

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 8th, 2009 – 1:30 p.m.
Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A-101**

CALL TO ORDER

Earl Haugen, Chairman, called the July 8th, 2009, 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: Joe McKinnon, MNDOT-Bemidji; Jane Williams, Grand Forks Traffic Engineer; Nancy Ellis, East Grand Forks Planner; Arden Striefel (Proxy for Stacey Hanson), NDDOT-Bismarck (Via Conference Call) ; Greg Boppre, EGF Consulting Engineer, Kent Ehrenstrom, MNDOT-Bemidji; and Charles Durrenberger (Proxy for Brad Gengler).

Guests present were: Randy Gust, EGF Emergency Management; Ken Westby, EGF Property Owner; and Duane Doble, EGF Property Owner.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Daniel Ollhoff, GF/EGF MPO Intern; Kristen Benidt, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Executive Assistant.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

A quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen requested that, because we have some new people here today, everyone please give a brief introduction of themselves.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 10TH, 2009, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO APPROVE THE JUNE 10TH, 2009, MINUTES OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 8th, 2009**

MATTER OF 2009-2012 T.I.P. AMENDMENT

Haugen reported that copies of the staff report, and supporting documents associated with this T.I.P. amendment were included in the packets. He explained that essentially we have a project programmed in 2009 that is part of the Transportation Revolving Loan Fund Program, and that is the 23rd Street N.W. project in East Grand Forks, which is projected to cost just under \$3,500,000. He stated that the request is to amend the T.I.P. to show this project as being done in two phases, one in 2009 and the other in 2010, and to increase the project cost to just over \$4,600,000.

Haugen referred to the staff report, and pointed out that it indicates that the first phase, programmed in 2009, will cost just under \$2,500,000 and will involve removal of the existing roadway, placement of the new infrastructure, completion of the sub-grade, installation of crushed concrete as a temporary road surface; and then in 2010 the second phase will occur at a cost of about \$2,200,000 and will involve placement of curbing, gutter, and concrete pavement, as well as the addition of a multi-purpose trail.

Haugen stated that as part of this amendment the City of East Grand Forks will also move the 2010 project currently programmed for City Sub-Target funds and replace it with the 23rd Street N.W. project instead, which will allow for them to utilize roughly \$740,000 of federal funds for the project. He said that the current 2010 project, the 5th Avenue N.W. intersection project, will then be programmed to occur in 2014, which is when the City will again receive sub-target monies.

Haugen commented that the East Grand Forks City Council met last evening and did verify and approve this request, and a letter to that effect will be forthcoming.

Haugen reported that staff did advertise this is a public hearing opportunity, and did allow that people that could not attend today's meeting could submit comments until noon today, however none were received. He pointed out that there are members of the community present today.

Haugen opened the public hearing.

Duane Doble, 2218 Country Court N.W., East Grand Forks, stated that his property is located between 6th Avenue N.E. and 8th Avenue N.E., on a dead-end street, and he was wondering if when they take out their culvert and approach, how will they have access into their patio homes there, and what about fire protection. Boppre responded that the City will actually be putting in a temporary access on the backside of these properties during construction, on the south side, and as far as fire protection is concerned, he would defer that to Mr. Gust, Fire Chief, who is here today. Gust stated that there is a hydrant located near the property that they can access should the need arise, and that would give them all the water they would need. Mr. Doble asked if any of the bushes on the south side of the properties would need to be removed as well. Boppre responded that he wouldn't think that would be necessary, but it will be looked at further. He added that they also plan on holding a neighborhood meeting before they begin construction

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 8th, 2009**

work, which will most likely be held at Valley Golf Course, so that everyone will be well informed before construction begins on the project.

Ken Westby, 2226 Country Court N.W., East Grand Forks, asked when they plan on removing the ditch, if it will be done as part of the first phase of the project this year. Boppre responded that they do plan on removing the ditch as part of the first phase. He explained that he is actually waiting for MNDOT Central Office to review the plans. He said that State Aid in Bemidji reviewed them a couple of weeks ago and approved them, but they are waiting for State approval, and once that is received he will then need to advertise it, so even if they were to get approval today it would still take two to three weeks before it can be bid, and then it would need to be approved by City Council, so they will most likely be looking at September before construction will begin, but the goal is to get all the preliminary things done this year, such as removal of the ditch, build a new drainway on the north side of the road, then put in a box culvert. Haugen asked the residents if they were satisfied with the answers received today, they indicated they were.

Haugen closed the public hearing.

Haugen stated, again, that the request today is to amend the 2009-2012 T.I.P. to change the Scope of Work for the 23rd Street N.W. project to include two phases of construction, to modify the project cost amount, to amend the 2010 project list to include the second phase of the project, and to delay out to 2014 the 5th Avenue N.W. project for sub-target funds. Haugen noted that the public comments did not impact any of the actions this body would be taking.

MOVED BY WILLIAMS, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FY 2009-2012 T.I.P. AMENDMENT, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF DISCUSSION ON BRIDGE CLOSURE PLAN

Haugen reported that a brief discussion was held on this item at last month's meeting, specifically about some issues that arose during our last flood fight, with the closure of "too" many bridges, and how these issues might be dealt with, and it was suggested that everyone should go back and review the document and create a list of things they feel could be done to improve the plan. He said he received only two bits of communication, which he has just distributed.

Haugen referred to the communication distributed, and pointed out that the first one was from Mr. Boppre concerning issues that East Grand Forks personnel had, and the second was from Mr. McKinnon concerning issues that MNDOT had with the plan. He asked that both Mr. Boppre and Mr. McKinnon go over their concerns.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 8th, 2009**

Boppre stated that it was his suggestion to do the comments based on the last meeting, which he fully intended to do, but after talking to John Wachtner, Public Works Director, they felt it was unnecessary. He explained that East Grand Forks uses the Corps of Engineers Flood Protection Operation and Maintenance Manual during closure events, but added that they also use the Bridge Management Closure Study as a reference guide.

Gust commented that there was a lot of discussion held during the past flood about when to open and when to close the various bridges. He said that they go back and use the O&M Manual as a guideline, which is a little different than what was presented by A.T.A.C. in the Bridge Management Closure Study, which they feel is too specific. He stated that they don't want something that is set in stone as each flooding event needs to be handled in a manner that is appropriate for that particular event. He said that he knows that some of the decisions they made during this past event created a lot of controversy, which isn't something they wanted to happen, but as a group they need some flexibility when dealing with these events since they don't have a very big staff, which is what they use to construct these closures, so they need flexibility.

Boppre stated that he wishes that Mr. Noehre were here today as the issue of when the Sorlie Bridge was reopened was really more of an issue for him than anyone else. He explained that if they would have used A.T.A.C.'s model, or plan, they wouldn't have been able to open the Sorlie for at least a couple more weeks, based on the elevation, so, again, it is a guide that they can use, but in the end common sense will have to prevail.

Williams said that they agree with that as well. She stated that they intend to use the Bridge Management Closure Plan as a guide, and/or checklist to follow to ensure that they don't miss anything when dealing with an event such as this last flood event, but there are just too many variables and the plan is tied to too many things, and ultimately you need flexibility.

Discussion ensued.

Williams commented that she feels that Mr. Noehre's concerns were alleviated by Mr. Aubol's comment that he would make sure that Mr. Noehre was contacted prior to the reopening of the Sorlie in the future.

Haugen stated that everything that is being said is great, but the fact remains that we have a document that has been published that includes some heights, and we know that those heights are different, that there will be modifications necessary to protect to a higher height, but he thinks that what we are trying to do is to make a living document that is relevant for the future.

Haugen commented that one concern has been that there are so many different heights being used for the same locations. He pointed out that the City of Grand Forks' website had different heights listed than the US Geological website as to when different things would occur, and we were trying to create a generic number so that there was consistent communication going out, so the public wasn't being told conflicting information as to when the various sites would be closed,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 8th, 2009**

so that is what the table in the plan was trying to address, but still allowing that each flood event is different, and will need to be adjusted accordingly.

Haugen reported that MNDOT did go to 220 and 2, and they did experience traffic issues there and made appropriate adjustments to the plan to deal with those issues, so it might, perhaps, make sense to add some of those adjustments to the document so that they are recorded, and are part of the living document.

Haugen stated that Mr. Noehre's biggest issue was that this was the second flood event in a row where he heard that the Sorlie Bridge had been opened through the media rather than being contacted directly, so he would like to see some of these adjustments made to the document.

Williams pointed out that Mr. Haugen had indicated that the heights used by the USGS were different than those used in the Bridge Closure Management Plan. She asked what the heights used in the Bridge Closure Management Plan were based on. Haugen responded that they are based on the East Grand Forks Corps Manual and the Grand Forks Corps Manual, and because the two manuals do not correspond with each others closure heights, as the Grand Forks Manual says the Sorlie will close at one height, and the East Grand Forks Manual says it will close at a different height, so we tried to create a table with a common number with the knowledge that each flood event is different and these numbers aren't set in stone. Williams asked where USGS got their information. Haugen responded that they go to the Grand Forks Manual and use those numbers.

Boppre commented that maybe A.T.A.C. should have looked at the fact that there was a lower closure height on the Sorlie in East Grand Forks than in Grand Forks and included that information in the table. Haugen responded that they did do that, that they used East Grand Forks' numbers as their base. Boppre stated, then, that he doesn't see the problem. Haugen responded that those numbers are good except we now know that the Murray is going to have a higher closure height than what is in the plan, and the Kennedy will have a higher closure height than what is in the plan, so once that information is corrected we would then have a table that we want to try to get to the info centers, and others, that says that these are the numbers to use. Boppre commented that he feels that if we do make these adjustments to the table, we should, out of courtesy, give it to the Corps to look at it to make sure it is consistent, because, again, the possibility exists that if we don't involve them there could be problems. Haugen stated that the Corps was involved with the initial creation of the table as well, so he agrees.

Gust reported that the Murray is a prime example. He explained that in 2006 they put berms in place because the estimated height of that flood event was just over closure height, but this year it was decided not to put berms in place because the estimated height of the flood event exceeded that of 2006, so where would you put that kind of information in a table. He stated that it would be almost impossible to do so because every year will be different. Haugen responded that if you have something in the table that talks about berms, you would simply need to talk about two heights for the Murray, a closure height with berms and one without berms, but if a permanent berm is put in place, then you would only need to include one height again. Boppre commented

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 8th, 2009**

at this time he would suggest, until they get direction from the City Council, at least on the southend of the Murray the information listed be left as is. He added, however, if you are looking for guidance for the Sorlie Bridge, if there needs to be an adjustment for closure and opening heights, we can look at that; and as far as the Kennedy Bridge is concerned, that is really up to MNDOT, and whether or not they intend to put up closures on the East Grand Forks side of the bridge. Haugen suggested that the Kennedy could be addressed in the same manner as the Murray, with and without closures.

Boppre stated, again, this all comes back to the fact that all events will be different, will create different jobs for everyone, and to have something static at 830 doesn't mean it will be at 830, but he understands that if we have, at least for the media, the same elevations, and then if it gets a little different during the actual flood fight, the media people can address the reason for any adjustments made.

Haugen reported that there were also some experiences with the different detour routes, particularly on Gateway Drive where we didn't anticipate all the left turns onto side streets being closed off for traffic control, that should maybe be addressed as well, so there are some things that we experienced that would improve the document. Williams stated that those closures will actually be implemented from the get-go should a similar event occur, the left turns will be eliminated and they will close 1st.

Boppre commented that signage is an issue for East Grand Forks just as it is for Grand Forks. He explained that while A.T.A.C. did a great job listing the signage required, neither city has the funds available to provide all the signage needed, so while it is nice to have a document with all that signage in it, the City shouldn't get criticized when they can't have all the signs out there, so it is nice to have the document, but again, it is a living document that we can try to work with, but we need to be flexible. Haugen responded that he isn't arguing that point, except that there will now probably be a focus on signage on Gateway Drive in Grand Forks that is not in the document, so why wouldn't we want to update the document to show the focus on Gateway Drive. He said that he doesn't think that, technically, we should mitigate or move signs from anywhere else, but we should show the signs on Gateway Drive. Boppre agreed, but added that what he is saying is that if, during the flood event, there is not a stop sign at 3rd and 4th for whatever reason, that he doesn't want the City criticized for it just because it is in the plan, because they were criticized during this last event when they weren't able to place all the signage shown in the plan.

Gust reported that East Grand Forks' website really got hammered on why the numbers weren't the same. He stated that they know there is an issue, and they know they need to make some adjustments, but, again if this is all placed in the document, it just gives ammunition to those nay-sayers out there that just want to criticize us for everything we do, so while we know we need to keep citizens informed, doing so can create a hindrance for us when we need to start addressing everyone's comments.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 8th, 2009**

Haugen commented that he thinks we are interested in making a living document, and one of the very toughest jobs, the first job that A.T.A.C. tackled was trying to craft those tables because we knew that we would be looking at the manuals separately, as they were produced separately, so they didn't reference each other's critical heights, and, in-fact, for the Pointe Bridge in East Grand Forks they referenced the closure way down by the fire station and we all know that is too high. Gust responded that what the Corps is telling them is that this is the elevation we should put the closure in, and that is why the two manuals don't coordinate, because Grand Forks is higher than East Grand Forks. He added that the Corps may need to address this, but we are still looking at two complete different documents, and taking information from the two and combining them would be hard because of the elevations. He stated that they don't use their OIM Manual as gospel, just a guideline, which is how they use the A.T.A.C. document as well as flexibility is the key.

McKinnon reported that some of the comments he submitted were put together by their Traffic Engineer, who deals with Highway 220 and Highway 2 intersection, and with the Highway 220 and County Road 72 intersection. He stated that these are just some of the things they had to deal with at those locations this year that weren't mentioned in the manual; such as the closing of turn lanes, the placement of variable message signs, additional law enforcement during peak hours, etc..

Ellis commented that she had one suggestion for Mr. McKinnon concerning the intersection of Highway 220 and County Road 72. She pointed out that the original document showed stops being reversed at that intersection, meaning that when the bridges are closed there should be stop signs placed on Highway 220 and through traffic should be allowed on County Road 72. She referred to Mr. McKinnon's recommendations, and stated that she doesn't think putting in four-way stops at the intersection of Highway 220 and County Road 72 would be a good idea, but should instead retain the original idea of reversing the stops.

Haugen stated that he believes there are some changes that we can do, but the question is can we do them internally or do we need to engage A.T.A.C. to help us. He said that in his opinion, they could be done internally. Consensus was to make the adjustments internally.

Information only.

MATTER OF SCHOOL SAFETY STUDY FINAL REPORT

Haugen reported that A.T.A.C. performed this study for two schools in Grand Forks, Lewis & Clark and West Elementary Schools; and one in East Grand Forks, New Heights Elementary School. He pointed out that copies of diagrams showing suggested improvements for signage and future parking layouts, were included in the packets.

Ellis commented that they took any and all recommendations from both City and School staff concerning the draft report. She stated there were some changes made to the final report, which she will go over briefly. She reminded the committee members that this is a "safe routes to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 8th, 2009**

school” report so it isn’t based solely on getting kids to walk or bike to school, but addresses all modes of transportation, therefore it also addresses motor-vehicle safety for kids being dropped off and picked up, as well as bus traffic, parked vehicles, etc., so that we can make it more safe all around the schools.

Ellis referred to Page 23 in the packet, and explained that one of the things that the A.T.A.C. reports always addresses is making sure that the signs meet the MUTCD standards, and that they also meet our Uniform School Traffic Control Study that we did before. She stated that what they are trying to accomplish is to get all of the signs in both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks are consistent so when you enter a school zone in either City, all signage is the same for clearer understanding. She said that this page shows ways to improve the signage around the Lewis and Clark area.

Ellis commented that the other adjustments they try to do are more of an engineering type of adjustment. She stated that one thing this plan provides is a way to drop off children, as well as to provide parking for employees and visitors that go into the schools.

Ellis continued going over the recommended adjustments for both West Elementary and New Heights Elementary.

Williams commented that one of the problems they have at West Elementary is that there are no parking signs up, so people are stopping and standing, so they are changing the existing signs to say there is no standing, stopping, or parking, so that the police can enforce it.

Ellis referred to Page 28, and commented that it shows the recommended parking changes, including the addition of some employee parking in the front of the south door, as well as some concrete play area for the students. She stated that it also provides a bus lane in the alley, where buses can more safely drop off and pick up students, and some additional parking at the very north portion of the alley as well.

Ellis referred to Page 27, and pointed out that it does give some cost estimates for long-term strategies.

Ellis referred to Page 29, and explained that New Heights Elementary is not a neighborhood school, but is instead a K-2 school so all children in Kindergarten through Second Grade attend this school. She said that every child in East Grand Forks has the ability to be bused, so there are a number of children riding the bus and being dropped off, and very few children walking, mainly due to their ages. She pointed out that the recommendation is to add several new signs around this school, as well as to remove several of the existing signs that do not meet MUTCD standards.

Ellis commented that the biggest concern they had with New Heights was that in the morning, the teachers park as close to the school as they can, and because there is only one entrance on the north end, that is where they park. She added that there is no on-site parking, only street parking, so, referring to Page 31, they are recommending some on-site parking be added to the site.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 8th, 2009**

MOVED BY DURRENBERGER, SECONDED BY BOPPRE, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD THAT THEY APPROVE THE FINAL A.T.A.C. SCHOOL SAFETY STUDY FOR WEST ELEMENTARY AND LEWIS AND CLARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN GRAND FORKS, AND NEW HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN EAST GRAND FORKS SUBJECT TO ANY MINOR CORRECTIONS NEEDING TO BE MADE TO THE DOCUMENT.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF RAILROAD CROSSING STUDY

Haugen reported that staff is asking for two basic actions; first to amend our work program to move this study from 2010 to the latter part of 2009, and secondly to approve the Draft RFP that is included in the packet.

Haugen stated that we already have this study identified in our work program, however it was scheduled to occur completely in 2010, but in light of some additional funding, and a desire by the City of Grand Forks to do it sooner, we are requesting approval to move it up to the latter part of 2009. He added that the North Dakota Legislature also passed a quiet-zone bill in which they have set aside state monies, and a portion of federal funds to address railroad crossing improvements, with a lot of discussion focused on creating quiet-zones, which also prompted the desire to do this sooner than later.

Haugen said that they have identified in the work program that the additional funding available will be used to fund the portion of this study being programmed in 2009.

Haugen reported that the RFP itself is a standard RFP. He referred to the Scope-Of-Work, included in the packet, and pointed out that there are actually two different types of crossing studies taking place. He stated that the first one deals with potential quiet-zone activities. He referred to a slide of a map illustrating the various crossings throughout the area, and explained that the crossings shown in black are those that have been identified to have a quiet-zone risk analysis done on them. He stated that all of these crossings, fourteen of them, do meet the minimum traffic control requirements necessary to qualify, or to be eligible to be a quiet-zone, with the only exception being the crossing at 3rd Street in East Grand Forks.

Haugen stated that the second part of the study will cover the area shown in red, which includes all of the State Mill Spur Line Crossings. He pointed out that these crossings are located approximately a block apart, with some alley crossings that create crossings every half-block in some areas, and we would like to see what it will take to upgrade these crossings, as well as to address the closure of some of them, with the ultimate goal being to create a quieter-zone in this area. He added, however, that we don't anticipate being able to upgrade all of them to the minimum required for a true quiet-zone.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 8th, 2009**

Haugen commented that this has been submitted to NDDOT for their review, and they have been working with federal highways. He explained that there are a couple of things federal highways still has questions about, so whatever action this body takes will be subject to final approval of federal highways.

Williams said that she had a question about the information they received today, the application, and whether or not it is true that this study will need to be completed before the application can be submitted. Haugen responded that he would think that would be the case. Williams stated that she read the information and that is what she got out of it, as far as where Grand Forks is in the process. Haugen agreed, adding that the only thing is that the State Legislature's Quiet-Zone Bill is providing funds, not just to implement those safety devices, but also the study, so we asked federal highway that if we can't look at "X" thing in detail, would that be eligible for the state program, and they said yes that the bill says it is also for studies, however it is first come first serve so they may not actually give us any monies.

Discussion on timeline ensued.

Haugen referred to Page 48, and asked if the project deliverables should separate the quiet-zone section from the State Mill Spur section, with the quiet-zone section having a completion date of November 2009 and the State Mill Spur section having a completion date of June 2010. Consensus was that the two sections should be split as stated.

MOVED BY BOPPRE, SECONDED BY DURRENBERGER, TO FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD TO APPROVE AMENDING THE 2009 ANNUAL WORK PROGRAM TO INCLUDE THE RAILROAD CROSSING STUDY, AND TO APPROVE THE RFP SUBJECT TO FINAL APPROVAL FROM FEDERAL HIGHWAY.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF SIGN INVENTORY UPDATE

Ollhoff commented that he had wanted to be able to have a demonstration of how this inventory works, and how it will be implemented into the IT Department, the Engineering Department, and the Public Works Department for each City, but that did not work out, so he apologizes for that. He referred to the inventory sheet included in the packets, and explained that there are 24 quadrants within Grand Forks, and 3 within East Grand Forks.

Ollhoff explained that an update was recently made to the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices concerning sign visibility requirements. He stated that municipalities have until January 2012 to establish a sign assessment method designed to maintain minimum levels of sign retroreflectivity, and until January 2015 to replace signs that do not meet the new requirements for regulatory, warning, and ground mounted signs (except street signs); and until 2018 to replace overhead guide signs and street signs.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 8th, 2009**

Ollhoff commented that replacement has already begun taking place, in East Grand Forks from the north end, and in Grand Forks around the school zones. He said that the majority of the signs that have already been replaced are school signs, so hopefully we can work on getting additional new signage placed around the schools.

Ollhoff referred to an excel spreadsheet that illustrates how the inventory is broken down and went over it, explaining that it will allow people to search by TCD code for sign type. He added that in addition there is a side note for each sign listed that indicates where it is located, whether or not it has been replaced, what kind of condition it is in, etc.. He stated that within the next two years this will allow us to come up with a replacement cycle for sign replacement.

Ollhoff stated that there are about 10,000 signs within the two areas, including those at UND that will not be replaced by the Grand Forks Public Works Department. He pointed out that the downtown areas are very densely signed and will take considerable time and funding to get done, but it certainly is necessary. He added that between the downtown parking areas and the school areas, those are the most imperative signs needing replacement.

Ollhoff reported that there are five different replacement plans:

- A) Visual Nighttime Inspection – Most common - signs are viewed in their natural surroundings so you will see how they really look – lowest level of replacement as some have already been replaced – very costly as you will need to hire a daytime and nighttime inspector – is very subjective.
- B) Measured Sign Retroreflectivity – Rarely used – will need to purchase a retroreflectometer - very costly - very difficult to operate unless trained – would remove subjectivity of how retroreflectivity is shown and realized – time consuming.
- C) Expected Sign Life – Most efficient.
- D) Blanket Replacement – Consistent – replacement interval is based on the expected sign life.
- E) Control Signs – Not used much if at all - sign replacement is based on condition of control signs – easy monitoring of signs through quality and life – hard to know how long the retroreflective life really is.

Ollhoff stated that it would make the most sense to use either a combination of C and D, or just use C. He commented that this is what they did for the study. He added that it is suggested that a GIS be used, and since we already have one this makes the most sense.

Ollhoff commented that they are now ready to move on to the next step, which is to get this information out to the two public work departments, MNDOT, and NDDOT and let them know how we will be meeting the requirements.

Williams asked if the actual costs of performing these various replacements plans are available. Ollhoff responded that Minnesota uses the Blanket Replacement plan, and they replace their

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 8th, 2009**

Type 3 every 12 years and their Type 9 every 15 years. Williams stated that that is exactly the information she needs. Ollhoff said that he would get that kind of information for the other plans as well.

Information only.

MATTER OF BIKE/PEDESTRIAN PLAN UPDATE

Benidt reported that we are in the process of updating the Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan Update. She stated that the last update was done in 2004, and the final draft of this update is scheduled to be completed in December 2009, with final approval in January 2010.

Benidt stated that there are three main focuses with this update, the first being to try to increase the amount of on-road bicycle facilities such as bike lanes, signed bike routes, and possibly sharrows, which are shared lane markings. She commented that we do have a very good system for recreational users, however there is minimal accommodation of transportation bicyclists. She stated that the second focus is to increase helmet use through education and support for a possible helmet ordinance, and the third is the continuation of bringing the pedestrian curb ramps up to ADA standards.

Benidt commented that she did run a bicycle level of service model for bike lanes, both existing and proposed, within Grand Forks and East Grand Forks. She explained that a bicycle level of service model is a statistically-calibrated mathematical equation that is used to evaluate on-road bicycling conditions to determine the compatibility of bicycling on a roadway. She said that things like roadway width, striping conditions, traffic volume, pavement surface conditions, motor vehicle speed and type, on-street parking, etc., all can affect the compatibility of bicycling on a roadway.

Benidt referred to slides illustrating the various levels of service, from a Level of Service A to a Level of Service F, and went over them briefly.

Benidt reported that a Grand Forks/East Grand Forks Pedestrian and Bicycle Trail Use Study was conducted to count the users of different sections of trails throughout the Grand Cities. She explained that 26 locations were studied, and two Saturday counts were done on major trail locations as well. She added that the counts were done weekdays from 7 a.m. to 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. to 9 p.m. and the Saturday counts were done from 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. using an electronic board with a button for each user type. She said that the four modes of transportation counted were walkers, joggers, rollerbladers/skateboarders, and bikers, and the age groups were divided into senior citizen, adult, teen, and child. She referred to slides illustrating the results, shown by age, mode, time of day, etc., and went over them briefly.

Benidt explained that the ADA Curb Ramp Study is a product of the Americans with Disability Act, which required the installation of curb ramps as well as truncated domes at the edges of public streets. She stated that this information was recorded using pavement photos. She

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, July 8th, 2009**

referred to slides illustrating the number of curb ramps currently in place, where curb ramps were needed in 1992, 2002, and 2009, and pointed out that we are making progress quite well.

Information only.

MATTER OF SOLICITATION OF JARC AND NEW FREEDOM PROJECTS

Kouba reported that both Minnesota and North Dakota are soliciting for JARC (Job Access/Reverse Commute) and New Freedom applications. She stated that North Dakota has an application that will be available tomorrow, and Minnesota has their applications available on their website, and are due August 14th.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY DURRENBERGER, SECONDED BY ELLIS, TO ADJOURN THE JULY 8TH,
2009, MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AT 3:16 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis, Executive Assistant