

## APPENDIX A

### INVOLVEMENT OVERVIEW

Provided in this appendix is information related to the involvement effort conducted as a part of the Grand Forks – East Grand Forks Street and Highway Plan update. Meeting announcements / press releases, sign-in sheets and comment forms from the public meetings are included. Also included are the meeting notes from the presentations to the various planning commissions in the area.

## PRESS RELEASE

### FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

CONTACT: Earl Haugen, Ex. Dir. 701/746/2660

### PUBLIC MEETING on TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

The Grand Forks – East Grand Forks Metropolitan Planning Organization will hold a public meeting on the Long Range Transportation Plan Update – Street and Highway Section on Wednesday, August 23rd at the Alerus Center. The meeting will be held in the “Oriole” Room beginning at 5:45 pm. This is being conducted as an open house format, meaning staff will be available around certain tables to obtain input. A short presentation will be held at 6:15 pm. After the short presentation, staff will be available until 7:30 pm.

“Congress imposed some new requirements on us and this update will focus on bringing our current Plan into compliance. With our current Plan adopted so recently, we do not anticipate much change in the current Plan recommendations.” according to Earl Haugen, Executive Director of the MPO. “The purpose of the meeting is to provide an overview of the update and seek public input.”

To assist in this update, the MPO has hired the consulting firm of URS. Mr. Bill Troe will serve as Project Manager. Houston Engineering has been retained as a sub-consultant to assist as well.

A mailing list will be started at the meeting. People unable to attend can contact the MPO by either calling 701/746/2660 or writing to the MPO at PO Box 5200, Grand Forks, ND 58206.

# # #

**August 23, 2006  
Public Meeting  
SIGN-IN FORM**

Name

## Address

Richard Gunderson	2805 N. University Drive, Fargo ND
Sheila Bruhn	2210-11th Ave. NW, EGF, MN
Dick Grassel	811 2nd Ave NE EGF
Jim WHITENGAR	41042 210 ST SW EGF.
Paula Lee	2507 Crown Dr. GF
Warren Swandell	2024 10th St SE - EGF
Scott Borshey	19704 State Hwy 270 SW EGF



## PRESS RELEASE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

CONTACT: Earl Haugen, Ex. Dir. 701/746/2660

### Meeting to Present Future Traffic Volume Forecasts

The Grand Forks - East Grand Forks Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) will hold an open house in order to present 2035 traffic forecasts and background on the process used to develop the forecasts and to gather public comment on forecasted volumes and resulting quality of traffic flow throughout the community. The open house will be held on Thursday, May 10, 2007, in the Training Room (Room #1S) of East Grand Forks City Hall, located at 600 DeMers Avenue in East Grand Forks. The open house will start at 6:30 pm and last until 9:30 pm. The public, special and private sector transportation providers, are encouraged to attend.

The purpose of the open house is to gather public input on 2035 forecasted traffic volumes that have been developed for the region and the transportation issues associated with future year traffic on the anticipated base condition street network. The input obtained through the meeting will be incorporated into the street system improvement alternatives analysis, which is the next step in the update process. The final product will be an update to highway plan that is a key element of the Grand Forks-East Grand Forks multimodal long range transportation plan.

“These forecasts reflect the continued growth in the metropolitan area,” stated Earl Haugen, Executive Director of the MPO. “We have all seen the growth evidenced by the new housing and businesses. Our traffic is growing as well. Even though 2035 seems like a long time away, we look this far to ensure that any improvements we do will provide benefits for some time.”

The MPO is the area’s designated transportation planning organization. Its primary function is to identify existing and future transportation needs and prioritize the region investments to address those needs.

###

## **PUBLIC NOTICE**

The Grand Forks - East Grand Forks Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) will hold an open house in order to gather public comment on future transportation issues. The open house will be held on Thursday, May 10, 2007, in the Training Room (Room #1S) of East Grand Forks City Hall, located at 600 DeMers Avenue in East Grand Forks. The open house will start at 6:30 pm and last until 9:30 pm. The public, special and private sector transportation providers, are encouraged to attend.

The purpose of the open house is to gather public input on the forecasted traffic volumes that will be presented. The forecast year is 2035. Information will also include existing traffic issues and how these forecasted volumes impact these issues.

If you are unable to attend the open house, you can submit written comments to the MPO at P.O. Box 5200, Grand Forks, ND 58206-5200. Written comments will be received until noon May 17, 2007.

For further information, contact Mr. Earl Haugen at 701-746-2660. Any individual requiring a special accommodation to allow access to participation at this meeting is asked to notify the ADA Coordinator 701-746-2655 of their needs prior to the Meeting.

(Please publish ASAP as an ad)

(Please submit bill to MPO 746-2660)

## **PUBLIC NOTICE**

The Grand Forks - East Grand Forks Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) will hold an open house in order to gather public comment on forecasted future transportation conditions. The open house will be held on Thursday, May 10, 2007, in the Training Room (Room #1S) of East Grand Forks City Hall, located at 600 DeMers Avenue in East Grand Forks. The open house will start at 6:30 pm and last until 9:30 pm. The public, special and private sector transportation providers, are encouraged to attend.

The purpose of the open house is to gather public input on 2035 forecasted traffic volumes that will be presented, and the transportation issues associated with future year traffic and the anticipated base condition street network. The input provided will be then incorporated into the street system improvement alternatives analysis.

If you are unable to attend the open house, you can submit written comments to the MPO at P.O. Box 5200, Grand Forks, ND 58206-5200. Written comments will be received until noon May 17, 2007.

For further information, contact Mr. Earl Haugen at 701-746-2660. Any individual requiring a special accommodation to allow access to participation at this meeting is asked to notify the ADA Coordinator 701-746-2655 of their needs prior to the Meeting.

(Please publish ASAP as an ad)

(Please submit bill to MPO 746-2660)

**GRAND FORKS / EAST GRAND FORKS  
LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE  
Streets and Highways Element**

**May 10, 2007  
Public Meeting  
SIGN-IN FORM**

**Name**

**Address**

Warren Strandell

2024 15<sup>TH</sup> ST SE - EGF

793-0051

## **PUBLIC NOTICE**

The Grand Forks - East Grand Forks Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) will hold an open house in order to gather public comment on preliminary recommendations for projects to be included in the MPO Street and Highway Plan for the period through 2035. The open house will be held on Tuesday, September 25, 2007, in the Meadowlark Room (Room #12) of the ALERUS CENTER, located at 1200 42<sup>nd</sup> St. S. in Grand Forks. The open house will start at 6:30 pm and last until 8:30 pm. The public, special and private sector transportation providers, are encouraged to attend.

The purpose of the open house is to gather public input on recommended improvements to the street and highway network for the metropolitan area of Grand Forks and East Grand Forks. The details of the recommended improvements can be viewed via [www.theforksmpo.org](http://www.theforksmpo.org) Paper copies can be viewed at either GF/EGF MPO Offices in either Grand Forks City Hall or East Grand Forks City Hall.

If you are unable to attend the open house, you can submit written comments to the MPO at P.O. Box 5200, Grand Forks, ND 58206-5200. Written comments will be received until noon September 25, 2007.

For further information, contact Mr. Earl Haugen at 701-746-2660. Any individual requiring a special accommodation to allow access to participation at this meeting is asked to notify the ADA Coordinator 701-746-2655 of their needs prior to the Meeting.

(Please publish ASAP as an ad)

(Please submit bill to MPO 746-2660)





**Meeting to be Held to on Preliminary Recommendations for the 2035 Street and Highway Plan** – The Grand Forks-East Grand Forks Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) will hold a public open house meeting on September 25, 2007 to provide residents, business owners and other stakeholders an opportunity to review the roadway projects that are being proposed as part of the 2035 Street and Highway Plan for the region.

Date: Tuesday, September 25, 2007  
Location: Meadowlark Room (Room Number 12)  
Alerus Center  
1200 South 42<sup>nd</sup> Street  
Time: 6:30 PM to 8:30 PM (Presentation is at 7:00 PM)

The Street and Highway Plan is one element of the MPO's long range transportation plan (LRTP) that covers all parts of the multimodal transportation system, including; streets and highways, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, transit, airports, and rail. The current project is an update of only the street and highway portion of the plan.

As part of the LRTP update process the MPO is asking the public to provide input on the preliminary recommendations for meeting the goals and objectives for the transportation system. The open house meeting offers the public an opportunity to learn more about the preliminary recommendations for specific routes that are identified for action in the period through 2035. Recommendations included in the draft cover a range from minor intersection improvements, to new river crossings and new interchanges on I-29.

Exhibits on the Street and Highway element of the LRTP will be available beginning at 6:30 PM and running until 8:30 PM. A presentation outlining the recommended improvement projects will begin at approximately 7:00 PM and will last about 20 minutes. Staff from the MPO and the planning consultant welcomes the public to review the material before and after the presentation. There will be opportunities for questions and written comments are encouraged.

Additional material on the LRTP process and the preliminary recommendations are located on the MPO website at [www.theforksmpo.org](http://www.theforksmpo.org) or can be reviewed at the MPO offices in either Grand Forks City Hall or East Grand Forks City Hall.

If you are unable to attend the meeting, the MPO will be accepting written comments until noon on September 25, 2007. Comments can be mailed to the MPO at P.O. Box 5200, Grand Forks, ND 58206-5200. Comments can also be emailed to the MPO at the following address [info@theforksmpo.org](mailto:info@theforksmpo.org).

For further information, contact Mr. Earl Haugen, Executive Director of the Grand Forks-East Grand Forks MPO at 701-746-2660. Any individual requiring special accommodations to allow access to participate is asked to notify the ADA Coordinator 701-746-2655 of their needs prior to the meeting.

###

GRAND FORKS / EAST GRAND FORKS  
LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE – Streets  
and Highways Element

September 25, 2007  
Public Meeting  
SIGN-IN FORM

Name	Address
6:05	JANE WILLIAMS PO BOX 5200 GF ND 58706-5200
6:20	Larry Curran 2125-12th Ave NW EGF MN 56721
	George Bryant Box 13000 Grand Forks ND (Nodak)
	George H Newton 601 24th Ave S GF
	Dale Bergmann 8167 S. 48th St. Grand Forks ND.
	Mark Lambrecht 3316 Primrose Ct. Grand Forks, ND
	John Thompson 1103 20th St East Grand Forks MN
	Vincent Langford 502 10th St NW E Grand Forks MN
	Wanda Kenguel 502 10th St NW J. B. J. MN
	Sheila Brahm 620 DeMere Ave. GF, ND 58201
8:00	David Whitcomb 504 S. 4th St. GF, ND 58201

# Evaluation Form

Sept 25, 2007 Meeting

Please fill out this form and return it at the end of the meeting.

## PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS USING THE SCALE BELOW

SA = Strongly Agree    A = Agree    U = Undecided    D = Disagree    SD = Strongly Disagree

1. I understood the goals of the public information meeting.

☒ SA    ☐ A    ☐ U    ☐ D    ☐ SD

2. The introductory presentation was valuable in helping me understand the plan objectives.

☒ SA    ☐ A    ☐ U    ☐ D    ☐ SD

3. I was comfortable sharing my thoughts and ideas about street issues in the study area.

☒ SA    ☐ A    ☐ U    ☐ D    ☐ SD

4. I had an opportunity to learn about the ideas and opinions of others.

☒ SA    ☐ A    ☐ U    ☐ D    ☐ SD

5. Everyone had an opportunity to speak and share ideas.

☒ SA    ☐ A    ☐ U    ☐ D    ☐ SD

6. What did you like least about the meeting?

7. What did you like most about the meeting?

Bill made a nice presentation. Nice graphics.

Very clearly explained. Earl made nice explanations, too.

8. What suggestions do you have for future public workshops and meetings? Very well done!

9. How did you learn about this meeting?

Grand Forks Herald article.

# Evaluation Form

Sept 25, 2007 Meeting

Please fill out this form and return it at the end of the meeting.

## PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS USING THE SCALE BELOW

SA = Strongly Agree    A = Agree    U = Undecided    D = Disagree    SD = Strongly Disagree

1. I understood the goals of the public information meeting.

☐ SA    ☒ A    ☐ U    ☐ D    ☐ SD

2. The introductory presentation was valuable in helping me understand the plan objectives.

☐ SA    ☒ A    ☐ U    ☐ D    ☐ SD

3. I was comfortable sharing my thoughts and ideas about street issues in the study area.

☐ SA    ☐ A    ☒ U    ☐ D    ☐ SD

4. I had an opportunity to learn about the ideas and opinions of others.

☐ SA    ☒ A    ☐ U    ☐ D    ☐ SD

5. Everyone had an opportunity to speak and share ideas.

☐ SA    ☒ A    ☐ U    ☐ D    ☐ SD

6. What did you like least about the meeting?

7. What did you like most about the meeting?

8. What suggestions do you have for future public workshops and meetings?

Use the Newspaper or T.V.

9 How did you learn about this meeting?

Newspaper

# Evaluation Form

Sept 25, 2007 Meeting

Please fill out this form and return it at the end of the meeting.

## PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS USING THE SCALE BELOW

SA = Strongly Agree    A = Agree    U = Undecided    D = Disagree    SD = Strongly Disagree

1. I understood the goals of the public information meeting.

☒ SA    ☐ A    ☐ U    ☐ D    ☐ SD

2. The introductory presentation was valuable in helping me understand the plan objectives.

☐ SA    ☐ A    ☐ U    ☐ D    ☐ SD

3. I was comfortable sharing my thoughts and ideas about street issues in the study area.

☒ SA    ☐ A    ☐ U    ☐ D    ☐ SD

4. I had an opportunity to learn about the ideas and opinions of others.

☒ SA    ☐ A    ☐ U    ☐ D    ☐ SD

5. Everyone had an opportunity to speak and share ideas.

☒ SA    ☐ A    ☐ U    ☐ D    ☐ SD

6. What did you like least about the meeting?

The fact that such an important meeting was so poorly attended. Well advertised but little interest

7. What did you like most about the meeting?

Well presented thorough analysis.

8. What suggestions do you have for future public workshops and meetings?

9 How did you learn about this meeting?

Radio TV News paper

# Evaluation Form

Sept 25, 2007 Meeting

Please fill out this form and return it at the end of the meeting.

## PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS USING THE SCALE BELOW

SA = Strongly Agree    A = Agree    U = Undecided    D = Disagree    SD = Strongly Disagree

1. I understood the goals of the public information meeting.

☒ SA    ☐ A    ☐ U    ☐ D    ☐ SD

2. The introductory presentation was valuable in helping me understand the plan objectives.

☒ SA    ☐ A    ☐ U    ☐ D    ☐ SD

3. I was comfortable sharing my thoughts and ideas about street issues in the study area.

☒ SA    ☐ A    ☐ U    ☐ D    ☐ SD

4. I had an opportunity to learn about the ideas and opinions of others.

☒ SA    ☐ A    ☐ U    ☐ D    ☐ SD

5. Everyone had an opportunity to speak and share ideas.

☒ SA    ☐ A    ☐ U    ☐ D    ☐ SD

6. What did you like least about the meeting?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

7. What did you like most about the meeting?

*Very informative*

\_\_\_\_\_

8. What suggestions do you have for future public workshops and meetings?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

9 How did you learn about this meeting?

*MPO email*

\_\_\_\_\_

# Evaluation Form

Sept 25, 2007 Meeting

Please fill out this form and return it at the end of the meeting.

## PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS USING THE SCALE BELOW

SA = Strongly Agree    A = Agree    U = Undecided    D = Disagree    SD = Strongly Disagree

1. I understood the goals of the public information meeting.

☐ SA    ☒ A    ☐ U    ☐ D    ☐ SD

2. The introductory presentation was valuable in helping me understand the plan objectives.

☐ SA    ☒ A    ☐ U    ☐ D    ☐ SD

3. I was comfortable sharing my thoughts and ideas about street issues in the study area.

☐ SA    ☒ A    ☐ U    ☐ D    ☐ SD

4. I had an opportunity to learn about the ideas and opinions of others.

☐ SA    ☒ A    ☐ U    ☐ D    ☐ SD

5. Everyone had an opportunity to speak and share ideas.

☒ SA    ☐ A    ☐ U    ☐ D    ☐ SD

6. What did you like least about the meeting?

---

---

7. What did you like most about the meeting?

---

---

8. What suggestions do you have for future public workshops and meetings?

---

---

---

9 How did you learn about this meeting?

Grand Forks Herald

Sept 25, 2007 Meeting



**Earl Haugen**  
<earl.haugen@theforksm  
o.org>

09/26/2007 10:57 AM

To: jason\_carbee@urscorp.com

cc

bcc

Subject: Fwd: 32nd Ave bridge

add this to the public comment from last night  
e

***Ted Kreis*** <tkreis@nppga.org> wrote:

From: "Ted Kreis" <tkreis@nppga.org>

To: <info@theforksmo.org>

Subject: 32nd Ave bridge

Date: Mon, 24 Sep 2007 12:52:05 -0500

I couldn't believe the 32<sup>nd</sup> Ave. Bridge is listed in the 28 yr. timeframe. It should be a priority and built ASAP. As someone who works on the east side and lives on the west side, it would be welcome soon, not in 28 yrs. Think how it would complement the 32<sup>nd</sup> Ave business corridor.

You need to stand up to the few but vocal voices opposing it, and DO WHAT IS BEST FOR THE COMMUNITY AS A WHOLE!

**Ted Kreis**



**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
City of Grand Forks, North Dakota  
December 13, 2006**

**1. MEMBERS PRESENT**

The meeting was called to order by Paula Lee at 12:10 p.m. with the following members present: Al Grasser, Dr. Lyle Hall, Curt Kreun, Dr. Robert Kweit, and Gary Malm. Absent: Mayor (Dr.) Michael Brown, Steve Adams, Doug Christensen, John Drees, Tom Hagness, Bill Hutchison, John Jenö, Frank Matejcek and Marijo Whitcomb. A quorum was not present. The presentation was offered for information and did not require a vote.

Staff present included Brad Gengler, City Planner; Ryan Brooks, Senior Planner; and Carolyn Schalk, Administrative Specialist, Senior (Planning and Zoning Department) and Bev Collings, Building and Zoning Administrator (Inspections Office). Absent: Charles Durrenberger, Senior Planner, Planning and Zoning Department. Also present: Earl Haugen, Executive Director of the Grand Forks-East Grand Forks Metropolitan Planning Organization (GF-EGF MPO), David Hampsten, Senior Planner of the GF-EGF MPO and Jason Carbee, URS Corporation, Consultant for the street and highway plan update.

**2. PUBLIC HEARINGS, FINAL APPROVALS, PETITIONS AND MINOR CHANGES:**

**3. COMMUNICATIONS AND PRELIMINARY APPROVALS:**

**3-1. MATTER OF THE GRAND FORKS-EAST GRAND FORKS METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (GF-EGF MPO) STREET AND HIGHWAY PLAN UPDATE.**

Haugen welcomed everyone to the meeting and stated there are several presentations on the progress of the street and highway side of the long-range transportation plan. He reminded members that a full conditions reports was available on the MPO website. The plan is approximately at the midpoint range now. It needs to be in place by June, 2007 in order to be in compliance with the federal regulations so that the transportation money continues to flow in the metropolitan area. He asked that questions be asked at any time during the power point presentation. Haugen introduced Jason Carbee of URS Corporation.

Mr. Carbee thanked all those that appeared for the meeting. There are two transportation elements – street and highway and alternate transportation nodes. The element they are working on at this time is the street and highway element. They are in the process of completing the initial phase and moving into the second phase that includes future traffic

and development. He spoke on the issues for the 2003 plan and identified the areas of congestion. One of the issues in the 2003 plan was where to locate a bridge.

The issues identified through public meetings, distribution of newsletters in the newspaper and discussions with TAC members to update the plan have been divided into three different elements: operations or connectivity (need to re-visit the issue of a north by-pass as well as studying the Columbia Road Corridor which is perceived as a congestion issue). Another important element is safety/geometry concerns (locations identified as a safety concern or area that could be improved such as a pedestrian crossing on University Avenue). The changes between issues now and issues in the previous plan seem to be timing; not where bridges will be located but timing of the bridges. The feedback from the public was “just get them built.”

Haugen said most of the comments received from feedback were very specific geometry or intersection specific issues not typically addressed in a transportation plan. He mentioned the intersection at 24<sup>th</sup> and Columbia and stated there was a project program to handle those types of issues. Another specific comment was the turning radi on 48<sup>th</sup> and DeMers ramps to connect with the interstate. Haugen noted there were projects pending to handle the issues by the DOT next year. Most of the issues noted already have projects pending by the city or the DOT to handle them. There were not questions of whether or not additional bridges were needed or where they should be; the questions were when would they be available? “No” to a bridge at 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South was at the end of comment responses regarding bridges.

Grasser said his lack of comment does not signify approval or disapproval. He just has not had the opportunity to review all of the data.

Dr. Hall asked if an overpass is planned for 17<sup>th</sup> going into the Industrial Park? Mr. Carbee said a 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue overpass was part of the last recommended plan. They will be reviewing the recommendations of the last plan and it would be assumed the previous recommendations be an unspoken issue that was already identified.

Grasser asked what comments were received on the interchange and bridge on Merrifield Road? Mr. Carbee answered the comments were based on timing. Haugen stated the comments were for additional bridges and when specific locations were noted, it was in regard to Merrifield Road. The plan is to construct the Merrifield bridge first and then construct the one on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South. Kreun asked if comments had been received on 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South since the road has been updated and is a through street with minimal driveways or accesses. Haugen said there was a comment for 47<sup>th</sup> as a possible bridge location. One of the MPO members also asked that 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South be reviewed again. Unless directed to study 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, this study is not aimed to re-visit where; just when.

Kreun mentioned that 48<sup>th</sup> is one of the top priorities and asked if that would be connected to the 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue South overpass. Haugen said 48<sup>th</sup> would be improved before an overpass at 17<sup>th</sup> took place. Haugen said the projects already planned were not

being solicited for input; they were trying to capture projects that have not been planned. Even though some of the projects are not shown on the map, they are still being planned or considered for review.

Malm questioned the north by-pass and said he thought that issue had been removed. Haugen said the current language in the plan is to continue studying the need for the north by-pass. It continues to be commented on by surveys and questionnaires. It is not seen as a recommended project in the current plan. Because of financial constraints and traffic patterns he does not see it as a recommended project. The reason it shows up is because of input from the public.

Mr. Carbee discussed the goals and objectives from the 2003 plan and said they were not very different from the environment that exists today. However, there were new requirements with the passage of the 2005 federal surface transportation authorization bill called SAFETEA-LU. The new requirements addressed security and coordinating with environmental resource agencies. Any goals and objectives added were based on the new requirements.

The consultant moved on to traffic operations, levels of delay and safety. The grades of level are based on letters A through F. Grade A is free travel with no delays while grade F is force-flow and indicates "at capacity" where vehicles cannot get through an intersection. He discussed what traffic operations analysis indicated and how the individual intersections rated. There were 31 key intersections across the metro area that were reviewed for the pm peak hour (the highest one hour of travel in the afternoon or evening peak). Based on the analysis, the appropriate letter grade was assigned to the intersections. The two intersections that crossed the threshold of what is considered acceptable and unacceptable were the intersection at 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue South and Columbia Road with a grade level of service "E" and Washington Street at DeMers Avenue with a grade level of service "F". Anything rated "D" or below is considered deficient.

Haugen stated the only critical intersections they were unable to get good counts on were Columbia Road/University Avenue and Columbia Road/2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. With the construction of the ramps, the turning movements data was not true.

Mr. Carbee stated that with the completion and improvements of 42<sup>nd</sup> Street, traffic movements on Columbia Road within the last four years have been reduced somewhat. The intersection of Columbia Road and 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South has been improved since 2002 and is shown as service level "C." The dual left turns appear to have the capacity for more vehicles before a service level "D" is assessed.

Dr. Hall asked if the delay at 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue South and Columbia Road was because of the street design or because the turning movement numbers? The consultant said it was because of the volume and the turns. They will diagnosis how the issues can be addressed under the alternatives analysis to improve traffic flow.

Kreun asked if there was any analysis on Columbia Road/2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue once the ramp is completed? Haugen stated there was a traffic impact analysis done by UND through SEH with the permitting of the parking ramp and how traffic would be impacted. Grasser said they looked at the impacts of the ramp and there were concerns about the ramp on the transportation network. There was a debate on what assumptions the different traffic engineers would dial into the program. The program that showed the acceptable levels of service was optimistic in his opinion and he has concerns on what the ultimate reality will show.

Kreun noted that was a congested intersection prior to construction, based on the pedestrian traffic, existing parking lot and more pedestrian traffic at University/Columbia one block away, as well as the traffic that constantly occurs on Columbia Road. He questioned traffic that would occur from the ramp after a hockey game. Grasser said the city is weak in areas of defining when and what criteria to establish for traffic studies. Usually the city is involved after the project is approximately 90% developed and they need to be more involved earlier in the concept.

Malm questioned the findings for 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South by the interstate. He referred to South 38<sup>th</sup> Street by Menards that indicated a service rating of "B" and said he did not agree with that rating. He stated it is very difficult to make a left turn and the entire intersection needs to be reviewed. Mr. Carbee stated that service level "B" did not mean the south bound left turn is necessarily a service level "B." The rating is only an average with all movements through the intersection. Malm said there would be more problems at that particular intersection based on events at the Alerus. The consultant said they would reevaluate the intersection.

Gengler asked if volume was the determination of the service level? Mr. Carbee said levels of service were based on delays estimated by the highway capacity manual and based on the number of lanes, configuration of lanes and on the volumes. It is not rated on lane alignment but based on vehicle delay. Lee mentioned that Grand Forks streets are striped very poorly and the intersection Malm referred to is one where you cannot tell what lane you are in or should be in. Even with a good plan, if the streets and intersections are not marked clearly, it will not work. Grasser noted that 15 years ago, the EPA changed the type of paint that could be used. They use a water-based paint. The city could move to a more urethane type paint but the materials and equipment are very expensive. On recent projects, they have been grinding the pavements and putting in the expensive plastic pavement markings, but that is generally intersection specific. Under general operations, the striping does not last very long due to the required material. Also, once snow covers the roadway, it cannot be seen.

Further discussion continued on the intersection at South 38<sup>th</sup> Street and 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South.

The consultant discussed the crash analysis by stating they reviewed the intersections with the most crashes and also looked at crash rates or how much traffic was entering the intersection and at what rate crashes were occurring. In reviewing the analysis for the

areas that had “higher than expected” rates of crashes, three areas were identified on the Grand Forks, ND side and one on the East Grand Forks, MN side. The three areas identified on the Grand Forks side were South 34<sup>th</sup> Street/32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South (by the Holiday Store); 1 block west of South Washington Street on 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue South; and Washington/DeMers (51 crashes over a three-year period). The Washington/DeMers intersection is the busiest intersection in town and did not come out as a “higher than expected” rate. The rates were adjusted for the amount of traffic going through the intersection. Mr. Carbee did note that the intersection at 38<sup>th</sup>/32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South did have a higher than average crash rate, but did not meet the “beyond higher than average.” Mr. Carbee noted for Grassers’ benefit that the data being used was from the NDDOT.

Mr. Carbee said the MPO was reviewing information based on the land use plan and identifying the amounts of housing and employment growth anticipated through the planning horizon of 2035. Based on the land use plan and assuming a 1.2% per year population growth through 2035, they divide that by households and non-households to determine the basis for generating trips on the travel model. Then they determine the employment in the metro area and find a ratio of the number of household to the number of employees.

Grasser stated he was working with a group on water demands in the Red River Valley based on population growth numbers and they were using 0.9%. He feels the 1.2% growth per year is very optimistic and maybe a more conservative growth rate should be used when deciding on funds spent for facilities. He asked if there was a way to run the transportation results based on a lower growth rate. He noted that Fargo has had an aggressive growth rate and they have recognized they will see a tapering off of the population.

Lee said she thought the land use subcommittee decided on 0.8 a few years ago. Haugen noted that 1.2% had been used as the growth rate for a number of years. The 0.8% growth rate was used in the 1996 plan and when the process started in 2000 and 2001 to update the 2025 plan, the 1.2% growth rate was adopted. There were three growth rates reviewed in 2000 and the 1.2% was adopted. Haugen stated the land use subcommittee made the decision on the growth rate and it was adopted by the planning commission and the city council. When the 2035 land use plan was adopted, the growth rate of 1.2% was adopted again. During the last street and highway plan, the sensitivities of growth rates of less than 1.2% were reviewed. There was a difference of densities. They looked at the current buildout or based on a higher density. The only impact was with the growing areas and not so much with the built growth and was not causing much change with the volumes of traffic patterns. Grasser said he favored the more conservative rate of 0.8 or 0.9% growth rate. Some projects may be further out on the timeline based on the water commitments growth rates used on his committee.

Mr. Carbee continued with explanation of the control totals they used in order to identify the traffic analysis. He showed a map of the draft allocation of housing and employment between 2005 and 2035. Based on the growth rate, the amount of housing added by 2035 is projected to be 7500 dwelling units and 10,500 employees. The map indicated that

most housing dwellings would be south of 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South towards 62<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South and in areas east of the interstate. Mr. Carbee then showed a map with the difference between 2005 and 2035 of employment density. The industrial park west of the interstate showed an increase as well as additional commercial development south of 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South to 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South. The analysis also showed additional commercial employment in the southwest portion of downtown and industrial growth north of Gateway Drive. All of the various steps and analyses are used to determine where the increased demands for traffic are going to be in order to determine long-term needs in the street and roadway system.

Mr. Carbee reviewed the next steps for the study team to get the transportation plan closer to completion. A draft of the existing conditions report currently exists and after comments, that will be finalized. Based on the development concepts of allocation of housing and employment, developing and forecasting where future traffic issues might be and looking at future and current issues, a list of potential improvements will be prepared for the street and roadway system for the next 30 years.

Lee asked if the plan will be presented to the planning commission again. Haugen stated the next time the planning commission will see the plan is when the projection of future traffic and level of services for 2035 is completed. There will be an assessment of the existing system and immediate projects planned for the next year or two and what improvements will be needed. The report will show how bad an area will be if nothing is done and alternatives that need to be considered. In May, 2007, Haugen said they would asked for preliminary approval of the report with final approval expected in June, 2007. July 1, 2007 is the deadline for federal safety compliance.

#### **4. ADJOURNMENT.**

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

---

Lyle A. Hall, Secretary

---

Paula H. Lee, President

**EAST GRAND FORKS  
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES  
Thursday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2006, – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Terry Hecht, Chairman, called the December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2006, meeting of the East Grand Forks Planning Commission to order at 12:00 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll, the following members were present: Chairman Hecht, Commissioners Hanson, Christianson, Horken, Beauchamp, and Bruhn.

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

Guests present were: Jason Carbee, Consultant with URS.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Chairman Hecht declared a quorum was present.

**COMMUNICATION**

None.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. Matter Of Approval Of The November 8<sup>th</sup>, 2006, meeting of the East Grand Forks Planning Commission

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER BEAUCHAMP, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER HANSON, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 8<sup>TH</sup>, 2006, MINUTES OF THE EAST GRAND FORKS PLANNING COMMISSION AS SUBMITTED.**

*Voting Aye: Christianson, Hanson, Hecht, Beauchamp, Horken, and Bruhn.*

*Voting Nay: None.*

**OLD BUSINESS**

None.

**NEW BUSINESS**

1. Matter Of Update On Long Range Transportation Plan – Street & Highway Element

Mr. Haugen reported that the MPO is about mid-way through its update of the Street and Highway Element of the Long Range Transportation Plan. He introduced Jason Carbee, a consultant with URS

**EAST GRAND FORKS  
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES  
Thursday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

Corporation, who is assisting the MPO with this study. He added that David Hampsten, MPO Senior Planner, is also present today. In the event we have any technical issues, he may be able to assist us with this agenda item, as well as, assistance with any technical issues that may come up with our second agenda item.

Mr. Haugen commented that we adopted a Street and Highway Plan back in 2003. However, in 2005, Congress created a new authorization act for transportation. This act has some requirements that cause us to have to update that plan by the end of June 2007 to be in compliance. Therefore we began that process in 2006, and are now about half way through the update. He stated that staff will be asking for preliminary approval of the plan in May of 2007, and final approval in June, however we will need to come back to this body with some additional body, and to obtain feedback in February or March.

Mr. Haugen reported that he did notify everyone that there is a five chapter report available on the MPO's website that could be accessed and reviewed for what we term "existing conditions". He said that part of the information that Mr. Carbee will go over today highlights that information. He added that the next step would be to create our future traffic forecasts and future conditions. We can then look at alternatives and ultimately develop a final plan.

Mr. Carbee commented that some of the things he will touch on include a very brief overview on what the plan is; discussion on some of the transportation issues that have been identified for both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks; discussion on goals and objectives; look at existing streets and road conditions, which would include levels of delay and safety issues; and give a preview of the allocation of future growth for housing and employment.

Mr. Carbee reported that there are two general sections or elements of the Long Range Transportation Plan. He explained that we are currently working on one of them, the Street and Highway element, and the other is the Alternative Transportation Mode, which is also being worked on, but not a part of this discussion.

Presentation ensued.

Mr. Carbee stated that what they are currently working on is existing and future conditions, which is basically what is contained in the report you had access to, and, for which he can hopefully get some feedback on from this body today. He explained that the report is in draft format. They have started looking at future areas of development and will soon begin determining what the projected traffic impacts those new developments will have on the system. He added that they would then look at where new issues develop, where old issues are already located, and how we are going to address them.

Mr. Carbee commented that he would like to talk about some of the current identified issues that have been determined at this point, and see if this body has anything they would like to add. He stated that this information comes from the previous plan, and basically identifies areas of congested roadways and intersections, issues with traffic through neighborhoods, potential river crossings, etc. This is the starting point for the new plan. He reported that a public meeting was held in late September. He has also met several times with the Technical Advisory Committee, and they talked about issues. These issues are identified as what is good and what is bad about the street and roadway system. He added that in addition to these meetings, an insert was placed in both newspapers requesting any issues the public had with our transportation system be noted on the insert's map, and mailed back to the MPO. He said that we did get quite a few responses to that request.

Mr. Carbee explained that the two main reasons for the MPO's need to revise it's Street and Highway Plan are to address the changes in federal MPO planning requirements set in SAFETEA-LU, and to address changes in area conditions. He stated that the two key areas of emphasis in SAFETEA-LU include the need to address transportation system security and the need for coordination with



**EAST GRAND FORKS  
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES  
Thursday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

environmental resource agencies when developing metropolitan area transportation plans. He said that goals and objectives were added to address these requirements.

Mr. Carbee stated that one of the first things they looked at was the current level of delay during the P.M. peak hour. He commented that the MPO conducted traffic counts at several intersections across the metropolitan area, and, basically they went through that information, and, based on analysis of how well traffic moves, how much delay there is during the peak hour, assigned a letter grade to it, going from a level of service "A", which is very little delay to a level of service "F", which is a very long delay. He said that what they did was to identify what the existing levels of service during the P.M. peak hour was at these signalized intersections. He referred to a table listing the various intersections identified, and pointed out that most of them have a level of service "A" or "B", and that traffic conditions, over the last four years, during the P.M. peak have not changed significantly on either side of the river.

Mr. Carbee commented that, typically, anything in the metro area, anything at a Level of Service "D" or worse is considered deficient, so none of the intersections are considered deficient at this time. He stated that he knows there are some issues, such as turning on and off of Bygland Road during peak times, but for the most part there aren't any deficiencies noted. Commissioner Horken asked what the P.M. peak hour was. Mr. Carbee responded that it is the highest one-hour of traffic volume at each intersection, which is usually around 4:00 to 5:00 p.m., but is unique to each intersection.

Mr. Carbee reported that they also did a safety analysis, based on crash data from the DOTs. He explained that they went through an exercise in which they combined both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks data, and looked for intersections with a high number of crashes. He referred to a map, and pointed out that intersections with ten or more crashes are shown in blue, but, as you would expect, intersections with a lot of traffic have a lot of crashes, so then they look at rates, using a method to try to determine where the statistically higher than expected rates of crashes were, and across the metro area there were four of them, with one being Central Avenue and Gateway Drive in East Grand Forks, showing thirty to forty crashes over a three-year period.

Mr. Carbee commented that he would now like to go over the allocation of housing and employment. He stated that what they are doing now, before they start working on future traffic, is, basically taking the Land Use Plans from Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, taking how much growth those two plans would expect between now and 2035 and inserting that into the plans. He said that they identified how much total growth is expected for the entire area, based on the Land Use Plans, and came up with an increase of about 1.2% per year population growth, then they determined how many people there are per household, what the vacancy rate is, etc. He stated that once the number of residences was determined, they then determined how much employment that translates into.

Mr. Carbee then referred to a map that illustrates employment changes, and explained that it basically indicates a growth along the U.S. 2/Gateway Corridor, as well as east and south of that area as well.

Mr. Carbee stated that the next steps include: 1) finishing up the existing conditions report; 2) develop future traffic conditions; 3) determine where the problem areas are and what can be done to improve them.

Mr. Haugen commented that, intuitively, as we are growing out beyond our three bridges, a lot of our traffic is going back and forth on those three bridges, that would lead one to believe that unless we do something, those three bridges will become more and more congested. He added that, as all of our past plans have indicated, as we grow away from our built-up area, our three crossings will not be enough to handle the added traffic, so, in the "issue section", how we address the issue of future river crossings is to say that it isn't a question of where they should be as we have made that determination, but it is a question of when we get those bridges, and that is the debate that is taking place.

**EAST GRAND FORKS  
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES  
Thursday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

Mr. Haugen referred to the "Issues" map and pointed out that there is still discussion about a north by-pass location, but our current analysis indicates that this isn't as attractive a route as our current bridges, nor is it as attractive as the two future southern bridges, so our current language is that we will continue to study the need for a north by-pass.

Commissioner Christianson asked, when you talk about the timing of the by-passes, are you talking about what year, or are you talking about which one should be constructed first. Mr. Haugen responded that they are talking about both issues.

Discussion on the proposed Merrifield (Truck Reliever Route) and the I-29/Merrifield Interchange ensued.

Mr. Haugen stated that they will now take the data shown today, convert it into future trips, place it onto a future network of streets, and identify issues such as capacity, connectivity, etc. Then, they will find alternatives to deal with those issues.

Mr. Haugen encouraged everyone to visit the MPO's website – [theforksmpo.org](http://theforksmpo.org). The first five chapters of the Street and Highway Plan are already available on this website and this PowerPoint presentation will be downloaded there as well.

Commissioner Christianson commented that one of the intersections discussed in Grand Forks was 17<sup>th</sup> and Columbia Road. He asked if there were any plans of changing that road at all, by adding turn lanes, etc.. Mr. Haugen responded that there has been discussion to that effect. Commissioner Christianson stated that he finds it interesting that we put schools on these highly traveled streets, and then those schools generate more traffic on those streets. Mr. Haugen explained that, if you are familiar with 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue in Grand Forks, if you are at the 42<sup>nd</sup> Street end of that roadway, it is a three lane section, with a continuous two-way left turn in the center, and that ends at 34<sup>th</sup>, so we have had discussions with the City about the possibility of expanding, or re-striping 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, east of 34<sup>th</sup>, but there is a concern in that we haven't had the opportunity to go through that neighborhood to let them know that parking would be prohibited at all times, as it currently is prohibited during the day, but not at night. He added, however, that traffic is not as heavy east of Washington, so a three lane may not be necessary at all.

Information only.

2. Matter Of Preliminary Approval To Amend The EGF Comprehensive Plan To Include The GF/EGF 2030 Transportation Plan Update

Mr. Haugen reported that this is the other side of the slide Mr. Carbee had up earlier, the Alternative Transportation Modes element. He explained that within the Alternative Transportation Modes element is our transit issues, and SAFETEA-LU has created some new programs, and added some additional funding, so we are seeking to formally adopt those requirements into the Transit Development Plan (TDP) to allow us access to those additional funds.

Mr. Haugen commented that one of the new requirements is the need for a Coordinated Human Services Public Transportation Plan, which we have already had adopted by both Cities, but it is not incorporated into our overall Transit Development Plan, which is one of the reasons we are asking for an amendment today, and the other reason is because of two new programs that Congress created, the Job Access Reverse Commute and New Freedom. He stated that those two funding sources are where the larger amount of federal funds is available under SAFETEA-LU to be used to improve or expand transit services. He added that through our coordinated planning activities we have identified that, and Grand Forks has already submitted applications to expand transit services to the South 42<sup>nd</sup> Street Corridor and to the Industrial Park, and to start Saturday transit service at the same time as the Monday through Friday Service, and to start a skeleton Sunday service. He explained that currently our night service operates an hour route in Grand Forks along arterial roadway systems, primarily with the demand response service as well, and it is being proposed to have that same service level on Sunday. He stated that East Grand

**EAST GRAND FORKS  
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES  
Thursday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

Forks is still drafting their application for these funds, but in talking with Mr. Hampsten and others, we aren't sure if they will request funds from those funds as the current 5307 Program may have enough federal funds available, but we do anticipate that if Grand Forks expands it's Saturday service, and adds Sunday Service, East Grand Forks will as well.

Mr. Haugen said that staff is requesting preliminary approval at this time, and will be asking for final approval, with a public hearing, at the January meeting.

Commissioner Hecht asked what percent of these funds would need to be subsidized by the Cities. Mr. Haugen responded that the federal assistance is capped at 50% of the net operating cost, which is derived from the total cost minus what is collected in fares. He stated that on the North Dakota side the other 50% gets distributed between a mill levy and state funds, with the majority coming from the mill levy monies. He added that on the Minnesota side they cap the City's portion at 20%, and that would basically be covered by state funds.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER HORKEN, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BEAUCHAMP, TO GRANT PRELIMINARY APPROVAL TO AMEND THE EAST GRAND FORKS COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO INCLUDE THE GF/EGR 2030 TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE, AND TO SET A PUBLIC HEARING DATE FOR JANUARY 11<sup>TH</sup>, 2007.**

*Voting Aye: Christianson, Hanson, Hecht, Beauchamp, Horken, and Bruhn.*

*Voting Nay: None.*

3. Matter Of Request From Phil & Alissa Knutson and Bob & Jeanine Peabody For Final Approval Of The Replat Of Point Of woods 5<sup>th</sup> Addition

Ms. Ellis reported that this is really just a minor subdivision, with the moving of two side lot property lines. She explained that Mr. and Mrs. Knutson owns Lot A, or Lot 7, and Mr. and Mrs. Peabody are allowing them additional property for his lot, which will reduce Lot B, or Lot 8 by that same amount of property. She stated that all easements, rights-of-way, etc., remain the same, so it is just the lot lines that are changing and the new lots meet all residential requirements.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER BEAUCHAMP, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER HANSON, TO APPROVE THE REQUEST FROM PHIL & ALISSA KNUTSON AND BOB & JEANINE PEABODY FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF THE REPLAT OF POINT OF WOODS 5<sup>TH</sup> ADDITION, SUBJECT TO STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 1) **SUBMIT A DIGITAL FILE TO THE PLANNING OFFICE.**
- 2) **PAY FEE TO CLERK-TREASURER'S OFFICE.**

*Voting Aye: Christianson, Hanson, Hecht, Beauchamp, Horken, and Bruhn.*

*Voting Nay: None.*

**OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Matter Of January Agenda Items

Ms. Ellis reported that next month there are two things that need to be included on the agenda. She explained that the first item will be to hold an organizational meeting to determine who will serve as Chairman, Vice Chairman, and Secretary. She said that the second item involves a Safe Route To School Project Proposal. She explained that right now the tentative project is that Bygland Road sidewalks stop at 6<sup>th</sup> Street SE and we are proposing to extend sidewalks all the way to 13<sup>th</sup> Street SE,

**EAST GRAND FORKS  
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES  
Thursday, December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

from the school, across the coulee, and connect to Bygland. Commissioner Beauchamp asked if they would be placed on one side or both sides of the road. Ms. Ellis responded that they would be placed on both sides of the road. She commented that she does have drawings of the proposed project, but does not yet have the estimated costs of completing it, but the Safe Routes to School grant is a 100% grant, so if our application is chosen, they cap the amount available at \$175,000. If that is how much we request, that is how much we will receive. She added that they do need a lot of support for this, and are going to need letters of concurrence, so she has already been in contact with South Point, the PTA, the School Superintendent's office, the Senior Citizen's Group, the East Grand Forks Bike Committee, etc., to ask that they write these letters. Commissioner Beauchamp asked if the property owners along Bygland would be contacted concerning this. Ms. Ellis responded that once the application is completed and we get all the cost summaries; it will go before the Planning Commission and City Council and she would think that they would notify them at that time.

**2. Matter Of Discussion On Surface Concerns On Central Avenue**

Chairman Hecht stated that he isn't sure who to bring this issue up with, but as everyone knows, Central Avenue was recently resurfaced, but the manholes are absolutely ridiculous. He asked if the contractor was going to be coming back in the spring to put rings, and re-tar those things, or are we going to be dodging those potholes the rest of our lives. Ms. Ellis responded that they are supposed to be addressing this, but you can bring the issue up with Jerry Skyberg and/or Greg Boppre, if you want to know more. She added that it is a good thing to continue to ask about this to ensure that something does get done, so she will bring it up at the next Utility Group meeting as well.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER HORKEN, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BRUHN, TO ADJOURN THE DECEMBER 14<sup>TH</sup>, 2006, MEETING OF THE EAST GRAND FORKS PLANNING COMMISSION AT 12:55 P.M..**

*Voting Aye: Christianson, Hanson, Hecht, Beauchamp, Horken, and Bruhn.*  
*Voting Nay: None.*

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis  
Executive Assistant

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS  
GRAND FORKS COUNTY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
May 8, 2007, 7:00 O'CLOCK PM

The meeting of the Grand Forks County Planning and Zoning Commission was called to order at 7:00 PM by Chairman Gary Malm. It was noted that all members were present: Gary Malm, Diane Knauf, Kurt Kreun, John Fortin, Paul Erickson, Robert White, Bob Klave, David Hagert, Bob Rodgers and County Planner, Lane Magnuson.

The minutes of the April 10, 2007, meeting of the County Planning and Zoning Commission were declared approved.

Bill Troe, a consultant for the Grand Forks Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) conducted a presentation for the commission on the update of the MPO Long Range Transportation Plan.

Discussion Ensued.

Mr. Magnuson addressed the commission with a request for a moratorium on confined animal operations.

Motioned by Mr. Kreun and Seconded by Mr. White to enact the moratorium on confined animal feeding operations for a period six months. Motion Carried.

Mr. Magnuson addressed the commission regarding administrative procedures of the septic system permitting process.

The Planning Commission recommended to the County Commission that County Staff be responsible for the soils work on all septic permits within the County's jurisdiction and have the installers be responsible for the rest of the system design.

Moved by Mr. Hagert and seconded by Mr. Kreun to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,



---

County Planner, Lane Magnuson

**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
City of Grand Forks, North Dakota  
June 6, 2007**

**1. MEMBERS PRESENT**

The meeting was called to order by John Drees, Vice President, at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present: Steve Adams, Doug Christensen, Robert Drees, Al Grasser, Tom Hagness, Dr. Lyle Hall, Bill Hutchison, Curt Kreun, Gary Malm, and Frank Matejcek. Absent: Mayor (Dr.) Michael Brown, Paula Lee and Marijo Whitcomb. A quorum was present.

Staff present included Brad Gengler, City Planner; Ryan Brooks, Senior Planner; and Carolyn Schalk, Administrative Specialist, Senior, Planning and Zoning Department; and Steve Johnson, representing the Building and Zoning Administrator (Building Inspections Office). Absent: Charles Durrenberger, Senior Planner.

**2. READING AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR MAY 2, 2007.**

John Drees asked if there were any corrections or changes to the minutes of May 2, 2007. Robert Drees noted on page 7 of the minutes, 12<sup>th</sup> line down from the top, "west of Merrifield" should be changed to "north of Merrifield." There were no other changes noted.

**MOTION BY ROBERT DREES AND SECOND BY MALM TO APPROVE THE MAY 2, 2007 MINUTES WITH THE CHANGE AS NOTED. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**3. PUBLIC HEARINGS, FINAL APPROVALS, PETITIONS AND MINOR CHANGES:**

**3-1. (PUBLIC HEARING) MATTER OF THE REQUEST FROM PRIBULA ENGINEERING, ON BEHALF OF RALPH APPLGREN, FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF THE PLAT OF BRETON'S 2<sup>ND</sup> SUBDIVISION, BEING PART OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER (NE-1/4) OF SECTION 3, TOWNSHIP 150 NORTH, RANGE 51 WEST OF THE FIFTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, GRAND FORKS COUNTY, NORTH DAKOTA.**

Gengler announced that Durrenberger was attending a conference and he and Brooks would be trading off for agenda items.

Gengler reviewed the plat stating it was located in the southwesterly fringe of the extraterritorial zoning jurisdiction. The plat is one of three originally submitted, then held back due to the moratorium and finally allowed to be processed. There is approximately 78 acres providing for six non-farm single-family lots and one large lot of 54 acres remaining in an agriculture status. Staff recommends final approval subject to the technical changes shown on or attached to the review copy.

Drees opened the public hearing. There was no one to speak on the issue and the public hearing was closed.

**MOTION BY DR. HALL AND SECOND BY CHRISTENSEN FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF THE PLAT REQUEST SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING TECHNICAL CHANGES SHOWN ON OR ATTACHED TO THE REVIEW COPY AS WELL AS FINAL APPROVAL OF THE STREET AND HIGHWAY ORDINANCE:**

1. Submit title opinion.
2. Remove lot dimensions of the original tract in lots 1 and 2, block 1.
3. Relocate width dimensions on Thomas and Mary Ann Avenues.
4. Show solid line along right-of-way on 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and 15<sup>th</sup> Street NE.
5. Dimension lots accordingly and show proper square footages and acreage.
6. Detach page 2 from plat and forward to the city of Grand Forks and add note No. 7.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**3-2. (PUBLIC HEARING) MATTER OF THE REQUEST FROM PRIBULA ENGINEERING, ON BEHALF OF GLEN GRANSBERG, FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF THE PLAT OF MERRIFIELD INDUSTRIAL PARK SECOND ADDITION TO THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS, ND, LOCATED AT COUNTY ROAD 6 AND SOUTH 55<sup>TH</sup> STREET.**

John Drees asked to be recused from voting.

**MOTION BY MATEJCEK AND SECOND BY DR. HALL TO RECUSE JOHN DREES FROM VOTING ON THE ISSUE. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Robert Drees asked to be recused from voting on Items 3-2 and 3-3.

**MOTION BY DR. HALL AND SECOND BY MALM TO RECUSE ROBERT DREES FROM VOTING ON ITEMS 3-2 AND 3-3. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Gengler reviewed the plat request and stated Item 3-3 (rezoning) coincides with the plat. He showed the aerial photo and indicated the access points associated with the plat in block 1. Gengler asked that technical change No. 8 be added to provide for the existing access in lot 1, block 2. That access would remain until such time that

the lot is redeveloped. Access would then be obtained from 74<sup>th</sup> Avenue South. That is to allow the existing approach for the structure currently located on the lot. Staff recommendation is for final approval subject to the technical changes.

Drees opened the public hearing. There was no one to speak on the issue and the public hearing was closed.

**MOTION BY HAGNESS AND SECOND BY MATEJCEK FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF THE PLAT REQUEST SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING TECHNICAL CHANGES SHOWN ON OR ATTACHED TO THE REVIEW COPY AND THE ADDITION OF TECHNICAL CHANGE NO. 8 AS WELL AS FINAL APPROVAL OF THE STREET AND HIGHWAY ORDINANCE:**

1. Submit title opinion.
2. Add acreage for all lots.
3. Include elevation of site benchmark in general notes.
4. Plat acceptance recognizes a variance to the land development code 18-0907(3)(L)(c) relating to level 4 access control.
5. Add wordage to state that South 55<sup>th</sup> Street shall be dedicated for public use.
6. Submit a letter to address the following items concerning this site:
  - Site grading and damage
  - Water service
  - Wastewater systems
  - Roadway maintenance
7. Note that new building elevations are to be a minimum of two feet above natural ground.
8. The existing approach access for lot 1, block 2 shall remain in place until the lot is redeveloped. Access would then be obtained from 74<sup>th</sup> Avenue South.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

- 3-3. (PUBLIC HEARING) MATTER OF THE REQUEST FROM THE GRAND FORKS PLANNING DEPARTMENT FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE ZONING MAP TO EXCLUDE FROM THE I-2 (HEAVY INDUSTRIAL) DISTRICT, ALL OF MERRIFIELD INDUSTRIAL PARK FIRST ADDITION AND ALSO TO EXCLUDE FROM THE A-2 (AGRICULTURAL URBAN RESERVE) DISTRICT, ALL OF MERRIFIELD INDUSTRIAL PARK SECOND ADDITION AND TO INCLUDE WITHIN THE MERRIFIELD PUD (PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT), CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT PLAN, ALL OF MERRIFIELD INDUSTRIAL PARK FIRST ADDITION AND ALL OF MERRIFIELD INDUSTRIAL PARK SECOND ADDITION, ALL LOCATED IN SECTION 31, TOWNSHIP 151 NORTH, RANGE 50 WEST OF THE FIFTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN.**



Gengler reviewed the request, showing a map of the area. There are industrial style buildings on the property for agriculture related purposes. The PUD rezoning will include all of Merrifield Industrial Park First and Second Additions. All A-2 uses will be allowed with the exception of residential development. The I-2 District setbacks will be followed on the property. Gengler explained the reason for the PUD was part of negotiations on the plat and the new subdivision regulations. It was a smoother process to incorporate the entire area as a planned unit development. Staff recommends final approval of the PUD.

Drees opened the public hearing. There was no one to speak on the issue and the public hearing was closed.

**MOTION BY HUTCHISON AND SECOND BY CHRISTENSEN FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF THE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD) REZONING ORDINANCE. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**3-4. (PUBLIC HEARING) MATTER OF THE REQUEST FROM THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT, ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS, ND, FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE TEXT OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, CHAPTER XVIII OF THE GRAND FORKS CITY CODE OF 1987, AS AMENDED, AMENDING SECTION 18-0206 A-1 (AGRICULTURAL PRESERVATION) DISTRICT AND A-2 (AGRICULTURAL URBAN RESERVE) DISTRICT.**

Brooks reviewed the text ordinance that allows farmsteads to be subdivided onto a separate lot and does not count against the density requirements. He asked for clarification on whether or not to allow properties in the A-2 District to plat out the farmstead on a minimum lot size of two and one-half acres. He explained the A-1 District is the furthestmost district from the city limits and they were allowed to plat out the farmstead on a minimum of five-acres. In the A-2, the farmsteads could be platted on a separate lot with a minimum of two and one-half acres. There would be a difference in lot size if platting the farmstead on a separate lot between the two districts. There would be other situations that might come up in the future that would have to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.

Matejcek said he remembered from the committee (land development code revision committee) that all farmsteads would be allowed to plat on a minimum of two and one-half acre but it could be larger if needed.

Christensen said the idea was not to penalize the existing farmsteads and it should be the same in the A-1 and A-2. Kreun and Hutchison said they remembered the discussion to allow platting of farmstead onto a minimum of two and one-half acre lot. The idea was to control growth and only applied to the existing farmsteads.

Drees opened the public hearing. There was no one to speak on the issue and the public hearing was closed.

**MOTION BY KREUN AND SECOND BY HAGNESS FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF THE TEXT ORDINANCE AND TO ALLOW THE PLATTING OF A FARMSTEAD ON A MINIMUM OF TWO AND ONE-HALF ACRES IN THE A-1 AND A-2 DISTRICTS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**3-5. (PUBLIC HEARING) MATTER OF THE REQUEST FROM PRIBULA ENGINEERING, ON BEHALF OF FRANCES L. BERTHEUSON, FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF THE PLAT OF FRANTASTIC ACRES ADDITION, BEING A PORTION OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER (NE-1/4) OF SECTION 35, TOWNSHIP 151 NORTH, RANGE 51 WEST, GRAND FORKS COUNTY, NORTH DAKOTA.**

Brooks reviewed the plat request by stating it would be the first plat to utilize the text change discussed in Item 3-4. He showed the location on the map. The owner wants to plat out the original farmstead and sell it. It currently is part of a 157-acre parcel. Based on the commission's action under Item 3-4, the owner will not need to have a restrictive covenant on the remaining property. Staff recommends approval of the plat subject to the technical changes.

Drees opened the public hearing.

Fran Bertheuson, owner of the property, stated she had been trying to get permission to sell the property for the last two years. She asked if she could only sell the nine acres or could she sell off more than nine acres? Brooks said the minimum is two and one-half acres and she is over that amount so she can sell it.

Mrs. Bertheuson asked if she could sell off any more lots. Brooks said she would first have to plat the property. She would have a 140-acre lot remaining and the owner could have three lots. The rule is that each parcel has to be 40 acres in size. She would have to sell a minimum of 40 acres at a time.

Drees closed the public hearing.

**MOTION BY DR. HALL AND SECOND BY KREUN FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF THE PLAT REQUEST, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING TECHNICAL CHANGES SHOWN ON OR ATTACHED TO THE REVIEW COPY AND APPROVAL OF THE STREET AND HIGHWAY ORDINANCE:**

1. Submit title opinion.
2. Add note to dedicate South 69<sup>th</sup> Street to public use.
3. Submit letter to address the following items concerning this site:  
Site grading and drainage

Water service  
Wastewater system  
Roadway maintenance

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**3-6. (PUBLIC HEARING) MATTER OF THE REQUEST FROM CPS, LTD., ON BEHALF OF BOSOX, INC., FOR FINAL APPROVAL (FAST TRACK) OF THE REPLAT OF LOT F, BLOCK 1 (OF THE REPLAT OF LOTS B AND C, BLOCK 1 OF THE REPLAT OF LOTS 1 AND 2, BLOCK 1) COLUMBIA PARK 10<sup>TH</sup> ADDITION TO THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS, ND AND LOCATED AT 3250 32<sup>ND</sup> AVENUE SOUTH.**

Brooks reviewed the replat request stating it was basically a simple lot split. He explained the lot split is between the Boston's Restaurant and the Lakeview Inn and Suites. A party is interested in buying the property. There may be some issues on stormwater for the site and that is being studied by the engineering department. Staff is also looking for information on access issues between the properties. A slip ramp entrance is in place on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South and a shared entrance and exit next to the Lakeview Inn and Suites. Staff recommendation is for final approval.

Dr. Hall asked about parking for each of the establishments. Brooks said that would be discussed under Item 3-13 for a joint parking facility agreement. That issue is considered under the site plan review. The size of the new restaurant is dictated by the number of parking stalls that can be placed. There is a requirement for one parking stall for each 75 square feet of restaurant space. There will be a shared parking agreement with Boston's Restaurant. Additional parking will also occur on the open space to the north of the property.

Malm said there appears to be a problem with access. People are driving through other businesses parking lots and it is creating traffic on the mall ring road.

Brooks said staff was aware there is minimal access to the site but they have to deal with what is out there and where development occurs.

Drees opened the public hearing. There was no one to speak on the issue and the public hearing was closed.

**MOTION BY HAGNESS AND SECOND BY CHRISTENSEN FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF THE REPLAT REQUEST SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING TECHNICAL CHANGES SHOWN ON OR ATTACHED TO THE REVIEW COPY:**

1. Submit title opinion.
2. Show ingress/egress easement across Lot "M" for the benefit of Lot "L" or supply copy of agreement to grant access to Lot "L."
3. Check length of line common to Lots "L" and "M" and check lot areas.

4. Stormwater issues may exist on this site. Additional stormwater review may be necessary.
5. Show existing shared access agreement with lands east thereof.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**3-7. (PUBLIC HEARING) MATTER OF THE REQUEST FROM PRIBULA ENGINEERING, ON BEHALF OF GREG CHALMERS AND ERIC TOUTENHOOFD, FOR FINAL APPROVAL (FAST TRACK) OF A REPLAT OF LOTS 13, 14, AND 15, BLOCK 1, HOLE'S CENTRAL ADDITION TO THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS, ND, AND LOCATED AT 419 AND 423 WALNUT STREET.**

Brooks reviewed the replat request, stating it was a simple lot split. He explained the three lots were 25 feet wide. The owner of the vacant lot 14 will sell one-half to each lot owner on either side (lots 13 and 15) making each of their lots a little larger. Staff recommends approval of the request.

Drees opened the public hearing. There was no one to speak on the issue and the public hearing was closed.

**MOTION BY DR. HALL AND SECOND BY CHRISTENSEN FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF THE REPLAT REQUEST SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING TECHNICAL CHANGES SHOWN ON OR ATTACHED TO THE REVIEW COPY:**

1. Submit title opinion.
2. Identify 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue South between blocks 1 and 2.
3. Correctly show existing Lots A and B of block 1.
4. Re-label new lots as "C" and "D."

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**3-8. (PUBLIC HEARING) MATTER OF THE REQUEST FROM ARVIN HEEMSTRA FOR APPROVAL OF A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP) FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSTRUCTING A PRIVATE HORSE STABLE AND RIDING ARENA, LOCATED IN THE NORTHEAST QUARTER, SECTION 23, TOWNSHIP 151 NORTH, RANGE 51 WEST OF THE FIFTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN (7173 32<sup>ND</sup> AVENUE SOUTH - BRENNA TOWNSHIP).**

Brooks reviewed the conditional use permit request. He showed an aerial photo of the property and indicated the general area of where the horse stable and riding arena would be located. The applicant's property is located on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South but there is a fairly heavy density of trees on the east side of the property. Private riding stables are allowed in the A-1 and A-2 Districts under a conditional use permit.

Neighbors within 400 feet were notified of the request. The applicant said neighbors also have horses. He plans on having two horses on site. Brooks stated there were not a lot of conditions but the request would go through the normal site plan review. Pictures of the building and the materials to be used have been discussed between staff and applicant but that has not yet been finalized. The plan is to have 12-foot side walls. Staff's recommendation is for approval of the conditional use permit (CUP).

Malm asked if the CUP would have a time limit. Brooks said staff was not recommending revisiting a riding stable every 10 years. The conditional use permit would be in place until the site changes or additional horses are added.

Matejcek asked if it was a private riding stable; he was told yes.

Robert Drees noted there were other homeowners to the south with existing private riding stables and wondered if they were grandfathered in. Brooks answered it was a legal non-conforming use and they can continue to operate them as an existing use. The applicant had to request the CUP because of the building construction and because it is a new use to the property.

Hutchison asked why the owner would be limited to two horses. Brooks said they limited it to the number requested. If more horses were added, it would begin to impact the neighborhood somewhat.

Drees opened the public hearing.

Arvin Heemstra said they would probably have friends over who also ride horses so on occasion, another horse might be on the property. He explained he has three granddaughters and the horses are for them. He currently has two horses and might add a pony but the horses are for his immediate family's personal and private use.

**MOTION BY HAGNESS AND SECOND BY CHRISTENSEN TO APPROVE THE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR A RIDING STABLE AND ARENA TO BE A NON-COMMERCIAL PRIVATE USE. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**3-9. (PUBLIC HEARING) MATTER OF THE REQUEST FROM JAMES R. BRADSHAW, ON BEHALF OF STRATA CORPORATION, FOR FINAL APPROVAL (FAST TRACK) OF THE PLAT OF STRATA THIRD RESUBDIVISION, BEING A REPLAT OF LOT B, OF A REPLAT OF LOTS 1 AND 2, STRATA RESUBDIVISION TO THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS, ND, LOCATED AT 1625 NORTH 36<sup>TH</sup> STREET.**

Brooks reviewed the request, stating it was discovered there was already a Strata Second Resubdivision and this request would be Strata Third Resubdivision. The

property is being split in order to sell off a portion to someone else. It is a simple replat and staff's recommendation is to approve the request.

Drees opened the public hearing. There was no one to speak on the issue and the public hearing was closed.

**MOTION BY ROBERT DREES AND SECOND BY GRASSER FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF THE REQUEST SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING TECHNICAL CHANGES SHOWN ON OR ATTACHED TO THE REVIEW COPY:**

1. Submit title opinion.
2. Show distances on curved line segments.
3. Remove lot line from previous plat.
4. In legend, add new lot line and plat boundary.
5. Correctly identify North 36<sup>th</sup> Street.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**3-10. MATTER OF THE REQUEST FROM SUNSET BLUFFS, LLC, FOR APPROVAL TO VACATE A PORTION OF A STREET RIGHT-OF-WAY ONLY FOR LANDS IN THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT B, BLOCK 1, SHADYRIDGE ESTATES FIFTH RESUBDIVISION, LOCATED IN THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF ADAMS DRIVE AND SHADYRIDGE COURT. THE ENTIRE AREA SHALL RETAIN ITS UTILITY EASEMENT STATUS.**

Gengler explained there were several items for the Shadyridge Estates area but they were not arranged on the agenda to follow one another. He first showed a map of the Shadyridge PUD area. He indicated the Shadyridge Estates Fifth Resubdivision area is located at the southeasterly corner of Adams Drive and Shadyridge Court. As currently platted, the northerly lot line is curved at the corner. The proposal is to vacate just enough to square off the intersection. The city would retain any utility easements on the portion being vacated. The vacation will relate to preliminary plat Item 4-2. Staff's recommendation is for approval subject to final approval of the replat of Shadyridge Estates Fifth Resubdivision.

Christensen asked what was on the property currently. Gengler said the site is developed for Cole Creek Estates. The original plan was for six structures with two units each in a condo-style development with a private internal roadway. Currently, there are only two structures built, with the remainder of the property vacant and under the same ownership. The proposal is to replat from the single-family attached units to standard single-family detached dwellings.

**MOTION BY HUTCHISON AND SECOND BY MALM FOR APPROVAL OF THE VACATION REQUEST SUBJECT TO FINAL APPROVAL OF THE**

**REPLAT OF SHADYRIDGE ESTATES FIFTH RESUBDIVISION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**3-11. MATTER OF THE REQUEST FROM THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS, ND, AND OTHERS, FOR APPROVAL TO VACATE STREET RIGHTS-OF-WAY IN SHADYRIDGE ESTATES THIRD AND SIXTH ADDITIONS.**

Gengler reviewed the request indicating on the map where Shadyridge Estates Third and Sixth Additions are located. When Desiree Drive was first platted, the roadway construction started off of Adams Drive going north and then stopped at a certain location. With subsequent replatting, the plat on file did not coincide with the existing conditions of the lots and single-family homes. Consequently, the street right-of-way is being vacated to allow for replatting and relocation of the street-of-way to provide an improved transition between the roadway and adjacent properties. Staff's recommendation is to approve the vacation subject to final approval of Shadyridge Estates Eighth Resubdivision. The vacated property will revert back to the single-family property owners. This will extend the front yards of the adjacent lots and re-establish the right-of-way.

**MOTION BY CHRISTENSEN AND SECOND BY HUTCHISON TO APPROVE THE VACATION REQUEST SUBJECT TO FINAL APPROVAL OF SHADYRIDGE ESTATES EIGHTH RESUBDIVISION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**3-12. MATTER OF THE REQUEST FROM MIKE YAVAROW, ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS, ND, FOR APPROVAL TO VACATE ALL OF THE GERTRUDE AVENUE RIGHT-OF-WAY NORTHEAST OF SOUTH 3<sup>RD</sup> STREET AND ALL OF THE DIVISION AVENUE RIGHT-OF-WAY NORTHEAST OF SOUTH 3<sup>RD</sup> STREET AND ALLEYWAYS DEDICATED IN AUDITORS RESUBDIVISION NUMBER 15, 21 AND 23.**

Gengler reviewed the request, stating the vacation is in conjunction with the city's flood protection project. The rights-of-way indicated on the map are no longer needed. Staff's recommendation is for approval of the vacation request.

**MOTION BY DR. HALL AND SECOND BY CHRISTENSEN FOR APPROVAL OF THE VACATION REQUEST. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**3-13. MATTER OF THE REQUEST FROM CPS, LTD., ON BEHALF OF BOSOX, INC., FOR APPROVAL OF A JOINT PARKING FACILITY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 18-0302(10) OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING, FOR THE REPLAT OF LOT F, BLOCK 1 (OF THE REPLAT OF LOTS B AND C, BLOCK 1 OF THE REPLAT OF LOTS 1 AND 2, BLOCK 1),**

**COLUMBIA PARK 10<sup>TH</sup> ADDITION TO THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS, ND,**  
**LOCATED AT 3250 32<sup>ND</sup> AVENUE SOUTH.**

Brooks reviewed the request as discussed earlier in conjunction with Item No. 3-6. He showed where the lot line would occur for a Denny's Restaurant next to Boston's Restaurant. It was difficult to split the lot to allow for the adequate amount of parking for the two restaurants. A reciprocal agreement is being drawn up for the two restaurants for shared joint parking as well as shared access and maintenance of the

parking lots. City code requires approval of the joint parking facility by the commission because each site will not have the correct number of required parking stalls. There will be a long-term agreement between the two restaurants, transferable to any property owners and shared access and maintenance to the parking lot.

Kreun suggested that signage should be in place to make sure people know how to get around the facilities.

Discussion continued on the access points and the problems associated with the hotels and restaurant located close by as well as the internal easements.

Malm stated there are going to be three high volume businesses (Texas Roadhouse, Boston's Restaurant and Denny's Restaurant). He suggested there should be a traffic light at 34<sup>th</sup> and the Lakeview Inn and Suites. He was told that would be too close to the existing light at South 34<sup>th</sup> Street and 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South.

Brooks said there will be more congestion but staff is dealing with a situation that was put into place. Staff is trying to improve the situation as much as possible.

**MOTION BY HUTCHISON AND SECOND BY CHRISTENSEN TO  
APPROVE THE JOINT PARKING FACILITY.**

Kreun brought up the Town Square area and the Shadyridge area as well as the area under discussion. All of them were piece-meal projects and were not put in at the same time. Access points and development variables were not considered. Afterward, the problems are brought to the city to solve. The problems are a development problem.

**MOTION CARRIED WITH MALM VOTING NAY.**

**4. COMMUNICATIONS AND PRELIMINARY APPROVALS:**

**4-1. MATTER OF THE REQUEST FROM WIDSETH SMITH NOLTING AND  
ASSOCIATES, INC., ON BEHALF OF RICK AND KATHY FAYETTE, FOR**



**PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE PLAT OF SHADY ACRES ADDITION TO THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS, ND, LOCATED ON GRAND FORKS COUNTY ROAD NO. 17 (SOUTH COLUMBIA ROAD).**

Brooks reviewed the plat request by stating it is the last of the three plats accepted under the old rules. The area is on South Columbia Road with two existing homes. An additional lot is being added to the back portion, making three, two and one-half acre lots. Brooks pointed out the private cul-de-sac road that will access lot 2 and will be the only access into the site.

**MOTION BY MALM AND SECOND BY MATEJCEK FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE PLAT REQUEST SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING TECHNICAL CHANGES SHOWN ON OR ATTACHED TO THE REVIEW, AS WELL AS APPROVAL OF THE STREET AND HIGHWAY ORDINANCE:**

1. Submit title opinion.
2. Plat should be on a 24" x 36" sheet.
3. Plat requires street and highway ordinance.
4. Plat requires park district approval
5. Title plat – Shady Acres Addition and also change in owner's consent.
6. Code requires 5/8" x 20" long rebar monument.
7. Add street and highway ordinance verbiage to city council approval.
8. Add spot ground elevations.
9. List Paula H. Lee and Lyle A. Hall as signers in the planning and zoning commission notary.
10. Include outside dimensions for plat boundary.
11. Show set monuments on the west Columbia Road right-of-way line.
12. Identify South Columbia Road.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**4-2. MATTER OF THE REQUEST FROM SUNSET BLUFFS, LLC, FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE REPLAT OF SHADYRIDGE ESTATES FIFTH ADDITION TO THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS, ND, LOCATED AT ADAMS DRIVE AND SHADYRIDGE COURT.**

Gengler reviewed the replat by stating the item had been discussed briefly when discussing the vacation request under Item No. 3-10. The replat changes the Cole Creek Condos. The plan is to change the remaining lots and create eight single-family lots. Gengler indicated the existing internal private access into the property that will serve lots T, U, V, and W. A private cul-de-sac would be constructed to access lots P, Q, R and S. The property owner wishes to rezone the remaining undeveloped areas from single-family attached dwellings to single-family detached dwellings (Item No. 4-3). Staff's recommendation is for preliminary approval. Gengler noted there were interested parties in the audience to speak on the issue.

Christensen asked about the roads into the property. When people buy the property, they will want to know who takes care of it. Gengler said that would be taken care of through the private covenants. The existing roadway and proposed cul-de-sac are private roadways.

John Erickson, owner of the property, stated the existing internal roadway has always been a private roadway and would continue that way. The association takes care of the roadway.

Christensen said the commission wanted to make sure there was a decent road constructed so that homeowners in the future do not start complaining to the city about the road.

Mr. Erickson said the roadway would be colored concrete. Christensen asked if that should be included on the plat.

Grasser stated the code now requires private roadways that are to be serviced with refuse trucks be constructed to meet city standards and that would require a 6-inch minimum concrete roadway.

Curt Tingum, 1317 Chestnut Street, attorney representing the Lavonne Adams Trust, stated he was objecting to the replat and rezoning on behalf of the trust. The property was sold to the present owner by the trust based on the intention of constructing the condo-type structures. That protected the trust because they were selling lots for single-family dwellings. Mr. Tingum said he did not know what written agreements were in place and the matter may have to be settled in court.

**MOTION BY HUTCHISON AND SECOND BY CHRISTENSEN FOR  
PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE REPLAT REQUEST SUBJECT TO  
THE TECHNICAL CHANGES SHOWN ON OR ATTACHED TO THE  
REVIEW COPY:**

1. Submit title opinion.
2. Show legal access to lots S, T, U, V and W with ingress-egress easements or a covenant agreement.
3. Show extents of water in the coulee east of this plat with water elevation.
4. Show ground contours and spot ground elevations.
5. Add 200-year flood line from current FEMA map.
6. Show extents of existing L.O.M.R. on affected lots.
7. Show access control along Adams Drive and Shadyridge Court. Level F access control will apply on Adams Drive, with 150-foot minimum gaps.
8. State that in the vacated portion of Lot "B," the utility easement shall remain.
9. Add note that building elevations shall be based on best available flood elevation data.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**4-3. MATTER OF THE REQUEST FROM SUNSET BLUFFS, LLC, FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE ZONING MAP TO EXCLUDE FROM THE SHADYRIDGE PUD (PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT), CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT PLAN, AMENDMENT NO. 2, AND TO INCLUDE WITHIN THE SHADYRIDGE PUD (PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT), CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT PLAN, AMENDMENT NO. 3, ALL OF SHADYRIDGE ESTATES FIRST ADDITION, SHADY RIDGE ESTATES SECOND ADDITION, SHADY RIDGE ESTATES THIRD ADDITION, SHADYRIDGE ESTATES FOURTH RESUBDIVISION, SHADYRIDGE ESTATES FIFTH RESUBDIVISION, SHADY RIDGE ESTATES SIXTH RESUBDIVISION, SHADYRIDGE ESTATES SEVENTH ADDITION, SHADYRIDGE ESTATES EIGHTH RESUBDIVISION, GREENWOOD SUBDIVISION AND UNPLATTED PORTIONS OF SECTION 26, TOWNSHIP 151, RANGE 50 WEST OF THE FIFTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ALL LOCATED WITHIN THE VICINITY OF ADAMS DRIVE AND SHADYRIDGE COURT.**

Gengler reviewed the request as discussed earlier. The owner wishes to rezone from single-family attached dwellings and to allow both single-family attached and detached dwellings.

Gengler stated a note would be placed on the zoning document allowing for sidewalks to be constructed only on the westerly and southerly side of Desiree Drive. No sidewalks would be constructed on the easterly or northerly side of Desiree Drive. The elevations on the easterly and northerly side of Desiree Drive would be physically limiting to construct a sidewalk after it is replatted. Another discussion is the area designated as R-3 type uses on the original PUD. The original plat for the R-3 type uses provided for multiple-family lots (condos). However, that plat was never recorded and was superceded by the current plat of Shadyridge Estates Third Addition, which provides for single-family lots. The area designated for R-3 type uses is not part of the proposed amendment.

**MOVED BY CHRISTENSEN AND SECOND BY GRASSER FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE REZONING REQUEST WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE NOTE REGARDING THE SIDEWALKS.**

Christensen said everybody else has to put in sidewalks at some time. but by placing the note on the rezoning, the people in this area get a free ride.

Hagness said some cul-de-sacs are eliminated from having sidewalks and the grade of the land makes it impossible to have sidewalks. Why make people put them in?

Christensen said it was inappropriate to remove sidewalks and exempt people in a certain group or area. His area did not have sidewalks for some time and then when it was forced on them, the people started petitions to protest them. There may be a time

in the future when sidewalks would need to be put in that area and if there is a note absolving them from having them, there will never be sidewalks put in.

Grasser said sidewalks are required by code and are supposed to be put in within a year of the home being built. When the homes are built in a rural area, it's more difficult and given the rural nature of the roadway, sidewalks would be constructed after the area is fairly well developed. Unfortunately, at that time the neighborhood has developed and people then object to the sidewalk. He noted that, by code, there are certain streets exempted from sidewalks. He does not see them pushing the sidewalk issue in the immediate future; the focus is getting the road in so people can get to their homes. Grasser said between preliminary and final approval, the engineering department could do a drawing of the area to indicate the issues of sidewalks.

Hutchison said the park district is putting in a bikepath halfway down the drainage ditch and there must be a way to create a shelf along the edge of that area for sidewalks.

Christensen asked if the new roadway alignment would include enough room for sidewalks. Gengler said the roadway was 90 feet in width until the turn and then it becomes a standard 80-foot roadway and sidewalks could be included.

Christensen said with the note removed, some day if the city proposed sidewalks, city council could listen to the homeowners at that time to determine if sidewalks would be required or not.

Grasser said that was the way procedurally to handle the issue. That type of note has not been added to a plat in the past and it is not a good precedent to start. Gengler said the note would be removed from the zoning document; the note was not on the plat.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**4-4. MATTER OF THE REQUEST FROM CPS, LTD., ON BEHALF OF LAVONNE ADAMS AND OTHERS INCLUDING THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS, ND, FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE PLAT OF SHADYRIDGE ESTATES EIGHTH RESUBDIVISION TO THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS, ND, AND LOCATED AT DESIREE DRIVE.**

Gengler reviewed the request.

**MOTION BY MALM AND SECOND BY GRASSER FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE PLAT REQUEST SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING**

**TECHNICAL CHANGES SHOWN ON OR ATTACHED TO THE REVIEW COPY:**

1. Submit title opinion.
2. Show monuments set at all lot corners and points of curve.
3. Include ground contours and spot ground elevations.
4. Relocate 15-foot utility easement between lots 3 and 4, block 1.
5. Add a 20-foot wide access easement along the south line of lot 1 to serve city dike lands west thereof.
6. Rename Desiree Drive.
7. Show detailed location for utility easement through lots 7-11, block 1.
8. Include existing easements between lots 6 and 7.
9. Add FEMA 100-year flood line as shown on current map.
10. Show extents of existing L.O.M.R. on affected lots.
11. Plat name should read "Shadyridge Estates Eighth Resubdivision."
12. Plat required street and utility easement vacation.
13. Plat requires street and highway ordinance.
14. Name city of Grand Forks, a municipal corporation, as owner of lot 1 and lot 8, Shadyridge Estate Third Addition.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

- 4-5. MATTER OF THE REQUEST FROM TURNING POINT, LLC, ON BEHALF OF AEROSPACE FOUNDATION, FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE ZONING MAP TO EXCLUDE FROM THE I-2 (HEAVY INDUSTRIAL) DISTRICT AND TO INCLUDE WITHIN THE DAKOTA PUD (PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT PLAN), ALL OF LOTS 2, 3, 4, B AND D, BLOCK 1, UNIVERSITY TECHNOLOGY PARK ADDITION, LOCATED WEST OF INTERSTATE 29, BETWEEN UNIVERSITY AVENUE AND DEMERS AVENUE.**

Gengler reviewed the request stating the proposal is a new Planned Unit Development (PUD) around the Technology Circle between University Avenue and DeMers Avenue railroad tracks, west of I-29. The area has been zoned I-2 for many years. Originally, a large area of this part of town was zoned heavy industrial but over time, rezoning in the area has changed the look of the area. To the west of this area is one of the Congressional housing districts developed post-flood. Gengler showed the PUD map, noting the existing buildings (USDA building and Weather Service building) and four undeveloped lots. The UND Aerospace is proposing to rezone the undeveloped lots to R-4 type uses on lots three and four with a density not to exceed 20 units per acre. The original proposal for the remaining two lots was to rezone from I-2 to B-1 (limited business) and R-4 type uses. Staff's recommendation is to allow the R-4 residential lots that abut the interstate but with a density not to exceed

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES FOR JUNE 6, 2007

20 units per acre. The remaining two lots staff would recommend B-1 type uses which do allow multiple family buildings. If residential building were included in the designated B-1 zoning, the units could not exceed the 20 units per acre.

Dr. Hall noted with the B-1 type uses, apartments could be built above the first floor. Gengler answered yes, it would be considered mixed-use but there could only be office use on the first floor.

Christensen asked for clarification for the R-4 uses. Gengler said the multiple family apartment buildings immediately adjacent to I-29 and transitioning to the west are the two vacant lots proposed only for B-1 zoning (staff recommendation); not B-1 and R-4 zoning. Christensen asked about the acreage for the lots and Gengler replied that lot 3 is 5.19 acres and lot 4 is 6.07 and that would equate to approximately 225 units. Gengler asked members to envision the Campus Place development on 42<sup>nd</sup> Street and University Avenue and three of those building are approximately 20 units per acre. The standard conventional R-4 allows up to 50 units per acre and that density would be too high for this area.

Christensen said the neighborhood changed with the development by the Mini-Mart. There are many more people, cars and traffic in the area. Now the proposal is to do the same thing at this site. There is only one way in and one way out on the site.

Robert Drees asked if the apartments are meant for the aerospace students or open it up to anyone. The apartments next to the interstate might not be the most inviting, but if it is for students, it might not be a bad situation. He suggested zoning it all B-1. Gengler said the multi-family structures are allowed in the B-1 zoning but he recommended if the view is to make it B-1, then a density level should be specifically placed on it; otherwise it could be up to 50-units per acre. Staff was trying to find the balance between the residential development versus a standard I-2 heavy industrial development.

Malm referred to the apartments across the interstate and behind the Loaf and Jug and asked if it was 20 units per acre? Gengler stated that development has a mixture of zoning ranging from R-4 to B-1 to B-3 and the development did end up with approximately 20-units per acre. Malm said units like that would be built on the subject property and it would be rented to university students. Access is better than what it is on the subject property. With those types of apartments and the cars, the traffic would be bad in the area and there should not be that many units in the subject area.

Kreun said there is a need for more industrial areas since the industrial park is almost full. Once residential is constructed in that area, it would be difficult to put light industrial uses.

Matejcek pointed out that the cars would not be traveling through other neighbors because there is only one way in and one way out and it is stuck in the corner. That is the one positive for the plan.

Hutchison asked if another access could be requested onto University and was told it would be very difficult.

Grasser mentioned the noise aspect and said residents complain about railroads and interstates. The heavy traffic comments are valid. He felt there should be some

berming to help with the noise issues. However, he did not feel residential use was appropriate for the area.

**MOTION BY MATEJCEK AND SECOND BY MALM FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL AND A REQUEST TO THE DEVELOPER FOR A BETTER IDEA OF HOW THE UNITS WOULD BE SITUATED ON THE LOTS.**

Malm asked about a light industrial zoning and Gengler noted that I-1 is a light industrial zoning. Malm said the bio lab was sought at this site and the neighbors fought it.

Christensen said the plan should be sent back for more information without preliminary approval. He said there could be 362 units in the area with 1200 people and cars. The commission needs the site plan layout and density. There is a neighborhood there now and the university wants to build apartment buildings.

**MOTION CARRIED WITH CHRISTENSEN, KREUN AND ROBERT DREES VOTING NAY.**

**5. REPORTS FROM THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

**5-1. (REMINDER) MATTER OF JULY 4, 2007 MEETING CHANGED TO JULY 11, 2007.**

Members were reminded about the date change for the July planning and zoning commission meeting.

**5-2. MATTER OF PRESENTATION FROM GRAND FORKS-EAST GRAND FORKS METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (GF-EGF MPO) OF THE 2035 TRAFFIC FORECAST AND INITIAL ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS.**

Earl Haugen, MPO Executive Director, gave a presentation of the 2035 traffic forecast and initial alternative analysis in order to update the street and highway plan. He told members he had shortened his presentation to save time but the handout they were given was the full presentation. There is growth outside and beyond the current developed area so growth and regional trips will be occurring and the length of the trips will be longer. There will be longer trips and people will have to make more trips to get to places. The study is to confirm that what we have in place still makes sense. The study asks if the land use plan has changed? Has the traffic forecast for 2035 changed from the plan from 2025? This is not a complete update but only confirmation that a good plan exists. There are also safety and compliance that needs to be addressed. This is under the SAFETEA-LU Highway bill passed several years ago. The list of projects are still a viable list. There is 10 years of data and growth to 2035 so the purpose is strengthened more than in 2025. The projects will continue to be studied and will move on to the next stage. However, there are some things that need to be re-evaluated.

One reevaluation is the DeMers Avenue/Washington Street intersection. In the current plan, there is a plan to add another right turn lane or three lane to the south side of the intersection that takes a person past the Washington intersection to the 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue off-ramp for the 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue/MN bridge. In 2003 and during the 2025 traffic forecast, the intersection was at the level service of C. After 10 years of growth, the level of service C is no longer maintained. Level of service C is the desired level for the intersection. On 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South, the current plan is for six lanes. From Washington Street to I-29, the forecast has changed for 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South and that will have to be re-examined. The I-29/47<sup>th</sup> Avenue interchange under the current plan is for a right-of-way reservation and it should possibly be a "build" alternative rather than a preserving right-of-way. The last one is Columbia Road widening to six lanes. In the current plan, Columbia Road from DeMers and past 36<sup>th</sup> Avenue South needs to be six lanes. The new forecasts are less than before and that will be re-examined. He noted the north by-pass is disappearing. It was part of the public request that the north by-pass be considered. It may be a want but it is not shown as a need in the next 20 years. The plan shows the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South and Merrifield Road bridges as still being viable; they are strengthened now and they will be moved to the next stage.

The Washington Street/DeMers Avenue intersection is a state highway intersection of two state highways and their threshold is a level C service. With the drop below a level C service, the problem becomes a state issue as well as a local issue. Other alternatives are being studied for the intersection. They are re-studying the single point urban interchange that at one time was a plan for the intersection. There would be right-of-way issues and the fire station is one of the impediments to many of the alternatives for the intersection. In the past plans, the underpass for Washington Street was not addressed but it will probably be rebuilt during the life of the current plan. The re-building of the underpass can be utilized in determining the alternatives for the intersection.



There are plans to beef up alternative corridors. One of those is to look at one-way pairs on the north side of the railroad on 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and University Avenue as a way to divert traffic away from DeMers to Washington and to bring the traffic from Washington to DeMers from the north. One of the real issues at Washington/DeMers are the left turns east bound to south bound and conflicting with other movements. If the left turns can be shifted from the intersection, it could create another alternative.

Haugen talked about the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South congestion. In addition to the six lanes, some of the congestion issues can be resolved by focusing on the intersection improvements at 38<sup>th</sup>, 34<sup>th</sup>, etc. Having an overpass and interchange at 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, thereby shifting traffic to 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue South from 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South to get to the west side of the interstate will help in that regard.

There is less traffic forecasted for the South Columbia Road than with the 2025 traffic volumes so more focused intersection improvements are being studied.

The downtown DeMers Avenue congestion has an alternative to widen it to five lanes.

South Columbia Road and 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue South are being re-constructed this year, but the area of 29<sup>th</sup> Street and 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue South is one of the highest critical crash rate areas. There are documented problems at 34<sup>th</sup> Street and 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue South. Haugen discussed the term “round-about.” The roundabouts might be a viable solution for 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue South/South 29<sup>th</sup> Street and 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue South/South 34<sup>th</sup> Street. On the Minnesota side, justification has to be made on why roundabouts would not work before justifying traffic signals.

DeMers Avenue and 48th Street on and off ramps of I-29 were discussed. The on and off ramps are being constructed by the NDDOT this year.

Haugen reported they would continue to look at the analysis. They have to update the financial plan and the revenues coming into the system. Since the last plan, the change has been significant. There have also been substantial changes in the cost estimates since the last plan.

Matejcek asked if there is still an option for a business to “pay” for parking stalls if they did not have enough stalls to meet the requirement of the code. Gengler said the provision was still in the code but it has not been used for years. It’s more of an archaic requirement.

## **6. OTHER BUSINESS:**

None.

**7. ADJOURNMENT.**

**MOTION BY MATEJCEK AND SECOND BY MALM TO ADJOURN THE  
MEETING AT 9:07 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

---

Lyle A. Hall, Secretary

---

Paula H. Lee, President

**EAST GRAND FORKS  
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES  
Thursday, June 14<sup>th</sup>, 2007, – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Punky Beauchamp called the June 14<sup>th</sup>, 2007, meeting of the East Grand Forks Planning Commission to order at 12:10 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll, the following members were present: Commissioners Bruhn, Christianson, Hecht, Hanson, and Buckalew.

Staff present was: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Nancy Ellis, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Executive Assistant.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Chairman Beauchamp declared a quorum was present.

**COMMUNICATION**

1. Update On Current Projects/Studies

Ms. Ellis reported that there weren't any public hearings this month. She explained that, although Mr. Ryan did come before the commission at it's last meeting, and did request a special meeting be held, it was determined that, because the property in question has not yet been sold to Mr. Ryan, a special meeting will not need to be held before the July meeting.

Ms. Ellis stated that as far as the Safe Routes to School project is concerned, if you drive down Bygland Road you will notice that there are stakes along the roadway, mapping out the project, however, there has been some discussion regarding the concerns of some of the property owners that it tends to jog in a certain area. She said that she did meet with Greg Boppre, City Engineer and Scott Gravseth, Water and Light Department, regarding this and was told that these are just preliminary stakes, that it is their intention to straighten it out, however, it will require the trimming of some of the trees along that roadway. She commented that staff is now working on preparing a project memorandum, and getting the project straightened out better. She added that this project still hasn't received final approval from the City Council, therefore they will need to hold a public hearing prior to construction of the path.

Ms. Ellis reported that the Central Avenue Improvement Study is now scheduled to begin, and they do have a consultant on board. She explained that JLG Architects, who, along with their sub-consultant SRF, will be performing these duties. She stated that their first steering committee meeting is scheduled to take place on Thursday, June 28<sup>th</sup>, at 3:00 p.m., which will most likely be the time most of the steering committee and staff meetings will be held.

After some discussion it was agreed that Gary Christianson would be the Planning Commission's liaison on the committee. She added that once they get started, and start getting information, they will have the consultants come before the commission to give an update on the study.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. Matter Of Approval Of The May 10<sup>th</sup>, 2007, Minutes Of The East Grand Forks Planning Commission Organizational Meeting.

**EAST GRAND FORKS  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
JUNE 14TH, 2007**

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER HECHT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BRUHN, TO APPROVE THE MAY 10<sup>TH</sup>, 2007 MINUTES OF THE EAST GRAND FORKS PLANNING COMMISSION AS SUBMITTED.**

*Voting Aye: Bruhn, Hecht, Hanson, Christianson, Buckalew, and Beauchamp.  
Voting Nay: None.*

**OLD BUSINESS**

**1. Matter Of Presentation On Street And Highway Plan Update**

Mr. Haugen reported that he is here today to give a brief update on where they are at on updating the Street and Highway Plan. He stated that they hope to be able to request preliminary approval of the recommended plan at the July meeting, and final at the August meeting.

Mr. Haugen then referred to a power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request), and went over it briefly.

Mr. Haugen pointed out that the first slide essentially shows that this is a three-step process. He explained that they did the data collection last year, and looked at the current land uses, as well as traffic volumes and turning movements. He stated that they are now going to finalize their current and future conditions, and then will come up with alternative recommendations as well.

Mr. Haugen stated that, while he did trim down this presentation considerably, the entire document is included in the packets for your review. He explained that this is really all about is the fact that we essentially having an extension of our driving activities going out further than our currently developed areas, which means that we will have growth in our trips, and growth in our miles, so we need to show that we can think beyond what our current development pattern is, and look at what our future development pattern will be.

Presentation ensued.

Mr. Haugen reported that we did do a street and highway plan not too long ago, so our attempt this time is to not re-examine everything, but really just to confirm that what our current plan contains is still valid today, so we need to look at whether or not base conditions have changed dramatically enough to warrant a real radical change to what we thought our land uses would be in 2035. He referred to a slide that lists those current projects that have been confirmed, and those that need to be re-evaluated, and went over it briefly.

Mr. Haugen commented that the next few slides are maps that identify certain segments of roads for which they are looking at alternatives. He stated that some of those alternatives are listed on the maps, and give you an idea of what they are focusing on for those corridors.

Mr. Haugen explained that in the next series of maps one map doesn't take priority over another, and are shown this way because trying to show it all on one map would be too complicated. He pointed out, however, that none show future river crossings for those have been determined, and while there has been discussion of a North Bypass, currently their analysis does not show a need for a North Bypass at this time.

Mr. Haugen commented that the next slide shows some of the different areas for which they are trying to determine alternatives, and, as you will notice, it shows two southend bridges. He explained that these are projects that are in the current plan, and have been confirmed as being valid for the update as well. He stated that because they still feel they are doing the job they hope they will do, they aren't spending a lot of time looking at whether or not those bridges should be there, and are suggesting that because they were included in the original plan for a reason, they should be continued in the update as well.

**EAST GRAND FORKS  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
JUNE 14TH, 2007**

Mr. Haugen reported that one other important thing that he would like to re-emphasize, and which is in the current plan is the concept of a central spine connector in East Grand Forks. He referred to a drawing of the recommended alternative for this concept, and explained that it includes an underpass on 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, and was re-examined for the update, and found to still be a viable alternative.

Mr. Haugen commented that the Beet Plant Truck Circulation/US 2 alternative is still being examined, but appears to be a weak alternative at this time.

Mr. Haugen stated one thing they were asked to do was to look at widening DeMers to 5-lanes for the Downtown DeMers Congestion Alternative, but this was found to not be a viable alternative due to the huge impact it would have on the downtown area, therefore they are recommending it not be pursued.

Mr. Haugen reported that the Washington/DeMers Congestion alternative, in which they are looking at an interchange at that intersection, is still a viable alternative. He explained that this alternative was first included in the 1969 plan, although they recommended an interchange similar to the Columbia Road/DeMers Avenue interchange at that time. He stated that it was then included in the 1979 plan, but was converted to a straight diamond interchange; and in the 1991 plan it was suggested that a single-point urban interchange be built. He said that our current plan now recommends adding an additional lane of traffic on the south-side of DeMers Avenue, to the 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue exit, which would give us a low enough level of service to get us, with our 2030 traffic volumes, to a level we would like to maintain. He stated, however, that now that we have added more traffic to this intersection, the single-point urban interchange no longer maintains our desired level of service, so we are trying to determine if a better concept should be recommended.

Mr. Haugen pointed out that they are also looking at adjacent corridors as well. He stated that the real issue at the intersection of DeMers and Washington are the left turns, coming from downtown, heading south on Washington, so the thought is that if we can shift some of the traffic from the downtown to an adjacent corridor, such as University Avenue or 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, that would move those turning movements away from the intersection, and have them occur somewhere else along Washington. He stated, however, that Grand Forks isn't real receptive to adding more traffic to what are "quasi" residential corridors, so it is uncertain if this will be achievable, therefore, we most likely will still need to look at an interchange at that intersection.

Mr. Haugen commented that something that has recently been added to the mix, which was never included in past plans, is that the Washington underpass is scheduled to be rebuilt. He said that most of the past plans have tried avoiding impacting that underpass, but now that we know that it is scheduled to be reconstructed, we are asking the consultants to take a look at it as part of the alternative, therefore, next month may offer some new alternatives for this corridor.

Mr. Haugen reported that this intersection may also be considered as one of the first roundabouts in the metro area. He explained that a roundabout is a recently emphasized solution for intersections with capacity issues, and, in-fact, Minnesota is now introducing that you have to justify why you aren't considering a roundabout before approving putting in traffic signals. He added that the one location we feel we may actually have the best chance of installing our first roundabout is the intersection of 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue South and South 34<sup>th</sup> Street.

Mr. Haugen commented that they are continuing their analysis, and will be updating their financial information, as well as their costs. He stated that he is sure that many are familiar with what has happened with highway construction dollars. He explained that they have increased it significantly over the last couple of years, and, as you are aware, the Minnesota Legislature has determined that the purchasing power of the current gas tax, or the revenue coming into the system is not keeping pace, so there is a little issue with revenues that are coming into the system being able to pay for the rising costs, so while our current plan is fiscally constrained, we do have to update it. He said, then, that there is a possibility that some of our current projects in our plan may have to be dropped because we can't prove we have the financial resources to fund them.

**EAST GRAND FORKS  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
JUNE 14TH, 2007**

**NEW BUSINESS**

None.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER CHRISTIANSON, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER HECHT, TO ADJOURN THE JUNE 14<sup>TH</sup>, 2007, MEETING OF THE EAST GRAND FORKS PLANNING COMMISSION AT 12:30 P.M..**

*Voting Aye: Bruhn, Hecht, Hanson, Christianson, Buckalew, and Beauchamp.*

*Voting Nay: None.*

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis  
Executive Assistant

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS  
GRAND FORKS COUNTY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
July 10, 2006, 7:00 O'CLOCK PM

The meeting of the Grand Forks County Planning and Zoning Commission was called to order at 7:00 PM by Chairman Gary Malm. It was noted that the following members were present: Gary Malm, Diane Knauf, Kurt Kreun, John Fortin, Paul Erickson, Robert White, David Hagert, Bob Klave, John Rodgers and County Planner, Lane Magnuson.

The minutes of the June 13, 2007, meeting of the County Planning and Zoning Commission were declared approved.

Mr. Magnuson addressed the commission with the staff report for Future Land Use Map amendments in the 2035 Land Use Plan. The amendment would change one square mile of land east of the Thompson interchange from rural residential to the business reserve designation. The second part of the amendment would change the townships of Niagara, Loretta, and Moraine from township zoning to the agricultural designation to reflect the relinquishment of township zonings in the past year.

Katherine Holien addressed the commission, and Mr. Magnuson answered her questions.

Kirk Tinguim addressed the commission, and Mr. Magnuson answered his questions.

Discussion ensued.

Moved by Mr. Kreun and seconded by Mr. Klave to approve Future Land Use Plan amendments.

Motion Carried.

Mr. Magnuson addressed the commission with the staff report for a Zoning Map amendment which would change one square mile of land east of the Thompson interchange from RR-1 Rural Residential Single Family District to the RBR – Rural Business Reserve District.

Mr. White asked about the impacts on development options, and Mr. Magnuson answered his questions.

Katherine Holien addressed the commission, and Mr. Magnuson answered her questions.

Kirk Tinguim addressed the commission, and Mr. Magnuson answered his questions.

Discussion Ensued.

Moved by Mr. Rodgers and seconded by Mr. White to form a committee that would further define the area to be rezoned.

Motion Carried.

Mr. Magnuson addressed the commission with the staff report for the Special Use Permit application of John Scott to site a solid waste management facility in Section 34 of Strabane Township.

Mike Korman of CPS Ltd. gave the commission a presentation on the operations of the proposed facility on behalf of the applicant.

Todd Leak addressed the commission with environmental concerns.

Mel Danner addressed the commission with traffic concerns, truck route enforcement, and environmental issues.

Discussion Ensued.

Rich McDonald addressed the commission with questions regarding the garbage coming through the bailing facility and traffic concerns.

Discussion Ensued.

The public hearing was closed.

Moved by Mr. White and seconded by Mr. Hagert to table the request until the next planning commission meeting on August 2, 2007, to receive comments from Strabane Township Board, State Highway Department, and The Grand Forks County Water Board.

Paul Bailey addressed the commission regarding answers to the environmental questions, Mr. Magnuson explained the County process in relation to the State Health Department process.

Discussion Ensued.

Motion carried.

Traffic Counts and the Merrifield Interchange information were discussed. Any further questions were to be directed to Earl Haugen of the MPO.

Mr. Magnuson addressed the commission with the possibility of changing the August Planning Commission Meeting to August 2, 2007.

Moved by Mr. Hagert and seconded by Mr. Klave to change the August Planning Commission Meeting to August 2, 2007.

Moved by Mr. Hagert and seconded by Mr. Klave to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Lane Magnuson", followed by a horizontal line.

---

County Planner, Lane Magnuson



**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
City of Grand Forks, North Dakota  
September 5, 2007**

**1. MEMBERS PRESENT**

The meeting was called to order by Paula Lee, President, at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present: Steve Adams, Doug Christensen, John Drees, Robert Drees, Al Grasser, Tom Hagness, Dr. Lyle Hall, Bill Hutchison, Curt Kreun, Gary Malm, Frank Matejcek and Marijo Whitcomb. Absent: Mayor (Dr.) Michael Brown. A quorum was present.

Staff present included Brad Gengler, City Planner; Charles Durrenberger, Senior Planner; Ryan Brooks, Senior Planner; and Carolyn Schalk, Administrative Specialist, Senior, Planning and Zoning Department; and Bev Collings, Building and Zoning Administrator (Building Inspections Office). Absent: None.

**2. READING AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR AUGUST 1, 2007.**

Lee asked if there were any revisions or corrections to the minutes of August 1, 2007. There were no revisions or corrections noted and Lee stated the minutes would stand approved as presented.

**3. PUBLIC HEARINGS, FINAL APPROVALS, PETITIONS AND MINOR CHANGES:**

**3-1. (PUBLIC HEARING) MATTER OF THE REQUEST FROM MEREDITH RICHARDS, URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS, ND, FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF THE REPLAT OF LOTS 2 THROUGH 8 AND THE NORTH 10 FEET OF LOT 9, BLOCK 1, WALCHESTER PLACE ADDITION, CITY OF GRAND FORKS, ND, LOCATED IN THE 1500 BLOCK OF WALNUT STREET.**

Brooks reviewed the request for the city-owned property purchased for flood control. The original homes were demolished and the property is being replatted from seven to six lots, which allows the lots to be slightly widened. The plat was tabled at the August meeting (final approval) because of drainage concerns by the city engineer. The subject area is the low point and the drainage concerns raised by the city engineer made it necessary to review it more closely. One of the recommendations is to place access control on the east side of the alley in order to prevent prospective homeowners from building a garage that accesses from the alley. City engineers want the water to continue to drain away from the alley. Building garages in the alley

would block water drainage and create problems for other homeowners. Brooks explained that Urban Development is going through a bid process by RFP (Request for Proposals). The plans or proposals are reviewed and homeowners will be made aware of the access control on the alley. The lots will be front-loaded with access on Walnut Street as it was pre-flood. There will be modest homes built on the lots that will fit in well with the neighborhood. He noted that the homes that front onto Cottonwood Street to the west do not have garages on the backside, but there are several sheds.

Grasser, city engineer, made the comment that at one time it was thought they would have to run the drainage along the back lot lines but after further review, it was decided to run the drainage along the lot lines to the street. He was concerned that if a homeowner did try to access off the high elevation of the alley and problems occurred, the city might be liable for it. They felt it was a prudent solution to the issue.

Lee opened the public hearing. There was no one to talk on the issue and the public hearing was closed.

**MOTION BY MALM AND SECOND BY HAGNESS TO APPROVE THE REPLAT REQUEST SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING TECHNICAL CHANGES SHOWN ON OR ATTACHED TO THE REVIEW COPY:**

1. Submit title opinion.
2. Add access control along rear (alley) line of Lots A-F.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**3-2. (PUBLIC HEARING) MATTER OF THE REQUEST FROM TIM BROWN, ON BEHALF OF AGRI PARK II, LLC., FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF THE PLAT OF BROWN CORPORATION SECOND ADDITION, LOCATED ON MERRIFIELD ROAD AND SOUTH 42<sup>ND</sup> STREET.**

Gengler reviewed the plat request, noting the supplemental technical change form passed out to each member. Technical change number six was added stating the proper language to be used on the plat under the "notes section." Staff recommendation was for final approval of the plat request.

Robert Drees stated that Merrifield Road is the generally accepted name for the road but the technical name according to the county is 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast. Gengler said the city had formally adopted the reports and studies with the designation of Merrifield Road. Staff will check on it and see if it needs to be changed.

It was noted the post office uses the 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE as the proper address. Kreun suggested putting 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast in parenthesis after Merrifield Road and that should suffice.

Lee opened the public hearing. There was no one to speak on the issue and the public hearing was closed.

**MOTION BY WHITCOMB AND SECOND BY JOHN DREES TO APPROVE THE PLAT REQUEST SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING TECHNICAL CHANGES SHOWN ON OR ATTACHED TO THE REVIEW COPY (ADDITION OF NO. 6) AND ALSO APPROVAL OF THE STREET AND HIGHWAY ORDINANCE:**

1. Submit title opinion.
2. Plat acceptance recognizes that outlot A is an unbuildable lot with no access.
3. In lieu of roadway maintenance plan, add note number 3 that Rylan Road shall be privately owned and maintained until such time as these lands are annexed by the city of Grand Forks.
4. Include square footage and acreage for all lots.
5. Correctly identify lot 1, block 2 and lot 1, block 1.
6. **Change the note located within Outlot A to read: Future Merrifield /I-29 Interchange Area as per the Merrifield Road and I-29 Interchange Justification Report dated October 3, 2002.**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**3-3. (PUBLIC HEARING) MATTER OF THE REQUEST FROM CPS, LTD., ON BEHALF OF VISIM, LLP, FOR FINAL APPROVAL (FAST TRACK) OF THE REPLAT OF LOT 2, BLOCK 1, AMUNDSON'S SECOND RESUBDIVISION TO THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS, ND, TO ALSO INCLUDE A VARIANCE FROM SECTION 18-0907(4)(L)(1)(d) FOR THE PURPOSE OF VARYING THE SUBDIVISION CODE REQUIREMENT TO ALLOW A SECOND ACCESS, LOCATED AT 3101 SOUTH 42<sup>ND</sup> STREET.**

Durrenberger reviewed the request for a lot split on the property located between the Amundson's Funeral Home and the All Reasons Storage unit business. The replat will accommodate a 100-unit hotel on the southern portion of the property. The northern portion of the property will allow another development in the future, possibly a multi-family development. When the area was originally platted, there was one access point on the eastern edge of lot one. The owner has requested a second access near the western lot line, located across from the Nodak headquarters access. The second access requires a variance. There is approximately 229 feet between the two proposed hotel accesses and another 326 feet from the west access to the Amundsons Funeral Home. Staff reviewed several factors for the variance request. The Nodak property has two accesses and it is not uncommon to have two accesses for a property. There is also the possibility, based on the transportation plan update, of re-routing the access on South 42<sup>nd</sup> Street to 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South, closing off the existing ramp on I-29, and moving the access ramp westward in order not to interfere with the proposed signalized intersection. If the plan is implemented, much of the traffic would be eliminated on South 42<sup>nd</sup> Street in front of the hotel reducing

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES FOR SEPTEMBER 5, 2007

conflicts with traffic entering or leaving the hotel. The variance would allow a closer separation. Normally 660 feet is required for a separation. With these two considerations, planning staff recommends approval of the replat with the variance and subject to the technical changes.

Malm stated the hotel has already started construction. Durrenberger said they received a footings and foundation permit.

Hagness spoke on the variance request and stated it made good sense for a second access for good traffic flow.

Durrenberger commented he had visited with the traffic engineer and there might be some conflict with people leaving the hotel eastbound on South 42<sup>nd</sup> Street, but it could be striped to aid in eliminating any problems.

Grasser said some modifications would have to be made to South 38<sup>th</sup> Street in the future. South 31<sup>st</sup> Street (in front of the hotel) will become a local street. He also noted there was no alterations for the hotel location on the site plan, regardless of the inclusion of one or two driveways. The footings and foundation permit was not tied to the decision made by the Planning and Zoning Commission. With the short construction season, the hotel wanted to get the project started before winter sets in.

Hutchison asked how far apart the accesses were for the Nodak facility and Durrenberger said approximately 400 feet.

Malm asked when the South 42<sup>nd</sup> Street would be re-routed.

Christensen said it was in the Grand Forks-East Grand Forks Metropolitan Planning Organization project plan and that plan was being modified to do that. Since money is not forthcoming from Congress, it would probably be five or ten years before the project is done. They need money to do the projects.

Malm also discussed the need for traffic control and a left turn signal on South 38<sup>th</sup> Street between Menard's and the gas station. That situation has been an on-going problem.

Christensen said that was all based on funding and the city needs the federal match. Grasser said there were various intersections in town, including the one on South 38<sup>th</sup> Street, that is being reviewed for a left turn signal but not only is funding an issue but the legal aspects have to be in place. The MPO will be doing traffic counts soon and that data is necessary for justification before they can proceed.

Lee opened the public hearing. There was no one to speak on the issue and the public hearing was closed.

**MOTION BY HUTCHISON AND SECOND BY JOHN DREES TO APPROVE THE REPLAT REQUEST, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING TECHNICAL CHANGES SHOWN ON OR ATTACHED TO THE REVIEW COPY:**

1. Submit title opinion.
2. Use correct distance on west line of "Lot B."
3. Plat acceptance recognizes a variance to the Land Development Code relating to right-of-way access (18-0907(2)(L)) for the access control along South 42<sup>nd</sup> Street.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**3-4. (PUBLIC HEARING) MATTER OF THE REQUEST FROM WIDSETH, SMITH AND NOLTING AND ASSOCIATES, ON BEHALF OF VALDAK CORPORATION, FOR FINAL APPROVAL (FAST TRACK) OF THE REPLAT OF LOT 1, BLOCK 1, MEADOW RIDGE FIRST ADDITION TO THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS, ND, LOCATED AT SOUTH WASHINGTON STREET AND 47<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE SOUTH.**

Durrenberger reviewed the replat request. There is currently an approved site plan for the new Valley Dairy store located on the corner of South Washington Street and 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South. The replat request is to separate two retail buildings, creating three lots. The replat proposal provides access easements for all facilities with no changes on the parking and landscaping. Staff recommends approval of the request.

Lee opened the public hearing. There was no one to speak on the issue and the public hearing was closed.

**MOTION BY DR. HALL AND SECOND BY MALM TO APPROVE THE REPLAT REQUEST SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING TECHNICAL CHANGES SHOWN ON OR ATTACHED TO THE REVIEW COPY:**

1. Submit title opinion.
2. Check the size of "Lot C" as it appears to be different than what is shown on the detailed development plan. Adjust all distances and volumes accordingly.
3. Use shorter version of the city council approval. A street and highway ordinance is not required because all street rights-of-way were previously platted.
4. Submit copies of any crossover/maintenance agreements that affect newly created Lots B and C.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**3-5. (PUBLIC HEARING) MATTER OF THE REQUEST FROM CHENEY-DAKOTA, LLC, FOR FINAL APPROVAL (FAST TRACK) OF THE REPLAT OF LOTS J AND K, BLOCK 1, OF THE REPLAT OF LOT C, BLOCK 1 OF THE REPLAT OF LOTS 1-6, BLOCK 1, COLUMBIA PARK 27<sup>TH</sup> ADDITION**

**TO THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS, ND, LOCATED AT 3901 32<sup>ND</sup> AVENUE SOUTH.**

Brooks reviewed the request, stating the property is located between the Village Inn and Arby's. The lot is currently divided north and south and the request is to divide the property east and west so each side has 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South frontage. Staff is currently reviewing a site plan for the IHOP restaurant to be located on the eastern portion of the property.

Lee opened the public hearing. There was no one to speak on the issue and the public hearing was closed.

**MOTION BY CHRISTENSEN AND SECOND BY ADAMS TO APPROVE THE REPLAT REQUEST SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING TECHNICAL CHANGES SHOWN ON OR ATTACHED TO THE REVIEW COPY:**

1. Submit title opinion.
2. Change Lots 1 and 2 to Lots L and M.
3. Remove "Cheney Dakota First Addition" from plat title, as replatted lots should remain as part of Columbia Park 27<sup>th</sup> Addition.
4. Add "a replat of Lots J and K" to the plat title.
5. Label 50-foot access and utility easement areas as being privately owned and maintained.
6. Remove the words "per plat" from all easements to be vacated with this document.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Malm stated there would be more traffic in that area.

Christensen complimented staff on bringing the fast track items to the commission as quickly as possible.

**3-6. (PUBLIC HEARING) MATTER OF THE REQUEST FROM EAPC ARCHITECTS ENGINEERS, ON BEHALF OF THE GRAND FORKS GROWTH FUND (AMAZON.COM), FOR APPROVAL OF AN APPEAL TO THE INDUSTRIAL 2<sup>ND</sup> PUD (PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT), DETAILED DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR LOT A, BLOCK 3, MAIER'S 4<sup>TH</sup> RESUBDIVISION, LOCATED AT 1550 SOUTH 48<sup>TH</sup> STREET. THE APPEAL IS TO INCREASE THE IMPERVIOUS SURFACE AREA MAXIMUM FROM 85% TO 87% TO ALLOW ADDITIONAL PARKING SPACES.**

Gengler reviewed the appeal request for the proposed parking expansion of LM Glasfiber in the Industrial Park. He showed the drawing of the primary building of the LM Glasfiber facility and another building to the north that comprised 70% for LM Glasfiber with the remainder housing Amazon.com. The LM Glasfiber business

has continued to grow and they have requested through the appeal process to increase the impervious surface area from 85% to 87% on the lot shared with Amazon.com. Gengler indicated on the drawing where the parking areas would be added. The plan has been reviewed by the engineering staff relative to the extension of the underground storm pipes and drainage system. He commented that additional paving is also taking place on the main facility, however, it does not exceed the maximum allowable impervious surface. Allowing the increase will not cause any undue hardship and staff's recommendation is for approval.

There was a short discussion on the stormsewer drainage for the area.

Lee opened the public hearing. There was no one to speak on the issue and the public hearing was closed.

**MOTION BY WHITCOMB AND SECOND BY CHRISTENSEN TO APPROVE THE APPEAL REQUEST. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**3-7. MATTER OF THE REQUEST FROM EAPC ARCHITECTS, ON BEHALF OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA, FOR APPROVAL OF AN ENTRANCE SIGN IN THE U-D UNIVERSITY ZONING DISTRICT TO BE LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF 2<sup>ND</sup> AVENUE NORTH AND NORTH COLUMBIA ROAD.**

Gengler reviewed the request for one entrance sign at the University of North Dakota. The university has approval for four entrance signs. The proposed sign is proposed in conjunction with the new parking ramp now under construction. The sign will be a v-shaped sign with 38.4 square feet for each panel. The sign will advertise various activities on campus as well as the occupancy level of the parking ramp. The sign will have an electronic display board and is consistent with what was approved in the past according to code. The maximum readerboard size is 18.8 feet by 7.5 feet. The city traffic engineer reviewed the location of the sign and did not feel there would be any problems. As established in the code, the sign must be approved by the planning and zoning commission.

Grasser asked if the readerboard was scrolled lettering. His concern was for the flashing type of readerboard since it will be located next to an intersection. Gengler stated the code does not specify flash times.

Jay Kleven, EAPC Architects Engineers, referred to a letter included in each members' packet regarding how the university plans to utilize the sign. The readerboard will only be a text message that scrolls information about the university and events taking place at the university as well as ramp status. It will not be a strobing, multi-colored electronic sign; it will only be a text device with red lettering on a black background. He noted it is the same as the one located at the Chester Fritz Auditorium.

**MOTION BY CHRISTENSEN AND SECOND BY HAGNESS TO APPROVE THE SIGN WITH AN ELECTRONIC READERBOARD AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA.**

The sign dimensions were discussed.

Mr. Kleven was asked when the ramp would be completed. He replied the university would like the ramp to be operational by mid-September.

Malm referred to the note on Exhibit A that indicates a future right turn lane on the intersection where the sign will be located. He asked how much room was between the base of the sign and the right-turn lane. Mr. Kleven stated there would not be a buffer between the future right turn that is identified. The right-turn is part of a corridor study but is not included on any capital plan. The university is aware of the possible right turn lane and will accommodate whatever needs to be done for corridor improvement.

Grasser said that was a struggle for him as well as the original ramp as far as traffic problems. It is not defined in a detailed plan as yet and the property is still owned by the university.

Malm asked where the entry for the parking ramp was located. Mr. Kleven said it was on 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue North (private UND road) about 170 feet west of the property line parallel to Columbia Road (almost in the middle of the facility).

Hagness asked if the sign jeopardizes the right turn lane when it is proposed or would the sign have to be removed? Mr. Kleven said that would depend on how far Columbia Road is widened. If there was a single curb cut for a right turn lane using the existing lane structure, the sign could stay in place. The corridor improvement study would recommend one whole extra lane and a right turn lane. If that happens, the sign would have to be relocated. However, the likelihood of that happening in the foreseeable future is rather slim.

**MOTION TO AMEND THE MOTION BY HAGNESS AND SECOND BY CHRISTENSEN THAT IF THE ROADWAY IS WIDENED FOR A RIGHT TURN LANE, RELOCATION OF THE SIGN WOULD BE AT THE UNIVERSITY'S EXPENSE; NOT THE CITY'S.**

Staff agreed with the amendment.

Mr. Kleven stated the right turn lane is not a defined criteria at this point that has to be met now. The amendment asks that the university accept a condition now to accommodate some undefined future potential consideration. He said he could not answer for the university accepting that. They have acknowledged that the risk is there.



Christensen said there had been issues with an underpass or overpass on 42<sup>nd</sup> Street on how much land we need and how much it will cost. The city has learned. We will accommodate the university on the sign and the placement, but someday there might be a road there and the city does not want to pay for the sign. If the sign has to be removed in the future because of a right turn lane, then it will be at the university's expense and not at the expense of the citizens of Grand Forks.

Grasser said the potential for the right turn lane has been defined well enough that there are dashed lines on the map and is part of the original site plan. There is nothing in the capital budget but it is depicted well enough that dimensions are shown. However, the land is owned by the university and when and if the expansions are necessary, the city will need to deal with the State of North Dakota on property acquisitions. Grasser said he did not have a problem with the motion and amendment. It will be a shame if they find out the parking ramp starts to generate traffic and turning movements to require the turn lane and thereby cause a conflict with the sign.

**MOTION FOR THE AMENDMENT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Malm said he would vote against the motion because he feels the parking ramp will create a bottleneck when entering and exiting the parking ramp.

**ORIGINAL MOTION, AS AMENDED, PASSED WITH MALM VOTING NAY.**

**4. COMMUNICATIONS AND PRELIMINARY APPROVALS:**

**NONE.**

**5. REPORTS FROM THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

**5-1. MATTER OF REPORT ON CEMETERY CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT.**

Gengler offered information for a proposed cemetery. In the A-1 and A-2 zoning districts, it was decided to list them as needing a conditional use permit (CUP). Recently, the Calvary Cemetery Association approached the planning department to locate a 20-acre cemetery approximately three miles south of 62<sup>nd</sup> Avenue in the Walle Township. Staff is recommending that instead of going through the CUP process, the preference is to use the planned unit development process. If it were processed as a CUP, there are conditions placed and if they are not met, the CUP is pulled. How do you pull a CUP for a cemetery after it has been in use for several years and what type of conditions would be placed on a cemetery? In reviewing and changing the land development code during the past year, the regulations adopted focused on residential development (excluding dimensional standards for non-residential land uses).

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES FOR SEPTEMBER 5, 2007

Christensen wondered why with all the land available, why would the cemetery be on Columbia Road? Staff noted the current cemeteries are located on main corridors (Columbia Road and Gateway Drive; Washington Street and 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South).

Whitcomb left the meeting at 8:03 p.m.

Gengler explained the cemetery association had been in talks with local landowners who have been receptive to a cemetery located by them.

Hagness asked staff if the costs of the planned unit development would be more than using the CUP process. He wondered if the process would be more cost prohibitive for the association. Gengler replied the property would have to be platted, drainage studies would have to be done and soil testing would be required. Those costs are required anyway. There will be standards to apply whether the property is in a PUD or processed as a CUP.

Matejcek said he found it ironic that a landfill is a permitted use and could be placed in the county and not have any discussion about it, but a CUP would be required for a cemetery. Under the old standards of the A-1 and A-2, churches and cemeteries were a permitted use and there was no permitted use for a landfill. Now it is reversed.

Christensen said there was state statute that allows cemeteries as a permitted use. He suggested staff discuss the issue with the city attorney and review the state law. If a CUP is used, then that will always be the use.

Gengler stated there had been discussions with the city attorney. In discussions with the land development code subcommittee, certain dimensional standards for the A-1 and A-2 were established such as 1 per 40 acres, setbacks, defined minimum lot size, etc. However, none of that discussion related to cemeteries. The PUD process was a way of developing a cemetery without having to address minimum lot size, etc. The PUD is the zoning and the code would not have to be changed to accommodate them.

Matejcek asked if the 20 acres was a part of a much larger parcel for the cemetery. Gengler answered he was under the impression there was a signed purchase agreement and the 20 acres was a part of a much larger parcel. The 20 acres is part of a 100 to 200 acres.

John Herz, 1019 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South, board member of the Calvary Cemetery Association, stated the cemetery at the corner of Gateway Drive and Columbia Road has 13 acres and the cemetery has been in existence for 100 years. The land purchase agreement will last for 100-150 years. The reason for buying land for a new cemetery is because they are running out of room at the existing cemetery.

After further discussion, commission members agreed that the cemetery should be processed through the PUD.

**5-2. MATTER OF REPORT FROM EARL HAUGEN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE GRAND FORKS-EAST GRAND FORKS METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (GF-EGF MPO), REGARDING THE LATEST INFORMATION ON THE LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN.**

Christensen left the meeting at 8:15 p.m.

Earl Haugen, Director of the Grand Forks-East Grand Forks Metropolitan Planning Organization, gave a power point presentation on the latest information on the long-range transportation plan. He stated the street and highway plan took five years to accomplish. He spoke on the alternatives analysis of 2004 and showed a list of the confirmed areas as well as the areas to be re-evaluated. The next activities are to continue alternative analysis to further narrow down to recommended alternatives, provide updated financial forecasts of funding available and provide updated cost estimates.

Hagness asked if the I-29/17<sup>th</sup> Avenue overpass had been approved by the city and Haugen answered yes.

On December 11, the fiscal constraint issues have to be met. The MPO will have to project what the future costs and revenues will be. Forecasting revenues will be very difficult. The current transportation bill will expire in 2009 and discussions are ongoing on how transportation across the nation will continue.

Haugen stated they have looked at the historic spending in the metropolitan area and adjusted the costs from the 1990s through the 2007 costs. Inflation will eat up any revenue increases, so we predict flat or decreasing revenue and the best North Dakota can expect is a 1 – 2 % growth. It was agreed to use the 2% annual growth. He also discussed the forecasting for the year a project will be constructed versus the costs and revenues if it is constructed within zero to five years, six to fifteen years and sixteen plus years.

Haugen talked about the planning level cost estimates and used the DeMers Avenue and Washington Street intersection as an example of large “swing” in costs. NDDOT historically would not “fund an improvement that did not raise the level of service to a grade “C” or better and the only planning level solution to a level of service “C” is the split diamond urban interchange which a cost estimate of \$20 million. He talked about the various alternatives considered. Haugen also showed a map of the various congested locations in the city of Grand Forks and the congested expansion results. He offered various scenarios of the congested locations and the grade level results with improvements.

Presentation ensued (a copy of which is available upon request).

**6. OTHER BUSINESS:**

Lee noted that the commission seat held by Dr. Rob Kweit had not been filled and Gary Malm is still serving although his appointment was up in February. He will continue to serve until he is either re-appointed or replaced. Lee asked staff to check on the two appointments. Gengler stated he had corresponded with the mayor's office on the appointments but had not received an answer. He will send further correspondence.

Lee announced there were only three members left on the sign subcommittee and at one time, there were five members. She asked Dr. Hall prior to the meeting to be a temporary member on the subcommittee and he agreed to do so. She asked if there was a volunteer to be a temporary member so there would be five members on the committee. Adams volunteered to serve on the committee.

Hagness stated that Cliff Coss had an item for rezoning that was to be on the agenda for tonight's meeting and it was not listed. Brooks said it was processed too late to be on the agenda and would be on the October meeting agenda.

**7. ADJOURNMENT.**

**MOTION BY MALM AND SECOND BY MATEJCEK TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:52P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

---

Lyle A. Hall, Secretary

---

Paula H. Lee, Vice-President