have to acquire two businesses to the south, and that you will also significantly impact a couple of other businesses as well, including the Park District's Office and the Firestation.

Carbee commented that, obviously, you have some significant widening and reconstruction costs involved with this, but you will also have some very significant right-of-way costs as well, and this will be the case will all of the alternatives for this intersection. Troe stated that this alternative would also requiring widening the railroad underpass as well. Carbee agreed, adding that that will be done in the future in any event. Troe commented that it will be reconstructed in the future, but not necessarily widened. Carbee agreed, adding that the cost of widening the underpass are not reflected in the current cost estimate.

Troe stated that this alternative, with all of the through and turn lanes, would get us to a level-of-service "D" in 2035, which, again, is below our goal of a level-of-service "C".

Haugen commented that they have always been told that, because these are two DOT highway, a level-of-service "C" is what we have to achieve before they will participate in the improvement cost. Troe stated that that is what led to the desire to look at other alternatives that provide an acceptable level-of-service at that intersection, so we are looking at two alternatives, and have essentially concluded that there probably isn't an at grade, add lanes improvement that will get us to a level-of-service "C", so we either have to find an alternative that pulls volume out of that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 20th, 2007**

corridor, which is going to be very difficult to do, or we need to look at grade separated alternatives.

b. Alt 2E – DeMers Avenue/Washington Street – Single Point Urban Interchange

Troe referred to a drawing illustrating how the single point urban interchange would look, and explained that it has one signal that would handle all of the through traffic on Washington, and the turning traffic on DeMers. He stated then, that the through traffic on DeMers, which essentially goes from the eastside of 4th Street over to the west side of Washington would be handled on a different level than this intersection. He said that this could be flip-flopped, but it would be more costly, and since Washington is depressed all the way through the railroad crossing, it makes sense to keep Washington Street down.

Troe said that, while this provides us with the traffic operational improvement we desire, there are some very significant impacts, including right-of-way costs and business acquisitions. He stated that another downside to this is that we would be getting into the operations of the firestation even more than we would with an at-grade alternative, therefore the impact associated with the ramp probably eliminates the use of that parcel as a firestation, and creates an access concern for Xcel Energy, which ultimately could result in the need to acquire those businesses as well. He commented that they did include the cost of relocating the firestation in the cost estimate, but did not include the impact of possibility needing to acquire Xcel as well.

Troe stated that this alternative, unfortunately, has some very significant impacts associated with it, but operationally it works pretty nice.

c. Alt 2F – DeMers Avenue/Washington Street – Split Diamond Interchange

Troe reported that what this alternative does is instead of having one intersection controlling the operations between DeMers and Washington we have two, so we essentially split traffic so if you are in the eastbound direction and you want to get off on Washington or 4th, you would get off west of Washington, go through the Washington intersection and either go north or south, or if you are going to 4th Street you would continue on through to the ramp or collector/distributor; and then if your are in the westbound direction and you want to get off on Washington or 4th, you would get off on a new ramp coming off the bridge, and go through an intersection at 4th Street.

Troe stated that this alternative, while it gets into the adjacent properties a little more, allows that we could maintain some semblance of access into those properties such as Xcel Energy's, it eliminates the activities associated with the Firestation, and we wouldn't be required to acquire the Xcel and Firestation buildings.

Troe commented that with this alternative we do achieve our goal of a level-of-service "C", but the downside is that the operations of Washington Street will be a little bit worse because we

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 20th, 2007**

now have two signals instead of one, and we have the same, or a very similar level of acquisition of properties, including the possibility of an additional property as we work through the corridor, but when you look at the balance we don't necessarily need to acquire all of these property as we most likely would with the single point urban.

Noehre referred to a drawing of the intersection, and proposed an alternative that would involve going over the railroad property. Haugen commented that going up and over the railroad would result in more separation than going under it, so the length of the structure would be quite considerable. Noehre stated, however, that it would be similar to the structure Columbia/DeMers structure. Troe referred to an aerial drawing, and explained how this alternative might look. He said that he doesn't think this alternative would work very well, as they would be looking at depressing the intersection that would be handling the turning movements between Washington and DeMers.

Troe reported that he does think that they need to make a scoring adjustment on the single point urban, although neither of these alternatives scored very well.

Haugen asked if this might be the time to bring back the University and 2nd Avenue pair alternative for discussion. Troe responded that he doesn't think that alternative would be viable. Carbee added that you end up going back through the intersection anyway, and operationally is isn't very good. Haugen asked, then, if the next hope would be the possibility that the Belmont corridor might take some of the traffic pressure off of the Washington/DeMers corridor. Troe responded that, unfortunately you would have a problem getting local support for either Belmont or a 32nd Avenue Bridge.

Haugen stated that the problem is that there isn't any easy solution to deal with the congestion on Washington/DeMers, as the cost to do so is quite high, therefore we are now back to trying to find a way to relieve some of that congestion through improvements to adjacent corridors in order that we can try to make at-grade improvements on DeMers and Washington.

John Thompson reported present.

Troe summarized the alternatives discussed, explaining the pros and cons of each. Haugen said, then, that this is what lead to the discussion of how we might be able to direct traffic to adjacent corridors. Thompson said that we could bring back projects that weren't even considered. Troe asked if he was referring to projects such as 20th Street, rivercrossings, etc.. He stated that those projects may help a little bit, particularly the movement of a new rivercrossing to the north which would result in significantly more traffic use.

Discussion on various other alternatives ensued.

Thompson asked what the level-of-service will be on Washington/DeMers in 2035. Troe responded the it will be at a level-of-service "F", but we can get to a level-of-service "D" with arterial improvements. Noehre asked what the current level-of-service is. Troe responded that it

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 20th, 2007**

is currently at a level-of-service “F” during the peak hours, however, if you go outside the PM peak hours you have a level-of-service “C”. Noehre stated that he drives that route several times a day, and finds that during the PM peak times you will sit through three lights instead of just one.

Haugen stated that ultimately we know we have a problem here, and we have solutions to those problems, but can we implement those solutions. Troe commented that he has waffled back and forth between the single point urban and the split diamond interchanges, but when you look at the potential impacts for each, he would think that the single point urban would be the best choice.

Haugen said that he would raise the question of how far the \$100,000,000 will go, and how much of the actual cost is outside of the \$100,000,000. He pointed out that the underpass project is outside of the \$100,000,000. Noehre asked why the underpass would be outside the \$100,000,000. Troe responded that it would be a maintenance project. Thompson asked what percentage is maintenance and what percentage is construction or expansion. Troe responded that on the North Dakota side they were about 70% expansion and 30% maintenance based upon the expenditures; and on the Minnesota side they were at 50% expansion and 50% maintenance. Noehre stated that he doesn’t know if he would look at this as a maintenance project. Troe disagreed, explaining that even if you were using federal aid urban dollars, if it was simply a rehab or overlay, he would put a project under maintenance, but ultimately it is your decision on whether or not this, or any project should be included in the \$100,000,000.

Thompson commented that the only other corridors that could be improved would be 20th Street and Cherry. Troe stated that you could do 20th Street, Cherry Street, Belmont Road, but you need to be looking at a relatively continuous corridor. Haugen pointed out that 20th Street is already carrying 7,000 to 9,000 vehicles a day. Carbee added that there is already a peak hour left turn, so if you are heading west, going southbound there are over 200 turning movements during the peak hour so there are already quite few people using 20th Street.

Troe stated that he would eliminate the Split Diamond Interchange alternative. He added that in discussions with the Fire Chief, indications were that they did see a benefit to moving the firestation, and he thinks he can get a more community-wide investment in fire protection using some of it for the southside fire station, and taking some of the activities done at this location and moving them to another at a relatively low cost.

Troe finished by saying that he thinks we should maintain the single point urban interchange and the at grade alternatives, and, as Earl said, start talking to the DOT, because he doesn’t think there is a viable option to add more traffic to 20th Street or to Belmont and Cherry.

7. 32ND AVENUE SOUTH CONGESTION

Carbee stated that this is similar to Columbia Road, in that they looked at it from three different perspectives: 1) transportation system management, focusing the improvements to the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 20th, 2007**

intersections; 2) expanding the corridor by adding three lanes; and 3) looked at couple of different options, or actually several options for parallel corridors, or interchanges that might divert traffic out of the corridor.

- a. Alt 3A – 34th Street/32nd Avenue – Add Dual Westbound Left Turn Lanes

Carbee commented that the biggest issue with this alternative is that today there is quite a bit of traffic turning into the commercial developments to the south, so that the left-bound turn lane, by 2035 is going to get pretty congested. He stated that the basic concept was to add an additional left turn lane at 34th and 32nd, which will require that we acquire six to ten additional feet of right-of-way. He said that they also looked at adding, just for consistency sake, southbound right turns, and a left as well.

Carbee reported that, on it's own this improves the operations to a level-of-service "D" by 2035.

- b. Alt 3B – Columbia Road/32nd Avenue – Add Dual Northbound and Westbound Left Turn Lanes

Carbee stated that there have been recent improvements to add to the left turn lanes here, and on the south approach as well, so it wasn't difficult to add the second dual left turn lane on each of the two approaches that don't already have them.

Carbee reported that by adding the dual left turn lanes this alternative will improve the operations to a level-of-service "D" by 2035. He added that these level-of-service "Ds" are what we would have in the event that none of the other improvements are done, such as the 17th Avenue Interchange, etc., but with those improvements we will get closer to our goal of a level-of-service "C".

- c. Alt 3C – 32nd Avenue/38th Street – Add Dual Northbound and Southbound Left Turn Lanes

Carbee said that on the north leg of this alternative you won't see significant widening, but on the south leg you will see some widening to the right. He pointed out that if they accept a limited sidewalk setback they won't be adjusting the right-of-way line very much.

Carbee reported that this alternative, alone, gets us to a level-of-service "D", so, again, we need to look at what other improvements might help get some traffic out of the 32nd Avenue corridor.

- d. Alt 3D – Washington/32nd Avenue – Add Eastbound and Westbound Through Lanes

Carbee reported that this alternative was looked at as kind of a contingency early in the process. He explained that should the 32nd Avenue bridge be constructed it would create a lot of through

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 20th, 2007**

traffic through this intersection, which would create delays to the extent that we would need to look at two through lanes here. He pointed out that there is quite a lot of impact with this alternative, but even with that added traffic it was determined that there really isn't a need for this improvement, which is why they included it as a contingency alternative, but at this time they would recommend removing it from the plan.

8. 32ND AVENUE SOUTH CONGESTION – EXPANSION/IMPROVEMENTS IN ADJACENT CORRIDORS

a. Alt 3E – 32nd Avenue South Interchange Reconfiguration

Carbee reported that this alternative was included in the previous plan, however when discussions occurred concerning extending 42nd Street so that it tied in to the northbound off-ramp, providing a more direct route from the Interstate to 42nd Street, some modifications were made to the original configuration.

Carbee commented that these are relatively high priced improvements, costing about \$17,000,000, and they really didn't identify a traffic operations issue in 2035, so he would look at this alternative as a lower priority project.

Haugen explained that there are two reasons this project is included in our current plan: 1) we are already six-laning 32nd Avenue, so there is a possibility that modifications may be required; and 2) it gives us a more direct route to the Alerus Center. He then referred to the drawing, and went over the modifications made.

Troe commented that we wouldn't necessarily need the loops in the northwest and the southeast quadrants along with that if all we want to do is modify the one ramp, although that wouldn't reduce the cost much in any event.

Haugen stated that there may be an alternative that does the bare 42nd Street direct connection without the big cost of loops on the interchange. He added, however, that the need for a direct connection is really more of a want than a need in any event. Troe agreed, saying that this gets into a discussion on the fact that we would really like that, but he doesn't think we will be able to justify putting a very high priority on this improvement simply due to the dollars concerned, and also that fact that there aren't any identified operational issues. Haugen agreed, but added that what he was getting at is that he thought he heard that we would be able to modify the off-ramp without having to do the rest of the alternative. Carbee pointed out that because of two intersections being so close to each other, you may have to consider moving the ramp.

Haugen said, then, that because we are no longer considering widening 32nd Avenue, we may need to modify this alternative to just focus on the 42nd Street connection. Troe responded that he thinks it would be a benefit for the planning process if we did that.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 20th, 2007**

Haugen reported that this became a project because the political process forced us to do so. Troe stated that we also need to consider if this is the right location for that access, or should it be moved up because we are getting pretty close to that high speed movement, so we may want to move it up, and over to 42nd Street, then the site access would be located downstream from the on-ramp.

Thompson asked how this project was politically forced to be considered. Haugen responded that they were considering six-laning 32nd Avenue, and they had to modify the interchange, so the political people said they would like to see a better access to 42nd Street and the Alerus, something other than the u-shaped, weaved one that cut across due to the left turn, so they came up with this alternative instead.

b. Alt 3G – Widen 32nd Avenue to 7 Lanes, I-29 to Washington Street

Carbee reported that this is a project that was also included in the last plan, but it is felt that quite possibly some of the issues with the 42nd Street construction may have affected the traffic volumes, as they are now seeing less of a demand for a seven lane on the 32nd Avenue corridor. He stated that one of the key points they have been looking at is what do these improvements do at 32nd Avenue and Columbia Road, and they found that if you don't do anything but add through lanes on 32nd Avenue South, you would still have a level-of-service "D" in 2035, so it would give us about the same benefit as adding just dual left-turn lanes.

Carbee stated that if you look at the forecasted volumes in that corridor, once you get away from the interaction at I-29 and 38th Street, our future daily traffic volumes are in the range of about 30,000 vehicles per day, and then get lower as you get closer to Columbia Road, and that just isn't the level of traffic that would produce the need for six lanes, so in this case he would focus back on some of the TSM improvements at this time.

c. Alt 3H – Merrifield Road/I-29 Interchange

Carbee stated that this alternative has already been included in the plan.

d. Alt 3I – Restripe 24th Avenue South as a 3-Lane

Carbee reported that this is a new alternative that, rather than widening 24th Avenue South, considers restriping it between Columbia and Washington, which will encourage more traffic to use the corridor by restriping it to three lanes. He explained that the pavement is 44-foot wide, and has on-street parking on both sides, and to lanes on each side, so there are a lot of driveways throughout the corridor, so this would basically increase capacity, and divert some traffic off of the 32nd Avenue Corridor, although it doesn't help our worst intersections, but does help 32nd somewhat, so it does help chip away at the problem a little.

Thompson commented that there are a lot of apartment complexes along that corridor. Troe agreed, adding that from a safety standpoint you would benefit from a left turn lane. Thompson

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 20th, 2007**

pointed out that there is a curve as well, right before Washington, which isn't reflected on the drawing. Carbee apologized, and stated that he would make that change.

Carbee referred to the drawing, pointing out that there is a park along the corridor, about 15 single family homes, and 8 apartment complexes, therefore you have residential driveways, so you would be improving safety in and out of those driveways, but you might be bringing in a little more traffic as well, so there are pluses and minuses. Thompson asked if they would only have parking on one side of the corridor. Carbee responded that they would only have parking on one side.

e. Alt 3J – Widen 36th Avenue South to 3-Lanes

Carbee reported that this alternative was also added recently, and involves a combination of expansion, extending, and minor widening along existing portions of 36th Avenue South. He stated that this really creates a commercial backage growth for a lot of the development to the south. He added that you would be looking at future signals, most likely when warranted over the next 30-years, and then you would have a couple of places where you would expand the current street, which now stops at 20th Street, so as that parcel between 20th and Washington develops you would want to reserve the right-of-way, and extend 36th Avenue all the way to Washington.

Carbee commented that if you could encourage this as kind of a backdoor route for shopping, etc., from the south that would help relieve about 2,000 vehicles off of 32nd Avenue. He added that if you combine this with some of the TSM improvements it should get us to an acceptable level-of-service.

Troe asked if the future network have a corridor through here. Haugen responded that it did.

f. Alt 3K – 17th Avenue South Overpass Of I-29

Carbee stated that this is one of the most popular alternatives. He said that it is pretty effective, especially as that business park continues to grow, at getting traffic in and out of there, as well as getting traffic off of both DeMers and 32nd Avenue South.

Carbee reported that with this alternative in place, along with the backage concept, Merrifield Road, the TSM improvements will definitely work on the planning horizon.

Troe pointed out that this alternative received the highest scoring of all the alternatives. Carbee said that it scores high because it does meet a lot of the goals you are looking for. Haugen commented that the only thing that would score better would be a full interchange at this location.

Carbee asked if anyone would disagree that the six-laning of 32nd Avenue South probably wouldn't be considered much further at this point. Haugen agreed, adding that he thinks that the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 20th, 2007**

nice thing about that is that the right-of-way is there so its not denied us in the future if it should be warranted. Troe stated that in addition to this they would also eliminate the improvements at 38th and shift it over to 42nd.

Haugen commented that they have also wrestled with the option of 34th Street extending south of 32nd, and 38th Street extending south of 32nd, and he was wondering if that would be addressed by any slides. Carbee responded that they don't have any slides available on that at this time, although they have discussed it.

Carbee stated that, instinctually, it seems that with the significant growth planned to the south, and not as much anticipated to the north, and the fact that there is a park being planned that will block off 34th Street or 40th Avenue, this may not be the best alternative. Troe commented that if you look at this, the density, or intensity of the development diminishes to the south, he could maybe see continuation of the street as a better alternative simply because of the continuity you get to the north. Haugen agreed, and stated that that is what he recommended to the City as well.

9. 24th AVENUE SOUTH SAFETY AND CONGESTION

a. Alt 5A – 24th Avenue South/34th Street Roundabout

Carbee reported that analysis has identified that there are some safety concerns at the intersections of 24th Avenue South and 29th Street, and long-term congestion, with a level-of-service "D", at the intersection of 24th Avenue South and 34th Street. He stated that they looked at two different options, with one being the construction of a roundabout at the intersection of 24th Avenue South and 34th Street, although signalization is another option as well.

Carbee commented that there are trails through here, with bikepaths that are quite heavily used, and a roundabout is conducive to pedestrian safety. He said that when designing the roundabout, they were able to pull it in and really minimize the impacts to the park or apartments there. Carbee stated that the design they have configured is a single lane roundabout that should provide sufficient capacity through 2035. He reiterated, however, that a signal, once warranted, would also be an option. Consensus seemed to be that a roundabout would make the most sense.

b. Alt 5B-5D – 24th Avenue South/29th Street South Safety

Carbee reported that the intersection of 24th Avenue South and 29th Street South was identified as a safety/crash location, so they came up with three different alternatives.

Carbee commented that 29th Street South is a kind of backage collector to the north, and gives access behind some of the businesses along there, and to the south it lines up with a Columbia Mall driveway, crossing 24th Avenue South.

Carbee stated that the first alternative is to channelize it so that there is no northbound left turns, and to provide a ¾ access; the second alternative is to remove the south leg; and the third

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 20th, 2007**

alternative is to signalize the intersection (warrants must be met). He said that the problem with signalizing that intersection is that it isn't warranted at this time, and it is very close to the Columbia Road/24th Avenue South intersection, which is signalized as well. He stated that it would appear that the best alternative would be to channelize it, and go with a ¾ access.

10. BYGLAND ROAD ACCESS AND CONGESTION

a. Alt 6A-6C – Bygland Road Access/Congestion

Troe reported that the idea on Bygland is that we have operational issues, as well as residential access concerns along the corridor, so our choices are to add some left turn lanes to the key intersections, and to reconstruct or redevelop it to a three lane roadway, or to consolidate/close minor street accesses. He stated that when we look at our alternatives, at adding left turn lanes to the key intersections, you get rid of a part of the problem, but your still not hitting a lot of the properties that access right out onto Bygland, so then we may want to look at restriping the whole thing as a three lane, or we look at doing some access control, it seems to him that the best option would be to strip it as a three lane roadway, but also to consolidate as many of the access points as possible.

Thompson asked if the roadway was wide enough to accommodate three lanes in addition to a bike lane. Ellis responded that it wouldn't, and that is what her concern is, that once you stripe it there isn't anything out there for pedestrians or bikes. Haugen asked if there wasn't an SR2 project awarded that area. Ellis responded that there was, but now they are saying that they don't want to put a sidewalk in, but would rather put in bike lanes. She added, however, that she thinks the project will still be done, at least on one side of the street. Thompson asked if would be a shared use path. Ellis responded that it wouldn't, that it would be a five-foot sidewalk only. Troe stated that that would have been outside of the existing right-of-way anyway, correct. Ellis responded that that was correct. Troe asked if they would need to widen the road to get a third lane. Carbee responded that you would if you want to put a bike lane in as well, otherwise it is wide enough to accommodate three lanes.

Troe asked which project had the higher priority. Haugen responded that the three lane project would have the higher priority, and then a bike lane path.

11. EAST GRAND FORKS BEET/POTATO TRUCK TRAFFIC

Troe reported that they would be meeting with the folks from Crystal Sugar to discuss the range of alternatives they might have for improving the access to the beet plant in East Grand Forks. He stated that they currently have three alternatives for consideration.

a. Alt 17A-17C – Beet/Potato Plan Truck Traffic

Troe said that one of the alternatives would involve doing improvements along 5th Street, although they would have impacts to the adjacent residential development, and to the park. He

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 20th, 2007**

added that you will also need to acquire right-of-way to create the buffer you need to eliminate conflicts between the residential uses and the trucks using that corridor. He stated that the second alternative would be to re-route 5th Street around the primary location of the residential development and park area, and then back into the corridor north of where the beet plant is located. He said that the third alternative would involve bringing the trucks around by Gateway, in from the east, which would have a greater investment in the infrastructure, and the improvements of the corridor there, and then we would need to try to figure out how to eliminate the truck movements along 5th, but that is a federal aid urban roadway, so that the idea of restricting trucks on the street doesn't work.

Ellis commented that they are concerned about the parking lot on the other side of Stauss Park. Carbee responded that that was one of the reasons they developed Alternative 17B. Ellis stated that they have two rinks out there, but they only put ice on one so the parking lot could be located where the second rink is. Carbee pointed out that Alternative 17C deals with redeveloping Stauss Park. Troe said that he still thinks, from an impact to the adjacent land use, that we would need to be looking at a corridor that would get around the park and some of the residential, or at least off-set from it because of the conflicts from the truck traffic because that is where you end up directing the vast majority of trucks. He asked if we really want those conflicts going on, adjacent residential, adjacent park, or do we want to try to create an off-set corridor to get round the residential pier, which would mean we need to at least limit the extent of some property takes we might ultimately end up needing to acquire to create enough of a setback, or do you try to create another roadway entirely that could be used by the truck. He stated that ultimately it all gets us back to thinking about another corridor, or about just biting the bullet along 5th and convert it to a more industrial corridor.

Troe stated that they would do some tweaking on this, and get that information back to everyone for review.

12. FUTURE CONGESTION ALONG CURRENT, RURAL TWO-LANE ROADWAYS

a. Alt 18A-18D – FUTURE CONGESTION ALONG CURRENT RURAL, TWO-LANE ROADWAYS

Troe reported that, based on development within the region, and the fact that a lot of development, from a residential standpoint was located south of 32nd Avenue, along Columbia, Washington, and areas in-between, and these areas are pretty much put together as two lanes, so we need to widen them out and do some improvements to create more of an urban section; similarly we need to do this to the development that is anticipated out to the west on 32nd Avenue; and also we have some residential and commercial development to the north to which we need to extend the median divided cross-section to the north. He said that all of these would be consistent with, or concurrent with the development as it continues its march either to the north in East Grand Forks, and primarily to the south in Grand Forks.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 20th, 2007**

Troe said that this is all they had to go through today. He commented that they didn't have very many changes to the scoring, and he would like everyone to take a look at it on their own. He stated that they now need start putting together some packages that everyone can review over the next few weeks, and then we can meet again to develop a finalized recommended list.

Haugen commented that the 47th Avenue Interchange is a project that helps Columbia Road, and the development to the south in Grand Forks, but how much does it take from the Merrifield Interchange, as they are only two miles apart, and how will it affect the Merrifield Justification Report. Troe responded that it would affect it somewhat, but again they are two miles apart, and are located further south where development stops pretty much at 62nd, and at 47th you don't have any river access, so the interaction between those two isn't going to be spectacular. He stated that if you look at them from just an interchange standpoint, and you went by the letter of the law, both of them are going to have some trouble, but we all know it doesn't work that way all the time, and they also serve different purposes.

Troe stated that as far as their next steps go, what comes to his radar screen is the next public meeting, and he is wondering if they are far enough along to have that in July.

ADJOURNMENT

Haugen declared the meeting adjourned at 1:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Executive Assistant