

2011 MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD MINUTES

January 19, 2011

February 16, 2011

March 7, 2011

March 16, 2011

April 20, 2011

May 18, 2011

June 15, 2011

July 20, 2011

August 18, 2011 - Cancelled

September 21, 2011

October 19, 2011

November 17, 2011 – Cancelled

December 15, 2011

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, January 19th, 2011 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Warren Strandell, Chairman, called the January 19th, 2011, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:00 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Gary Malm, Warren Strandell, Mike Powers, Steve Adams, Greg Leigh, Mike Pokrzywinski, and Doug Christensen.

Absent were: Tyrone Grandstrand.

Guest(s) present were: Dean Rau, Assistant Grand Forks City Engineer.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Nancy Ellis, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Matt Leal, GF/EGF MPO Planning Technician; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Chairman Strandell declared a quorum was present.

SELECTION OF SECRETARY

Chairman Strandell stated that the Secretary position needs to be filled by a representative from the Grand Forks side, and will serve a two-year term as such, then will take over as the Chairman of the board.

MOVED BY POWERS TO NOMINATE STEVE ADAMS AS SECRETARY OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD.

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY POKRZYWINSKI TO APPROVE THE NOMINATION OF STEVE ADAMS AS SECRETARY OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, TO CEASE NOMINATIONS, AND TO CAST A UNANIMOUS BALLOT.

Voting Aye: Powers, Strandell, Leigh, Malm, and Pokrzywinski.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: Adams.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 19th, 2011**

Christensen reported present.

APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 15TH, 2010, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 15TH, 2010, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Powers, Strandell, Leigh, Malm, Pokrzywinski, Adams, and Christensen.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2011-2012 MPO ANNUAL UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM UPDATE

Haugen reported that, as you will recall, last month you had the 2011-2012 Annual Unified Planning Work Program presented to you, and at that time we mentioned that our federal partners wanted us to clarify a few things. He explained that one thing they asked us to do since that meeting was to develop an indirect cost rate proposal.

Haugen commented that in the past we have always charged all of our costs directly to the grant, but this last year our federal partners started to look more deeply at MPO, and some State DOT operations to clean up some things, and one of the things they focused on for the MPOs was that they prepare indirect cost rate proposals. He explained that, essentially what this means is that we have items that are more general to the overall MPO function, and are not specific to a planning document or study that we are doing, so those costs now have to be billed indirectly using an indirect rate added to our salaries to be able to recoup those costs to the grants rather than applying them directly.

Haugen referred to a copy of a draft cost proposal, included in the packet, and pointed out that it identifies direct and indirect costs. He commented that one indirect item would be our fringe benefits, which includes vacation time, holiday pay, sick leave, social security, health insurance, etc. He added that, after working on a few drafts, the rate we came up with for our indirect costs is 30.49%.

Haugen briefly went over some of the other things that will now be billed indirectly, and explained the formula used to determine the indirect cost rate. He stated that what we are using is what is called a "provisional rate". He explained that the provisional rate will be used for billing throughout 2011, then at the end of the year we will determine the actual costs for these different items and reconcile our billing to reflect the difference between the two rates. He added that the actual rate for 2011 will then be used as a provisional rate for 2012, and so on.

Haugen stated that the indirect cost rate proposal is now a requirement for the MPO, and will be an annual part of our Unified Planning Work Program.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 19th, 2011**

Strandell asked if there are any changes to the local dollars. Haugen responded that there will be a slight local dollar increase to the local dollars.

MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE AMENDED 2011-2012 ANNUAL UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM TO INCLUDE INDIRECT COST PROPOSAL.

Voting Aye: Powers, Strandell, Leigh, Malm, Pokrzywinski, Adams, and Christensen.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF 2012-2015 T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR MINNESOTA SIDE AND TRANSIT

Haugen reminded the board that at their meeting in December they approved T.I.P. candidate projects for the North Dakota side, and now we will be doing the same for the Minnesota side, and also for transit projects for both sides as well.

Presentation ensued (a copy of the presentation is included in the file and available upon request).

Haugen stated that the MPOs responsibilities are to ensure a project is consistent with the MPO Long Range Transportation Plan, and to prioritize them within their proposed funding program.

Haugen referred to a map of the MPO study area, and pointed out that all projects located within the gray area need to show up in our T.I.P. document.

Haugen briefly went over the various programs we are eligible for; including transit for both sides, MN Transportation Enhancements, Safe Routes to School, City Sub-Target, MN Trunk Highway Sub-Target, and County Roads. He commented that the MN ATP decided that because 2015 is the first year we would have any enhancement monies available, and with the question on what will happen with the reauthorization, there would not be any project solicitation for enhancement dollars. He added that this is the same for the Safe Routes to School program as well.

Haugen then went over the projects submitted:

1. MN Trunk Highway Sub-Target – 2 projects
 - a. Minor concrete pavement repair and concrete planning project for US #2 between Red River and MN #220.
 - b. Minor concrete pavement repair and concrete planning project for MN220 between US 2 and 23rd Street N.W.
2. Transportation Enhancement Program – None
3. Safe Routes to School – None

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 19th, 2011**

4. Transit – City of Grand Forks will be submitting FY2012 funding requests for some program and 2015 for operating and the City of East Grand Forks will be submitting their FY2015 funding requests for operating.

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE LIST OF CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE FY-2012-2015 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING.

Powers asked if the concrete repair on Gateway was just concrete panels being replaced. Haugen responded that that is correct. Pokrzywinski asked if they would be taking it down to one lane during construction. Haugen responded they would. Powers asked if there has been any thought to widening the walkway. Haugen responded that there really isn't a walkway along Gateway Drive, and as far as the Kennedy Bridge itself is concerned, in 2016 it is scheduled for rehab work to be done, and in 2018 the Sorlie Bridge is scheduled for rehab work.

Haugen referred to the agenda and pointed out that one of the latter agenda items is an RFP for transit, so all of the transit estimates are subject to change pending the outcome of that update.

Voting Aye: Powers, Strandell, Leigh, Malm, Pokrzywinski, Adams, and Christensen.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF DRAFT RFP FOR THE DOWNTOWN GRAND FORKS PARKING STUDY

Haugen reported that the City of Grand Forks asked the MPO to assist them with updating their assessment for "free" parking in their downtown. He stated that the RFP draft was worked up with city staff involvement, and went before the Finance Development Committee and City Council this past week.

Haugen stated that they are asking the consultant to come in and look at the current assessment policy, and assist us in developing a new way of paying for the operation and maintenance of the public parking system in downtown Grand Forks. He added that as part of that assessment process, or formula, there is a required number of parking stalls by business type in the code. He stated that those parking standards differ from what is required in the rest of the zoning area, so we are also asking the consultant to look at those standards as well to determine whether or not they should be updated.

Haugen commented that there is a pretty quick turn-around time on this proposal, as requested by the City, with the responses being due the end of February, a consultant on board by the 7th of March, a draft report by the 15th of April, and a final report by the 15th of May.

Haugen referred to a map included in the packets, and reported that the other issue that will be part of this study will be to create one boundary from the two different boundaries shown. He pointed out that the area in black indicates those entities that are assessed operation and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 19th, 2011**

maintenance costs, and the area in red consists of those entities that are assessed construction costs for the Corporate Center parking lot. He explained that this means that some businesses are paying for operation and maintenance fees but not construction fees, and some are paying construction fees and not operation and maintenance fees, so the city asked that we create a common boundary. He added that they also asked that we include those areas shown in yellow as well.

Haugen stated that they will have the consultant work with the Finance Development Committee and a Steering Committee, and will hold two public meetings to gather input from the general public as well.

MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT RFP FOR THE DOWNTOWN GRAND FORKS PARKING STUDY.

***Voting Aye: Powers, Strandell, Leigh, Malm, Pokrzywinski, Adams, and Christensen.
Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF DRAFT RFP FOR THE TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
UPDATE**

Kouba reported that the MPO is starting their scheduled Long Range Transportation Plan update, and part of that is the Transit Development Plan for the Cities Area Transit.

Kouba commented that there have been some unpredictable elements that have come to pass, and we need to make sure there is stability in the finances of the transit system, both on the Grand Forks and the East Grand Forks sides.

Kouba stated that, basically the RFP will require the consultant look into the financial stability of our system, to try to find some funding areas we haven't yet looked at, at partnerships, and other opportunities that might be available for both sides. She added that they will also look into operation efficiency, hopefully to help create financial stability with not only the fixed-route portion of the system, but the paratransit and senior rider programs as well.

Kouba commented that they are also looking at ways to market the system better, and to cooperate better with UND and both states for the future.

Kouba reported that they will also be looking at route efficiency. She stated that at this time, in Grand Forks they are having issues with Route 3, Route 5/7, and Routes 4 and 6 keeping on time, particularly during the school session. She said that there have been request from East Grand Forks to go to the Good Samaritan facility, as well as other areas, and that needs to be looked at as well.

Kouba stated that there is definitely a need for step-by-step implementation of any alternatives the consultant develops, and they will be asked to include this as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 19th, 2011**

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT RFP FOR THE TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN UPDATE.

Voting Aye: Powers, Strandell, Leigh, Malm, Pokrzywinski, Adams, and Christensen.

Voting Nay: None.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. MPO Executive Policy Board Meeting Dates For 2011/Meeting Location/Food Vendor Preference

Haugen distributed a copy of the proposed meeting dates for the MPO Executive Policy Board for 2011, and asked if there were any concerns with any of the dates. Consensus was that the dates appeared to be fine.

Haugen stated that another issue is that in the past when our meetings have been held in East Grand Forks we met in the Council Chambers, however since it was booked today we had to hold the meeting here, in the Training Conference Room. He asked what everyone's preference would be, to move the meetings back to the council chambers, or continue to hold them here. Consensus was that the meetings should be held in the training conference room.

Strandell asked if there was a reason why Mr. Grandstrand is absent from our meetings. Malm responded that he thinks he has class at this time. Haugen stated that he would contact him to see if there is a problem with the meeting time. Powers asked if there was a policy on missing meetings. Haugen responded there was, that after missing four consecutive meetings, a letter is sent to the body the missing member represents. Strandell commented that it just seems like Grand Forks isn't getting equal representation.

McNelis asked if anyone has a preference on where we order our lunches. Christensen commented that previously we ordered from a place that had really good chicken, so he would vote for that place. Leigh stated that it was from Luigi's. Consensus was that we order from Luigi's in the future.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY CHRISTENSEN, TO ADJOURN THE JANUARY 19TH, 2011, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:40 P.M.

Voting Aye: Powers, Strandell, Leigh, Malm, Pokrzywinski, Adams, and Christensen.

Voting Nay: None.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, February 16th, 2011 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Warren Strandell, Chairman, called the February 16th, 2011, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:04 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Warren Strandell, Mike Powers, Steve Adams, Greg Leigh, Mike Pokrzywinski, and Doug Christensen.

Absent were: Tyrone Grandstrand and Gary Malm.

Guest(s) present were: Dean Rau, Assistant Grand Forks City Engineer.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Nancy Ellis, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Matt Leal, GF/EGF MPO Planning Technician; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Strandell declared a quorum was present.

COMMUNICATION

Strandell reported that it is a sad day for the MPO, that Gary Malm's son, Matt Malm, passed away after a lengthy illness.

McNelis stated that because Mr. Malm has been on both the Grand Forks Planning Commission and the MPO Executive Policy Board for quite some time, the two entities discussed that they would jointly order an arrangement for the Malm family, and will include both the Planning Commission and the Executive Policy Board, along with staff, on the card.

Haugen commented that Mr. Grandstrand has decided that he will not be able to complete his term on the MPO Executive Policy Board, and will request that a replacement be appointed. He added that Mr. Grandstrand had also stated that he would try to find a proxy for today's meeting, however it appears that he was unable to do so. Hopefully either a proxy, or a replacement will be available for our next meeting.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, February 16th, 2011**

PRESENTATION OF LETTER OF APPRECIATION AND PLAQUE

Strandell stated that he would like to take this opportunity to read a letter of appreciation for Dick Grassel into the records. He then presented Mr. Grassel with a copy of the letter and a plaque in appreciation for all the years of service he gave to the MPO, and to the Cities of Grand Forks and East Grand Forks.

Grassel thanked the board, and stated that he enjoyed his time on the board, which he was just informed has been for over half of the time the MPO has been in existence, but felt it was time to move on to other things, and to allow for new blood on the board.

APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 19TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 19TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Leigh, Powers, Strandell, Pokrzywinski, Adams, and Christensen.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF URBAN ROADS MAP

Haugen referred to the staff report, and explained that back in November the MPO submitted a map to NDDOT that included roads we would like to make eligible for federal funding. He referred to a power point slide of the Urban Roads Map and went over it briefly.

Haugen commented that the area they had the most discussion on with the NDDOT was the area where the two ramps are located, and because of those ramps, the NDDOT rejected our request.

Haugen stated that this was all discussed at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting last Wednesday, and their recommendation is to classify the ramps as local urban roads on the regional system, and resubmitting the map for approval.

Haugen reported that there is a repavement project for the DeMers Ave ramps in 2011. Leigh asked what the project would entail, would they be doing a concrete repavement or a redesign. Haugen responded that it is his understanding they will be doing an asphalt overlay, along with some panel replacement, but he will get more information on this project and bring it back to this body.

MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO APPROVE THE MPO RESUBMIT THE NORTH DAKOTA URBAN ROADS MAP WITH THE RAMPS SHOWN AS URBAN LOCAL ROADS.

Voting Aye: Leigh, Powers, Strandell, Pokrzywinski, Adams, and Christensen.

Voting Nay: None.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, February 16th, 2011**

**MATTER OF DRAFT RFP FOR THE NORTHWEST EAST GRAND FORKS STREET
NETWORK STUDY**

Ellis reported that currently a project to construct a full intersection at 5th Avenue N.W. and Gateway Drive is included in our Long Range Transportation Plan. She explained that this project was included in the Long Range Transportation Plan based on previous studies, in the Access Management Plan that was done in 2008. She stated, however, that the City of East Grand Forks is now questioning whether or not they want this intersection constructed due to some recent concerns about possible negative impacts to the residences along, and near 4th Avenue N.W., as well as the necessity for another access as River Road is open the majority of the year, and emergency personnel are not really hindered with the one access during flooding events.

Ellis explained that because of the City's concerns, a study of the East Grand Forks Northwest Street Network is needed to review current street corridors and to identify possible future transportation corridors in northwestern East Grand Forks. In addition, the study will provide insight for the future planning of parks and recreation, developments, etc..

Ellis stated that the RFP is requesting the consultant conduct a study to review, analyze, evaluate, and recommend improvements to the east/west and north/south transportation corridors for the northwest portion of the City, to include the feasibility of building the full intersection at 5th Avenue N.W. and Highway 2, as well as what would need to be done if a full intersection is not built in the next 30-year planning cycle. It will also consider the necessity of the Highway 2 off-ramp to the north if the full intersection is not built, and will emphasize any intersection and/or roadway improvements, potential safety or security controls, new accesses and corridors, future right-of-way acquisition, and multimodal/ADA improvements.

Ellis reported that a Transportation Enhancement project is also currently planned for 2012 that places a multipurpose trail within the Highway 2 off-ramp that enters 10th Street N.W. and runs west along Highway 2 to 8th Avenue N.W. She explained that the project is planned with the idea that there will be full intersection built at 5th Avenue N.W. and Highway 2, and that the off-ramp would no longer be necessary, and thus removed, therefore this study should provide a conceptual layout for this project should the intersection not be built, and the off-ramp would remain in use.

Leigh asked why the off-ramp would be removed even if they do the full intersection. Haugen responded that it was a trade-off with MNDOT in order to get approval for the intersection.

Ellis stated that they hope to be able to re-evaluate the studies done previously to make sure that if we don't do the full-intersection project we have adequate traffic information for any necessary improvements needed within the Northwest Street Network.

Ellis commented that there will be a Steering Committee set-up to help guide the Consultant through the process. She stated that the committee will consist of: 1) City Council

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, February 16th, 2011**

Representative; 2) 1-2 Business Owners; 3) 1-2 Property Owners; 4) Planning and Zoning Commission Representative; 5) School District Representative; and 6) MnDOT Representative. She added that staff to the Steering Committee will include a representative from: 1) Engineering; 2) Public Works/Streets; 3) Planning; and 4) MPO.

Grassel asked if the full-intersection project isn't done, will the funding be lost. Haugen responded that this project is programmed to occur in 2014, and if not done then those monies can be used on a different project, so no funding would be lost.

Strandell asked if this was a popular project. Pokrzywinski responded that the City Council is actually divided on this project. He said that he is actually in favor of it, and feels that because it is already an adopted policy, by not doing it we would be changing that policy, and that is something we shouldn't be doing. He commented that he feels there are a lot of positive reasons for doing this project, including the fact that it will allow for better travel options for emergency personnel during flood events, and for better access to our downtown businesses. He added that we shouldn't change policy because of a small group of neighborhood resistance when the benefits are so great, and in addition he feels that the intersection of 2nd and US 2 is dangerous as well. Grassel commented that he has favored doing this intersection project from the get-go, and agrees that we need another access for emergency personnel and community traffic. Leigh stated that he is not really for doing this project, but wants to see the results of this study before making a final decision.

Ellis reported that she did talk to emergency personnel about this, and they stated that they feel they can get to the north end during flood events with or without this intersection being built. She said, however, that either way we need to do this study.

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY POKRZYWINSKI, TO APPROVE THE
NORTHWEST EAST GRAND FORKS STREET NETWORK STUDY RFP.***

Voting Aye: Leigh, Powers, Strandell, Pokrzywinski, Adams, and Christensen.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF BRIDGE CLOSURE TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN

Haugen reported that, as part of the 2006 Bridge Closure Traffic Management Plan Study, the MPO agreed to have, as an agenda item at their Technical Advisory Committee meetings, discussion on possible flood closures in order for the respective agencies to begin preparation, if necessary, to implement the Plan, and it appears that this year's flood event could be considerable. He reminded everyone, however, that the Plan is just a guide, and is subject to changes.

Haugen referred to the Plan, and commented that some of those changes made were to the Contact list. He pointed out that in addition to some of the previous phone numbers changing, BNSF also contacted us and requested that we add contact numbers for their Terminal Manager and Roadmaster as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, February 16th, 2011**

Powers asked, in the past when they closed the Point Bridge, they put berms on the side of the Murray in order to keep it open, is that something that could be left there permanently. Ellis responded that those cannot be left there permanently due to Corps regulations.

Grassel asked how far Grand Forks was planning on going with their additional clay on the Lincoln Park Dike. Christensen responded that he isn't sure how far they plan on putting the clay, but he feels they shouldn't be doing it at all.

Pokrzywinski asked if the plan is the same as last year. Haugen responded that it is for the most part, although they now have the ability to change the timing on a couple of the downtown signals to allow for traffic to move more efficiently through the downtown area.

MOVED BY CHRISTENSEN, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO UPDATE THE PLAN TO INCLUDE A GROUP E-MAIL LIST IN ORDER THAT EVERYONE RECEIVE E-MAIL UPDATES AT THE SAME TIME DURING FLOOD EVENTS.

***Voting Aye: Leigh, Powers, Strandell, Pokrzywinski, Adams, and Christensen.
Voting Nay: None.***

OTHER BUSINESS

- a. Wellness Center Open House

Haugen reported that an open house will be held on the Wellness Center site on

- b. Submittal Of RFPs for Downtown Grand Forks Parking Study and Transit Development Program Update

Haugen reported that RFPs should be in for the Downtown Grand Forks Parking Study and the Transit Development Program Update next week.

- c. President's Proposal For Reauthorization Bill

Haugen stated that the President has submitted a proposal for the Reauthorization Bill.

- d. Highway 75/County Road 21 Update

Strandell reported that MnDOT and Polk County Engineers have been studying the intersection of Highway 75 and County Road 21 due to an increasing number of accidents, many fatal. He stated that it appears that re-alignment of that intersection may be the best alternative.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO ADJOURN THE FEBRUARY 16TH, 2011, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:52 P.M.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, February 16th, 2011**

Voting Aye: Leigh, Powers, Strandell, Pokrzywinski, Adams, and Christensen.

Voting Nay: None.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Monday, March 7th, 2011 – 9:00 A.M.
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Warren Strandell, Chairman, called the March 7th, 2011, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 9:02 a.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Warren Strandell, Mike Powers, Steve Adams, Greg Leigh, and Gary Malm.

Absent were: Tyrone Grandstrand, Doug Christensen, and Mike Pokrzywinski.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Nancy Ellis, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Matt Leal, GF/EGF MPO Planning Technician; Drew Flanagan, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Strandell declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF CONSULTANT FOR THE GRAND FORKS
DOWNTOWN PARKING STUDY**

Haugen thanked the board for agreeing to hold this special meeting today. He explained that when the City of Grand Forks asked the MPO to help them re-examine their assessment of parking in Downtown Grand Forks they also asked that we be very aggressive with the timeline, therefore it was his intention to seek approval from the board at their last meeting to authorize the Finance Committee be able to execute this contract, but he failed to do that. He stated, then, that in order for the consultant to meet the timeline the City would like this study completed within, we were forced to have this special meeting in order that a draft report be submitted by April 15th; and a final report by May 15th.

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that the Staff Report identified that we received a total of five proposals to the RFP, and if you look at the list of firms submitting those proposals you will notice that several of them are national firms specializing in parking, and downtown parking in particular. He added that we also received a proposal from MMM Group out of Canada, and one from Downtown Parking Solutions, which is a group of guys that split away from some of the larger national firms and created their own specialty firm.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Monday, March 7th, 2011**

Haugen reported that the Selection Committee reviewed all five proposals, and selected three firms for interviews; Walker, Rich & Associates, and Downtown Parking Solutions. He stated that Rich & Associates were ranked number one going in to the interviews, and came out still ranked number one. He added that one thing they felt made Rich & Associates number one was the fact that they are planning on doing a pretty comprehensive review of the parking. He stated that they are actually going to do an inventory of the usage of space, as well as to have a vehicle come through and photograph license plates to determine parking turnover, so it will should be a very thorough parking study. He added that they will also be looking at enforcement issues as well, so they are doing a lot more than the rest of the firms were planning on doing, while still staying with the budgeted amount identified.

Haugen stated that the negotiated contract will be \$33,079.00, and our consultant budget for this study was \$36,000.00, so the recommendation is that the MPO hire Rich & Associates to do the study for a contract price not to exceed \$33,079.00.

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE MPO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH RICH & ASSOCIATES, INC., TO COMPLETE THE GRAND FORKS DOWNTOWN PARKING STUDY AT A COST NOT TO EXCEED THE AGREED BUDGET OF \$33,079.00.

***Voting Aye: Powers, Strandell, Adams, Malm, and Leigh.
Voting Nay: None.***

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY MALM, TO ADJOURN THE MARCH 7TH, 2011, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 9:06 A.M.

***Voting Aye: Powers, Strandell, Adams, Malm, and Leigh.
Voting Nay: None.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, March 16th, 2011 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Warren Strandell, Chairman, called the March 16th, 2011, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:05 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Warren Strandell, Mike Powers, Steve Adams, Greg Leigh, and William “Spud” Murphy (Proxy for Gary Malm).

Absent were: Doug Christensen and Tyrone Grandstrand.

Guest(s) present were: Dean Rau, Assistant Grand Forks City Engineer.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Nancy Ellis, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Matt Leal, GF/EGF MPO Planning Technician; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Strandell declared a quorum was present.

APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 16TH, 2011, AND THE MARCH 7TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 1TH, 2011, AND MARCH 7TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Powers, Strandell, Leigh, Adams, and Murphy.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF A CONTRACT FOR THE TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN UPDATE

Kouba referred to the staff report, and explained that back in January this board approved the RFP for the Transit Development Plan Update. She stated that they received seven proposals, and interviewed three of the firms submitting those proposals.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 16th, 2011**

Kouba stated that, based on the interviews, the selection committee and staff were recommending the MPO hire URS/Houston Engineering to perform the update. She explained that they will be focusing on the efficiency of the transit fixed-routes; the possible expansion of the City's para-transit operation, as well as its efficiency and effectiveness; and the efficiency and effectiveness of the senior rider operation. She stated that they will also be looking into the financial aspects of the transit system as well.

MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE MPO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH URS TO PERFORM THE TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN UPDATE.

Voting Aye: Powers, Strandell, Leigh, Adams, and Murphy.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF TITLE VI DOCUMENTS

Haugen reported that this is part of the federal requirements the MPO has to follow in order to be able to continue our MPO activities. He referred to the packet, and explained that we are required to post copies of these documents, as well as to have copies available in the event we receive any complaints from the public.

Haugen stated that there is now a specific sign-in sheet that we need to use for our public input data. He explained that these are voluntary forms that we ask people to fill out to give us some demographic information as to who is attending our meetings.

Haugen commented that one significant item is the limited English Proficiency Plan. He explained that back in 1991, with the American with Disabilities Act, we were required to have interpreters available in the event someone were to request one, but now, with the Limited English Proficiency Plan they have taken that a step further by actually looking at our census statistics in order to give them an idea as to how diverse our population is, how diverse our non-English speaking population is, and based on our diversity we were able to do a pretty simple proficiency plan.

Haugen referred to the documents, and pointed out that they are all pretty simple, fill-in the blank forms, so we shouldn't have many concerns with them.

Leigh asked who the designated contact person is for this. Haugen responded that the Human Resource Director is the dedicated contact for any requests concerning language concerns. He added that he would be the main contact person for any complaints the MPO would receive.

MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE TITLE VI DOCUMENTS, AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Powers, Strandell, Leigh, Adams, and Murphy.

Voting Nay: None.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 16th, 2011**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL TO AMEND RICH & ASSOCIATES CONTRACT TO
INCLUDE THE EAST GRAND FORKS PARKING STUDY**

Haugen reported that last week this body approved hiring Rich and Associates to perform the Grand Forks Downtown Parking Study at a cost of \$33,000. He explained that we had a consultant budget of \$36,000 for that study, thus leaving \$3,000 on the table.

Haugen stated that during a conversation with Mr. Huizenga, East Grand Forks City Administrator, he was informed that the City received a request to add to the river side of the parking lot in front of the Blue Moose. He said that Mr. Huizenga asked if the MPO could have Rich and Associates come over and, for the remaining \$3,000, give them a basic idea as to what the supply and demand is for parking in the East Grand Forks downtown area.

Haugen commented that representatives from Rich and Associates, along with himself, met with Mr. Huizenga yesterday to flesh out what he has in mind, and Rich and Associates are preparing a scope-of-work within the \$3,000 budget amount we identified to perform this for the City of East Grand Forks.

Haugen stated that he would offer three options for approval of this amendment: 1) approve authorizing the Executive Director to execute the contract amendment with Rich and Associates to include the scope-of-work for the East Grand Forks Downtown Parking Study not to exceed \$3,000; 2) approve authorizing the Finance Committee to execute the contract amendment with Rich and Associates to include the scope-of-work for the East Grand Forks Downtown Parking Study not to exceed \$3,000; or 3) hold a special Executive Policy Board meeting to approve the contract amendment with Rich and Associates to include the scope-of-work for the East Grand Forks Downtown Parking Study not to exceed \$3,000.

Leigh commented that he looked this over quite a while ago, when it was first brought up, and he suggested to Mr. Boppre that they elongate the plan and move the fountain to allow for parking along the entire length of the boardwalk.

MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONTRACT AGREEMENT WITH RICH AND ASSOCIATES TO INCLUDE THE EAST GRAND FORKS DOWNTOWN PARKING STUDY, NOT TO EXCEED \$3,000.00; AND TO EXPAND THE STUDY TO INCLUDE LOOKING AT THE POSSIBILITY OF MOVING THE FOUNTAIN AND ALLOWING PARKING ALONG THE ENTIRE BOARDWALK.

Powers asked how much parking the City would gain by eliminating the fountain. Leigh responded that the problem is that the fountain is located in the middle of the length of the parking lot, so you would gain an additional 30 or so stalls by moving it.

Strandell asked how the additional parking would be paid for. Haugen responded that there is a Downtown Development fund of \$250,000 that could be used to pay for this project.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 16th, 2011**

*Voting Aye: Powers, Strandell, Leigh, Adams, and Murphy.
Voting Nay: None.*

OTHER BUSINESS

a. April Executive Policy Board Meeting

Haugen reported that, as you can tell staff is fairly busy with all the projects we have going on. He added that, unfortunately, at our meeting in April our agenda will be much fuller as we will have recommendations coming from some of the studies we are doing, and we will have our draft T.I.P. to discuss as well.

b. 2010 Census Results

Haugen stated that before the end of the week we should have the results of the 2010 Census. Adams asked if this is a good thing or a bad thing. Haugen responded that the Grand Forks results will be somewhere between 51,000 and 55,000, as the last estimate the Census Bureau gave out was 51,000, and the last estimate the MPO gave out was 55,000.

Haugen reported that when they gave out the state populations, North Dakota was the second ranked state that had an estimate under the actual population figures, so that means there was only one state that had a higher actual population than the figures the Census Bureau gave, so that gives us a little more hope that the number will be closer to 55,000 than to 51,000. He added that Minnesota was also under-estimated by the Census Bureau, so there is hope that East Grand Forks will have a positive result as well.

Haugen commented that Montana and South Dakota's results were just released, and even in Montana, which was released yesterday, all of their growth really wasn't showing up in their oil country. He added that in North Dakota some of the discussion has been that we are going to have 5% growth, but it is all because of the oil activity, but, again, because in Montana the growth wasn't shown in the oil producing counties on the eastern end of the state, there is some hope that maybe the growth in both North Dakota and Minnesota will be shared in areas other than the oil producing areas as well.

Haugen reported that in South Dakota it was again the rural exodus to urban migration, so we are anticipating, again, that both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks will benefit from that continued pattern, but we won't know for sure until the end of the day on Friday.

Strandell commented that Polk County is concerned that they stay above the 30,000 population mark, which is the trigger point for some federal funding eligibility, but we won't know for sure until possibly Friday as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 16th, 2011**

c. Grand Forks Downtown Parking Study Public Meeting

Haugen reported that there will be a Grand Forks Downtown Parking Study public meeting this afternoon at 2:00; and a public open house tomorrow at the Grand Forks Herald.

Haugen stated that because of the action taken this afternoon concerning the East Grand Forks downtown parking, we will post an on-line survey on our website that everyone from either side of the river can fill out to comment on the parking situation for both cities.

d. Congressional Action

Haugen reported that congress is passing another extension of FY funding. He stated that we hear about transportation cuts, but what they are really doing is continuing to fund transportation at 2010 levels, which are really the 2009 levels, and where the cutting comes in is on projects that had monies earmarked specifically for them. He explained that those projects got a lump sum of money, and because no projects were earmarked last year the difference in the formula monies and the earmarked monies was redistributed as formula money. He said that this year they are cutting the earmarked monies, so there will not be a redistribution of those funds.

Haugen commented that, as you will recall, last July and August we said that Minnesota and North Dakota were announcing that there were some extra federal funds available that we should apply for, however we did not receive any, and this year, because they are cutting earmarks, that extra money will not be available either.

Haugen added that another program they are cutting, or rescinding, is one that was called "TIGER", which was sort of the livability initiative that Obama developed, and the DOT had about \$100,000,000 for competitive "TIGER" grants. He stated that North Dakota received one grant for a grade separation project in Minot, and that "TIGER" grant is one of the cuts that Congress is pushing through, so that project might not happen. He added that, again, this is money that is above and beyond our regular funding programs, so the cuts aren't actually affecting our regular funding sources.

Strandell commented that if the Thompson Bridge project hadn't been done when it was, it most likely would not have occurred due to cuts.

Haugen reported that the Legislatures are currently meeting, and he thinks the Minnesota House Transportation Budget gets released Friday, and North Dakota has had some appropriations, however most of the money that they are putting into transportation is all going to the western states at this time. Strandell asked if any project priorities were rearranged, or is it just new monies being distributed. Haugen responded that it is new money.

Haugen explained that North Dakota gets Oil Extract Tax money, and they are taking that money and putting it back, at least this biennium, into the oil areas. He stated that he thinks that part of

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 16th, 2011**

what the Legislature, from this side at least, is trying to say is “yes we will support you this year to get all the money, but next biennium, assuming oil is still flowing and the bank is still a strong positive, that you will come and help us with some of our infrastructure projects.”

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO ADJOURN THE MARCH 16TH, 2011,
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:25 P.M.***

Voting Aye: Powers, Strandell, Leigh, Adams, and Murphy.

Voting Nay: None.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, April 20th, 2011 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Warren Strandell, Chairman, called the April 20th, 2011, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:05 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Warren Strandell, Mike Powers, Steve Adams, Greg Leigh, Mike Pokrzywinski, Gary Malm, and Doug Christensen.

Absent was: Tyrone Grandstrand.

Guest(s) present were: Dean Rau, Assistant Grand Forks City Engineer.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Strandell declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF 2010 MPO AUDIT

Janelle Mulroy, Brady Martz, was present for a brief presentation of the 2011 MPO Audit Report.

Mulroy referred to the report, and explained that the first part of the audit is the Independent Auditor's Report, which states that Brady Martz conducted the audit in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards, and government auditing standards, and as a result have issued an unqualified, or clean opinion. She stated that the report also indicates that Brady Martz believes the financial statements are fairly presented in all material respects.

Mulroy referred to pages 3 through 7 of the report, and stated that this portion of the report, Management's Discussion and Analysis. She reported that page 3 lists some financial highlights, in a more narrative format, and gives an overview of the financial statements. She then pointed out that pages 4 and 5 you will see comparative information, which she thinks is a handy section of the Management's Discussion and Analysis because the financial statements themselves cover

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 20th, 2011**

only one year, but here you can compare two years of financial information in order to see where there might be any significant differences.

Mulroy referred to page 8, and commented that this is the balance sheet and statement of net assets. She pointed out that there are three columns of information; general fund, adjustments, and statement of net assets.

Mulroy reported that pages 10 through 15 are the “notes” to the financial statements. She stated that there weren’t really any changes to this section from previous years.

Mulroy referred to page 16, and explained that it is the budget to actual comparison of the general fund. She stated that this is the same information that we went through previously for revenues and expenditures, but also includes the original and final amended budget and compares them.

Mulroy reported that pages 17 and 18 is a standard letter in accordance with government auditing standards. She pointed out that it states that they looked at the internal controls over financial reporting and compliance issues, and that no problems were discovered for either.

Mulroy referred to page 19, and stated that it is the schedule of findings and responses. She pointed out that there is one comment, similar to what has been included in the past, that states that since they helped draft the financial statements and proposed some audit adjustments, they are required to include a statement to that effect. She explained that this is strictly the result of an auditing standard, and is no reflection on any change to how the books are kept or how internal control is accomplished.

Mulroy referred to the letter dated January 31, 2011, and commented that this is a standard letter that they are required to send to the Executive Policy Board, or Audit Committee. She stated that the letter indicates that there were no changes to the accounting policies; that there are estimates in the financial statements that should really be depreciation expenses; that there were some proposed audit adjustments, however most of them involved setting up accrual amounts; that there were no disagreements with management; and that ultimately everything went smoothly and it was a clean audit.

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE 2010 MPO AUDIT REPORT AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Leigh, Powers, Adams, Pokrzywinski, Malm, Christensen, and Strandell.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF PRESENTATION OF TRAFFIC CHANGES 2000 TO 2010

Haugen reported that Drew Flanagin, the MPO’s Intern, has been working on this item, however, due to his class schedule he was unable to be here today to give the presentation.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 20th, 2011**

Haugen stated that once the NDDOT did their traffic study last fall, we noticed there had been some changes in traffic patterns, so the MPO began doing some research into those changes, and this is the result of that research. He added that he will be giving a power-point presentation today, however a more in-depth, interactive GIS presentation will be given at next month's meeting.

Presentation ensued (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request).

Strandell asked how much of the decrease in traffic on Columbia Road can be attributed to the condition of the roadway. Haugen responded that it could be a factor, but most of the reduction is probably contributable to the 42nd Street facility that is available to us. He added that Columbia Road is still a desired travel lane because of the grade separation with the rail-yard, and with UND traffic that is somewhat important so they don't get stopped at 42nd Street trying to get access to campus.

Pokryzwinski commented that prior to the light changes that were made to Columbia Road it used to take longer to travel it, and 42nd moved more quickly, however since the changes were made that is no longer the case.

Haugen reported that they are trying to understand some of the differences in traffic volumes shown on our three bridges, whereby one state says there is a decline in traffic while the other state says there is an increase. Christensen asked which bridges this is occurring on. Haugen responded that one is the Kennedy, with Minnesota saying there is a decrease in traffic and North Dakota is saying there is an increase. He pointed out that North Dakota also shows more of an increase in traffic on the Sorlie than Minnesota as well; and on the Point Bridge Minnesota shows an increase and North Dakota shows a decrease.

Christensen asked if someone could take a wild guess as to why we have so much traffic on DeMers from East Grand Forks. He stated that it is obvious that this route has become the preferred method of getting from East Grand Forks to Grand Forks, and he thinks it should be studied. Haugen responded that the downtown attractions in East Grand Forks may be causing the increase.

Haugen commented that they don't count some of the side roads, but it is interesting to him that Bygland Road traffic has increased considerably, then splits more than was previously thought at the intersection of the Point Bridge and the Louis Murray Bridge. Strandell stated that he would think that if you knew when that traffic was moving through that area you would find that the majority of it was doing so just prior to school starting and again when school ended. Haugen responded that the numbers are the average daily traffic traveling that roadway, and they are counted during a 24-hour period.

Haugen reported that, as you will recall, back in 2001 the MPO conducted a vehicle intercept survey of the traffic on the three bridges, and a similar survey will be done next spring. He stated that they will be asking people where they are coming from, where they are going, and what the purpose of their trip is.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 20th, 2011**

Christensen stated that if he were doing a survey, he would be asking people where they are going once they cross the bridge, are they going north or are they going south, because if you want a bridge at 32nd, then you have to have data to support it. Haugen commented that the survey the MPO will be doing next spring should give us that data as we will be intercepting the right amount of traffic at all three bridges and ask them where they are coming from, where they are going, and what the purpose of their trip is. Christensen added that he would also ask them where they live. He stated that he would like to see the survey before it is used, would like to have the Executive Policy Board approve it before it is used. Leigh agreed, adding that we want to make sure we get the information we need. Christensen said, then, that it would be our survey, and we can then have the consultants come here and we can have a half-hour work session to go over the questions so we get all the relevant information we need.

Pokrzywinski commented that a simple answer, though, is if you look at the parking lot behind the restaurants and theater on a Friday and Saturday night, you will see that that is where a lot of the traffic went. He asked if we know whether or not a lot of traffic has been going out to the Thompson Bridge during this flood event as it seems like there has been less traffic issues this year. Haugen responded that he has heard from people that have been doing this, but we don't actually have any counts to substantiate it at this time.

Leigh asked if anything had been done to increase the timing for the lights at the intersection of DeMers and Gateway, specifically the left turn because during rush hour cars are backed up to City Hall. Ellis responded that they have, but they didn't change it so that the left turn lasts longer every time, but instead are rotating the increase for all legs of the signal.

Christensen stated that in order to generate any community conversation as to the need for a south end bridge, you are going to have to have the necessary data. He commented that on Sundays he does see a lot of cars going down Belmont, and most of them are from East Grand Forks, but it doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure it out that they are going to the mall, so the problem East Grand Forks has, at least in the minds of most Grand Forks citizens, is that the traffic ends at 11th, maybe 13th, so you have a long way to go before you get to 32nd. He added that the pushback is that your city ends at this location, at least for Grand Forks, and with East Grand Forks' population numbers, it will take a long time before there would be enough people on the south end to warrant a south end bridge, plus you need to find your money for it anyway, so whomever sits on the councils after us, unless a lot of federal money comes our way, they aren't going to program a lot of money for a bridge that they aren't going to use, so that is an obstacle that needs to be overcome, if possible.

Leigh commented that the issue is a lot of people that live in East Grand Forks work in Grand Forks. Christensen stated that that's because you have a better home program than Grand Forks, but in any event they made a decision to live over there, and when they bought over there they knew the problems they would have with their transportation.

Christensen reported that he is just trying to be objective as to the issues that will be raised. He stated that he just talked to Al Grasser, Grand Forks City Engineer, yesterday, and they are

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 20th, 2011**

struggling to even begin to know how they are going to come up with the funds for the underpass on 42nd, so there will be a lot of hoarding of funds for that project alone, and that is always a problem for City leaders. Strandell commented that he doesn't think the State of Minnesota is going to be standing there ready to give money for a bridge, because they are at the point now where they are going to have trouble maintaining the road system they already have, some may have to go back to gravel, so it would be pretty hard to sell a new bridge when your letting roads go back to gravel.

Christensen commented that there has been some conversation on possibly increasing Grand Forks' sales tax just to cover infrastructure costs. He asked Mr. Rau where the City of Grand Forks was getting the funds to overlay Columbia Road. Rau responded that a large portion will come from the State Urban Aid Fund, 80%, and the other 20% would typically come from the City itself, but he isn't sure if that is true with this project. Christensen asked how much that would be. Rau responded that it would be around three to four million dollars a stretch, and there will be at least two stretches to do from DeMers Avenue to about Knight Drive.

Pokrzywinski asked if the one percent sales tax increase would include maintaining and rebuilding residential streets. He stated that he thinks there will be some support from the surrounding communities that pay that sales tax for such things as the Alerus Center, the Library, but when it comes to maintaining residential streets there will be opposition from your neighbors. He added that East Grand Forks is struggling to find a way to fund it's own street maintenance, and it isn't easy, but asking our neighbors to help us with that isn't something we would consider. Christensen stated that he is sure that if the State of Minnesota allowed East Grand Forks to impose a sales tax increase, they would. Strandell responded that they do allow it. Christensen said, then, that they should do it. Strandell stated that he doesn't support doing it because they are trying to save what commercial activity they have, and to keep some advantage by having even a fraction of a cent lower sales tax than Grand Forks can help do that. Christensen said, then, that his response would be that Grand Forks will help advance East Grand Forks' commercial economic development, because if they add that sales tax it will help keep more people home.

Christensen commented that, you may have seen a report on sales leakage in Grand Forks, and if so you will understand that they have to do some thinking on how to alleviate this. He added that this is a shared problem, and he doesn't know how else they can come up with the funds for the needed infrastructure, either you put a levy on property owners, or you increase the sales tax. He stated that he doesn't have the answer, and he is only addressing the avenues of revenue we have available.

Information only.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FY2011-2014 T.I.P.

Ellis stated that this is a public hearing.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 20th, 2011**

MOVED BY POKRZYWINSKI, SECONDED BY MALM, TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING.

***Voting Aye: Leigh, Powers, Adams, Pokrzywinski, Malm, Christensen, and Strandell.
Voting Nay: None.***

There was no one present for discussion.

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY POKRZYWINSKI, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.

***Voting Aye: Leigh, Powers, Adams, Pokrzywinski, Malm, Christensen, and Strandell.
Voting Nay: None.***

Ellis reported that back in 2008 we had submitted an application to place sidewalks on DeMers Avenue continuing across the Highway 2 Intersection, up 220 on the east side, and along the northend of the frontage road on the west side. She stated that this project was originally to be done in 2012, but we asked that it be moved up to be done in 2011.

Ellis stated that when doing the project memorandum, and preparing the plans for the actual project, MnDOT requested that we look into including doing some intersection improvements to make them ADA compliant, so we prepared the plans for that as well. She said that discussion was then held with MnDOT as to how these intersection improvements would be paid for, and MnDOT agreed to cover those additional costs, thus the need for an amendment to the T.I.P., to include not only the additional costs, but the change to the scope of work, and additional funding sources.

Ellis commented that the original project was to include the sidewalks, at a cost of \$146,000. She said that since the original project was developed, discussion was held on adding a trail on the east side because of a lack of right-of-way, so that did bring the cost of the project up to \$160,000. She stated that now, with the added intersection improvements, the cost increased again to \$294,000.

Ellis reported that we would still be receiving \$116,000 in federal funds, which are the T.E. funds we were awarded at the ATP meeting, but now MnDOT will be kicking in some state funds, in the amount of \$90,000, as well. She pointed out that this leaves a remainder of \$88,000 that we will need to cover with local funds. She stated that they had originally budgeted \$45,000 for the original project, so the other \$44,000 will come from TIF funds because the sidewalk on the south side of Highway 2 falls in a TIF District, therefore we can use TIF funds for that portion of the sidewalk.

MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE FY2011-2014 T.I.P. AMENDMENT, AS SUBMITTED.

***Voting Aye: Leigh, Powers, Adams, Pokrzywinski, Malm, Christensen, and Strandell.
Voting Nay: None.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 20th, 2011**

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT FY2012-2015 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that the action you just took is in our current approved T.I.P. document, and we now have to approve next year's draft T.I.P. document. He pointed out that a copy of the Draft T.I.P. was included in the packet, and he would now like to highlight some of the information contained in that document.

Presentation ensued (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request).

Haugen stated that it is the MPOs responsibility to ensure that each project is consistent with the MPO Long Range Transportation Plan, and that each project is prioritized within its proposed funding program.

Haugen reported that in our T.I.P. cycle we always look at the current projects, and this is a four-year T.I.P. so we always have three years that identify projects that have already been approved, and for which funding sources have been identified, so we need to see if there are any changes required for those projects. He stated that there have been no changes on the Minnesota side, but on the North Dakota side, when we reviewed the candidate projects in December, it was noted that there were a lot of changes to the projects, mostly to the cost estimates. He explained that the main reason for these changes is the need for us to adjust the costs to the year of expenditure.

Haugen pointed out that the new year of this T.I.P. is FY2015. He stated that back in December we received requests from the North Dakota agencies to consider three projects on the street side, however, only one is being forwarded into the Draft T.I.P., and that is the DeMers Rehabilitation project from I-29 to the Fire Station.

Pokrzywinski asked when the DeMers project from the Fire Station to N. 5th St was scheduled to be done. Haugen responded that it is scheduled to be done this summer. He stated that work will also be done to the 4th Avenue ramp at the same time. Rau added that some work will also be done to the east side of the bridge, from the bridge structure down to 5th. Haugen commented that, again, they requested that monies be set aside for a project on the local system, and also identified the Washington Street Underpass as a potential reconstruction. He stated that they are currently in the process of studying both projects, and are studying 47th Avenue as well.

Haugen reported that on the Minnesota side a request was made to consider some minor repair of concrete panels on Gateway Drive Drive and 220 North. He stated that back in January the request was that they be funded with federal funding in 2015, but the State moved them to 2014, and show them as being funded with state monies.

Haugen commented that on the Minnesota side, for the transit side of things, they basically only added the 2015 operation requests. He stated that on the North Dakota side, City Bus also goes after some other funding programs, including JARC funds, which is basically how they are operating for the federal share on the southwestern route of Grand Forks. He added that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 20th, 2011**

New Freedom funds are earmarked for the disabled and senior rider programs, so we have been using these funds to replace vehicles for those programs for the past several years, so this is just a continuation of those requests. He reported that until just recently, the statewide earmark request was being programmed fairly well, but, as we are all aware, earmarks are now unacceptable in Washington, although there are still requests out there in the event additional funding should become available.

Haugen reported that on the Minnesota side, for transit, all they really did was add the 2015 year to the T.I.P.

Haugen commented that on the North Dakota side they did submit Phase 1 of 42nd Street for Transportation Enhancement funding. He explained that Phase 1 includes that portion of DeMers Avenue from 42nd Street to the underpass on 48th Street. He stated that State of North Dakota has not made any decisions on Transportation Enhancement awards at this time, so in the Draft T.I.P. you will see that this project is listed as an Illustrative Project, so it shows that we are waiting funding. He added that Phase 2 was forwarded for funding as well.

Haugen summarized that projects that are currently in the T.I.P. will carry over, that there haven't been a lot of changes to those projects, that there are no additional projects, that no projects are being dropped, and that most changes involve cost estimates. He added that the last year of the current T.I.P. is the first year of the new T.I.P. now that we have projects programmed, the DeMers project is really the only new project other than continuing transit operations.

Haugen stated that included in the T.I.P. are a couple of other appendices, one dealing with actual obligation of 2010 projects, and the other is an update of what our 2011 construction season looks like.

Haugen reported that a public hearing was held at last week's Technical Advisory Committee, and there was no one present for discussion, nor were any comments submitted prior to the meeting, therefore the Technical Advisory Committee, and staff are recommending approval of the Draft 2012-2015 T.I.P.

***MOVED BY POKRZYWINSKI, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT
FY2012-2015 T.I.P., AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Leigh, Powers, Adams, Pokrzywinski, Malm, Christensen, and Strandell.
Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF CONTRACT FOR EAST GRAND FORKS STREET
NETWORK STUDY**

Ellis reported that RFPs were submitted to conduct a Northwest East Grand Forks Street Network Study. She explained that the study will mainly look at the 5th Avenue N.W. full

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 20th, 2011**

intersection proposal, as well as to revisit travel forecasts and travel demand in and along the Northwest corridors.

Ellis commented that they will also be looking at traffic analysis, provide some insight on some possible intersection improvements, addition of a multi-purpose trail enhancements, and transit routes.

Ellis referred to page 81 of the packet, and explained that the group the Selection Committee chose was Alliant Engineering. She stated that Alliant Engineering provided a scope-of-work, and a presentation that the committee felt met the needs of the RFP, and focused on what we wanted to accomplish with this study. She then referred to page 82, the Key Issues Map, and went over everything the study will be looking at.

Ellis reported that Alliant has proposed 422 hours of work; they have scheduled three public meetings and four steering committee meetings.

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY POKRZYWINSKI, TO APPROVE THE FY2011-2014 T.I.P. AMENDMENT, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Leigh, Powers, Adams, Pokrzywinski, Malm, Christensen, and Strandell.

Voting Nay: None.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2010 Census

Christensen stated that, yesterday there was a conversation about an update, or review of the census, and he was wondering what the increase was in Grand Forks' population. Haugen responded that the U.S. Census has said that Grand Forks City proper is now at 53,838, which is an increase of about 7% from the 2010 figure of 49,475, or about 4,000 people.

Haugen said that he thinks that what might be being talked about is that we are reviewing, just as we did in 2000, to ensure that the census has properly placed everyone in the right boundaries. He stated that in 2000 we were able to show the Census Bureau that they misplaced people in some boundaries, so Grand Forks' city population increased from what the Bureau said it was at that time.

APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 20TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE MARCH 16TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Leigh, Powers, Adams, Pokrzywinski, Malm, Christensen, and Strandell.

Voting Nay: None.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 20th, 2011**

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO ADJOURN THE APRIL 20TH, 2011,
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:12 P.M.***

***Voting Aye: Leigh, Powers, Adams, Pokrzywinski, Malm, Christensen, and Strandell.
Voting Nay: None.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, May 18th, 2011 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Warren Strandell, Chairman, called the May 18th, 2011, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:05 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Warren Strandell, Mike Powers, Steve Adams, Mike Pokrzywinski, Gary Malm, and Doug Christensen.

Absent were: Tyrone Grandstrand and Greg Leigh.

Guest(s) present were: Dean Rau, Assistant Grand Forks City Engineer.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Strandell declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 20TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY POKRYZWINSKI, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE APRIL 20TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Powers, Adams, Pokrzywinski, Malm, Christensen, and Strandell.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF AMENDING THE ANNUAL UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM

Haugen reported that staff is requesting approval to add two activities to our work program. He explained that with our federal funds we have to identify all activities we are going to perform.

Haugen commented that a Mid-Year Review was held earlier this month with our federal partners. He explained that during a Mid-Year Review, our federal partners ask us how things are going, and then they perform an intense review of one of the tasks we are required to perform, and this year they looked at our Public Participation Plan. He stated that back in 2006

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, May 18th, 2011**

they indicated to us that we need to make some changes to that plan, primarily because SAFETEA-LU, which was adopted in 2006, required that some changes be made, which we accomplished, and then in 2007 the DOT promulgated some additional changes so our 2006 document is now no longer consistent with the 2007 regulations that were adopted, so we need to amend our Public Participation Plan this summer in order to be compliant.

Haugen stated that the second item involves working with our Transit Development Plan update. He explained that there is a strong interest to have better coordination and correlation with the UND Campus Shuttle Services. He said that as a result of a recent UND Shuttle Plan, they hired a group out of Fargo to look at the service, and some route changes were suggested. He stated that UND has now asked our consultant, URS, to be involved in assisting them in identifying some route changes to their campus shuttle routes, so, hopefully with our consultant looking at our routes, we should have a better hand in determining how to better coordinate and connect people from their system to our system as well.

Haugen commented that UND has indicated that they would provide the local match for this activity. He stated that the cost of the study will be \$21,000, so the local match will be around \$3,600. He reported that there is an item in our work program, identified as Technical Assistance, so that when studies like this come up, we have funds available to cover the cost of the study. He stated that there is \$20,000 in Technical Assistance, so the cost of this study would be covered.

Christensen asked why the MPO would pay to do this study. Haugen responded that the Federal Transit Administration believes that this is a transit issue, and we get monies to plan and address transit issues in Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, so they feel this is an eligible project for us to undertake.

Haugen commented that one thing we have not had cleared yet, in writing, is concurrence from Federal Highway, so the recommended action on this item today would be to approve subject to their concurrence.

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE AMENDING THE MPO FY2011 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM TO AUTHORIZE THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT AMENDMENT WITH URS ONCE THE UND CAMPUS SHUTTLE ROUTE STUDY SCOPE OF WORK HAS BEEN APPROVED BY OUR STATE AND FEDERAL PARTNERS, AND TO INCLUDE THE SCOPE OF WORK FOR THE 2006 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN UPDATE IN THE WORK PROGRAM.

Voting Aye: Powers, Adams, Pokrzywinski, Malm, Christensen, and Strandell.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF NORTH DAKOTA JARC AND NEW FREEDOM APPLICATIONS

Strandell asked what JARC stood for. Kouba responded that JARC stands for Jobs Access/Reverse Commute, which is a federal funding program used to help people get to and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, May 18th, 2011**

from jobs. She stated that currently Cities Area Transit uses some of those funds to operate their Routes 12/13, which covers more of the western and southern portions of the city. She added this application is to continue the funding again this year, at a total project cost of \$237,520, and with the 50/50 split, the JARC amount being \$118,760.

Kouba reported that the biggest change was with the New Freedom program, going above and beyond ADA regulations. She explained that the Cities Area Transit proposed hiring a Mobility Manager, which has actually already occurred, and to use these funds to support that position. She stated that the Mobility Manager position will help fund the Dial-A-Ride and Senior Rider programs more efficiently and help educate the public on what the transit system has to offer and how to use it.

Christensen asked what will happen with the Mobility Manager position if funding is no longer available. Kouba responded that a solution to that has not yet been determined. Haugen added that this is a contract position, and he doesn't know if the contract provisions stipulate whether or not the position is contingent on federal funding or not. Strandell asked how long the contract was for. Kouba responded that she believes it is renewed on a yearly basis. Christensen said, then, that we are going to fund that and then lay it on the city to continue funding the contract. Haugen responded that the City has already taken on that responsibility should we not receive these funds, as there is no guarantee that this grant will be awarded, and if it is awarded there is no guarantee it will be awarded at 100% of what is being requested.

MOVED BY CHRISTENSEN, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE MPO FORWARD THE JARC AND NEW FREEDOM TRANSIT PROJECT APPLICATIONS, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Powers, Adams, Pokrzywinski, Malm, Christensen, and Strandell.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF SOLICITATION OF MINNESOTA SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL APPLICATION

Haugen reported that Minnesota has now released their solicitation for the Safe Routes To School Program. He commented that back in the fall of last year, North Dakota solicited their Safe Routes To School Program, however no application was submitted at that time.

Haugen stated that we have until mid-June to get our applications in for the Minnesota Safe Routes To School Program, and he believes the City of East Grand Forks staff are looking at a sidewalk on the west side of Bygland Road as their project for submittal.

Haugen explained that with the Safe Routes To School Program, the construction costs of a project are 100% funded with federal funds, so no local monies are required. He added that East Grand Forks has been fairly successful in acquiring Safe Routes To School funding in the past.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, May 18th, 2011**

Haugen reported that this is just an announcement of the opening of candidate projects to be submitted, either through the City or the County on the Minnesota side, so prior to this being submitted to the MPO in June, either the City Council or the County Commission will have to have approved the applications first.

Pokryzwinski stated that he has also received some calls from people that live on the west side of Bygland about a safe way for pedestrians to get to the other side. He asked if an upgrade to the pedestrian crossing would be eligible for Safe Routes To School funds as well. Haugen responded that it would. Pokryzwinski said that he would like to see this discussed further, so it should be added to the next work session if possible. Haugen commented that should a decision be made to submit this as a project, it would need to be done before June 15th. Pokryzwinski asked when the next MPO meeting is scheduled. Haugen responded that it is scheduled for June 15th.

Further discussion on types of pedestrian crossings ensued.

Haugen reported that we just talked about the infrastructure programs, but there is also a non-infrastructure program. He explained that Safe Routes To School isn't just about putting in the sidewalks and such, but it is also a program that promotes, educates, and implements safe use of these facilities.

Haugen stated that neither North Dakota nor Minnesota will be soliciting for non-infrastructure program applications at this time. He added that the concern is that both North Dakota side and Minnesota have dedicated a portion of their Safe Routes To School funding to non-infrastructure solicitations, so those funds are just sitting in the bank, so-to-speak, not being utilized and we are trying to assist both states in getting to a point where they can release those funds.

Haugen stated that Safe Kids of Grand Forks has been very successful with their program. He said he would like to give kudos to Ms. Ellis and Safe Kids, as later this month during a national webinar, Safe Kids is presenting an aspect of their non-infrastructure program of getting bicyclists to ride their bikes to school, and they are being recognized for doing this. He added that in August the National Safe Routes Conference is being held in Minneapolis, and Nancy and Grand Forks Safe Kids presented a proposal to present and were successful in obtaining that distinction.

Pokryzwinski asked if the council cannot agree on a project to submit, and we miss the deadline, what would that mean, would there be funds available next year. Haugen responded that we don't know yet if there will be funds available or not, it is a year-to-year program that is contingent on funding from Congress.

MATTER OF MINNESOTA GO MEETING IN BEMIDJI

Haugen reported that MNDOT is working on a vision document of what transportation in Minnesota will be like in 50-years or so, and this vision is what is going to lead them when they update their Multi-modal Statewide Plan, so there is a meeting in Bemidji tonight. He said that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, May 18th, 2011**

he will be attending, and he placed this on the agenda in the event anyone else was interested in riding along and attending.

Haugen commented that there is a website for additional information. He pulled the website up and pointed out that they are asking people to take a survey on what they think Minnesota will be like in 50-years. He added that MNDOT will also be attending the August meeting to present an update on Minnesota GO.

MATTER OF STUDY UPDATES

Haugen reported that this is just to give the board an update on the studies the MPO is currently working on:

1. Transit Development Plan

Kouba reported that at the end of April the first steering committee meeting on the Transit Development Plan was held, and staff did an on-board bus survey, so it was a very busy week.

Kouba stated that there were a couple of surprising wants and needs established within the steering committee. She explained that these included late night service and things of that nature, which have been popular recommendations in the past as well, so putting them out there is the best way to begin things.

Kouba said that at this time they will also be looking into the budget and finances, and what kind of future we're looking at in terms of what, if any of these wants and needs we can accomplish.

Kouba stated that they are also looking at holding a public meeting sometime in June.

2. 47th Avenue South Corridor Study

Haugen explained that this study involves the area between Washington and Columbia Road, the roadway located adjacent to South Middle School, and an open house was held back in March to introduce the study to the neighborhood.

Haugen reported that this is currently a rural two-lane section of roadway, and the MPO is assisting the City of Grand Forks in identifying whether it should be converted to a four or five lane urban section right away, or if a three lane section should be built first to allow us to determine if there is room should it need to be widened to a four or five lane later.

Haugen commented that one of the unique things we did to engage more community conversation was to go into the classrooms to get the students involved in some scenario activities and to get input from them on what they feel would make it safer for them.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, May 18th, 2011**

Haugen stated, then, that this study is currently on a holding pattern while we figure out how the next item, the South Washington Street Wellness Center, will impact this study because of changes it will most likely cause to traffic patterns in and around this area.

3. South Washington Street/Wellness Center Traffic Study

Haugen reported that later today there are meetings being held on this item in Grand Forks City Hall for the steering committee, and then tonight at 6:30 p.m. an open house will be held at South Middle School to present these displays to the public.

Haugen referred to illustrations of the proposed wellness site, and pointed out that since the last time we met as a board, Altru Health Systems submitted a proposal to locate a facility here. He explained that the Park District and the City of Grand Forks requested that the MPO assist them, since they changed the land use in this area from housing, with a commercial strip, to a wellness center and business, in determining what the traffic changes might be, and that is what this study consists of.

Haugen commented that we have two different scenarios we will be looking at: 1) after the Wellness Center is opened what will the traffic will be like, and we are predicting it to be near our 2013 traffic volume numbers, so we anticipate there will be some issues with that traffic increase; and 2) looking at our 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan, we will try to identify what issues there will be once the Wellness Center is open, and as the area builds out further.

Haugen stated that we do know that we will need to have a traffic signal at 40th Avenue, and it currently programmed in our T.I.P. document for the year 2014, however there may need to be a conversation about moving it up sooner and switching around some other projects in Grand Forks. He said that we have also identified that there are some additional right turn lanes that would be optimal improvements. He added that when they go in to do the traffic signal, they could go in and do the lane additions at the same time, however it isn't absolutely necessary they be done at all.

Haugen commented that on 32nd Avenue and Washington Street they have identified some capacity issues with through movements that are resulting from a more north/south traffic pattern, so they are suggesting there be a merging of the dedicated right turn lane to a through right turn lane, which would mean making the island somewhat smaller. He pointed out that on 47th and Washington, the signal is there, but, again they have identified a desire to put in some right turn lanes to help traffic flow better. He commented that in terms of right-of-way, they are not suggesting any particular changes to the access along Washington, between 47th and 40th Avenues. He added that when 11th is built, they will basically be doing stop-through conditions.

Christensen asked why they would plan a three-lane on 47th, when it is obvious there will be serious traffic volumes out there. Haugen responded that there are two reasons: the first being the fact that the traffic forecast is still within the capacity of a three-lane section; and the other is that the financial cost of doing three-lanes versus five-lanes is considerable, particularly as there

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, May 18th, 2011**

are other improvements that the City wants to do as well. He added that currently 47th is not under any program to actually be changed from a two-lane section to an urban section, so what we are doing with this study is to show that there is only a capacity now for three-lanes, but also making sure that when the decision is needed to actually construct it, and you want to do five lanes, we have laid that out for you as well.

Christensen asked what the earliest would be for 47th to be constructed. Haugen responded that the earliest would be 2016, as we just drafted a T.I.P. to 2015, and it is not included in that document.

Haugen commented that another alternative would be for 42nd to only have right-in/right-out movements.

Further discussion ensued.

Haugen reported that the next set of presentation slides cover the 2035 timeframe. He stated that this is where they identify a need for a traffic signal at 44th, which is the main entrance into the Aurora complex, and will be the main entrance into the wellness site.

Haugen stated there are meetings this afternoon, and this evening, presenting these displays to the public and neighborhood.

4. South Washington Street And Underpass Study

Haugen reported that a public input meeting was held on May 5. He stated that two things that are guiding this study is the condition of the underpass, and some street pavement issues along South Washington. He referred to a slide illustrating the area, and pointed out where the roadway has an asphalt overlay, and where there are new sections of concrete.

Haugen commented that the underpass is actually two separate structures. He stated that the west side is the original section and was built in the 1930's; and the east half was built in 1964, so when we look at the condition we have two different structures to consider.

Haugen referred to some photos, and explained that they show some of the visual distress that has become a concern with the underpass. He commented that they also did some core borings of the concrete, and are doing an analysis of the condition of the concrete seat to determine whether or not the structure can be rehabbed, or if it needs to be replaced.

Haugen reported that, traffic wise there are a lot of driveways accessing the corridor, particularly south of DeMers Avenue, and, as we know, the more access points there are, the higher the incidences of accidents, so part of the study will also be to look at doing some turning movement restrictions, and maybe remove some driveways. He added that, once we go in and make improvements to the street itself, we may have to address some ADA issues along the sidewalks as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, May 18th, 2011**

Haugen commented that the next Steering Committee meeting will be held in June to discuss the condition concerns of the underpass structure itself, and to try to determine what needs to be done with it.

5. Downtown Parking Study

Haugen reported that a utilization study was done for both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks. He stated that they spent more than two days in March inventorying the use of the available parking, and they found that there is about a 60% usage of the parking available during peak times. He commented that usage hits a peak in the a.m. in Grand Forks, and the p.m. in East Grand Forks

Haugen said that some of the recommendations for Grand Forks include: more bicycle parking; more transit; better/additional sign usage; more enforcement of parking regulations; address condition issues of the parking ramps; develop different rate structures to encourage different usage of parking ramps; change way in which parking is assessed in the downtown so that property is assessed instead of the businesses; and develop a repair and replacement fund established.

Haugen reported there were similar recommendations for East Grand Forks as well.

Haugen stated that these are the preliminary recommendations. He added that the next draft should be here today, so they will be setting up the steering committee to get their reaction to the consultant's recommendations. He said that they hope to be able to present this to City Council in June.

Haugen commented that one other issue in East Grand Forks involved the construction of additional parking on the riverside of the current wetside parking in front of the Blue Moose, Applebees, Mike's, and Whitey's. He asked the council representatives if this additional parking would even be allowed. Pokryzwinski responded that after some discussion, it appears that the business community is not united on this issue, and there are deep divisions, depending on which business owner you talk to, on whether or not this additional parking should be done, as some feel that the view from the boardwalk would be compromised, and liability would be increased because vehicles are now closer to the river, etc.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. Council Request For Board Updates

Pokryzwinski reported that East Grand Forks Council President, Craig Buckalew, has asked all of the Council members on the various boards and commission to come to the council on a semi-annual, quarterly, or maybe three times a year, to give a report to the Council on the activities of said board. He stated that it would be nice if the chairman and/or staff would attend a council meeting to give an update on their committee/commission activities.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, May 18th, 2011**

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY POKRYZWINSKI, TO ADJOURN THE MAY 18TH,
2011, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:56 P.M.***

Voting Aye: Powers, Adams, Pokrzywinski, Malm, Christensen, and Strandell.

Voting Nay: None.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, June 15th, 2011 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Warren Strandell, Chairman, called the June 15th, 2011, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:03 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Warren Strandell, Mike Powers, Steve Adams, Mike Pokrzywinski, Tyrone Grandstrand, and Doug Christensen.

Absent were: Gary Malm and Greg Leigh.

Guest(s) present were: Dean Rau, Assistant Grand Forks City Engineer.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Nancy Ellis, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Bryan McCoy, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Strandell declared a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen introduced Bryan McCoy, MPO Intern, to the board. He stated that Bryan is a native of Tennessee and is seeking a degree in Public Administration at UND. He added that the MPO also hired Lisa Atkinson to replace Matt Leal as our Planning Technician.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MAY 18TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY POKRYZWINSKI, TO APPROVE THE MAY 18TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Adams, Pokrzywinski, Powers, Grandstrand, and Strandell.

Voting Nay: None.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 15th, 2011**

**MATTER OF DISCUSSION ON T.I.P. AMENDMENT FOR 42ND STREET GRADE
SEPARATION RIGHT-OF-WAY**

Haugen reported that the City of Grand Forks submitted a project request that would require we amend our current T.I.P. He explained that the project would consist of either repaying the federal government for right-of-way already purchased for the 42nd Street Grade Separation project, or to purchase additional right-of-way for the project.

Haugen commented that, although the 42nd Street Grade Separation Project has no hope of being constructed in the next four years, the City of Grand Forks is going through an Environmental Assessment Process in order to allow them to do some preliminary work for the project. He explained that in order for that assessment to be formally considered by the FHWA, a project needs to be included in the T.I.P., and it needs to be federally funded. He stated that the NDDOT informed us that they are working with FHWA-ND to identify the process and parameters on how this proposed amendment could be included in the T.I.P./S.T.I.P.. He said that they had hoped to have this ready for approval at today's meeting, however that did not occur. He said that it will be available for the next MPO Executive Policy Board, at which time staff will be seeking approval to amend the T.I.P..

Christensen reported present.

Haugen stated that he would like to give a brief presentation on the alternatives currently available for the 42nd Street Grade Separation project.

Presentation ensued (a copy of which is included in the packet and available upon request).

Strandell asked about the possibility of doing a diamond interchange at the intersection of DeMers and 42nd Street. Rau responded that it would be extremely difficult to do anything that would impact the north side of the roadway as they would have to deal with Railroad right-of-way, as well as the existing businesses on that side of the roadway, and UND.

Christensen asked why the City doesn't like the depressed option. Rau responded that their main concern is the problems that would occur during snow and rain events. Christensen stated, however, that the depressed option would have the least impact to adjacent property, and would cost the least. Rau referred to the depressed alternative drawing, and explained all the concerns the City has with this option, including access issues.

Discussion on issues concerning each of the alternatives ensued.

Haugen commented that one point of interest is that UND has expressed a possibility of not maintaining their golf course, and provided some possible redevelopment ideas for that property, which would mean that if an alternative were chosen that required acquiring some of the golf course property, the impacts may not be quite as much of an issue as previously thought.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 15th, 2011**

Haugen stated that this was just for information at this time, but reminded the board that they will need to approve an amendment to the T.I.P. at their July meeting.

MATTER OF MINNESOTA SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL APPLICATION

Ellis reported that, as discussed at last month's meeting, MNDOT has proposed another round of Safe Routes To School funding, and solicited projects within the State of Minnesota. She stated that after review, it was determined that only one project met all the eligibility requirements, a sidewalk on the west-side of Bygland from 6th Avenue S.E. to 13th Avenue S.E., and intersection improvements at 13th Avenue S.E. including the addition of some speed minder signs.

Ellis commented that the School district supports this project, and the City Council approved it at their last meeting. Pokrzywinski added that the City Council approved this project unanimously.

***MOVED BY POKRZYWINSKI, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE
MINNESOTA SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL APPLICATION, AS SUBMITTED***

Voting Aye: Adams, Pokrzywinski, Powers, Grandstrand, Strandell, and Christensen.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF RECENT T.I.P. PROJECT AWARDS/APPLICATIONS

Haugen reported that since the Executive Board's last meeting some projects were awarded funding, however one project was not awarded funding.

Haugen stated that some projects are included in our T.I.P. as "Illustrative" projects. He explained that Illustrative projects are projects that are not funded, but have applied for funding. He said that once one of these projects is funded, it is removed from the Illustrative listing and placed in the funded project list.

Haugen reported that the project that was not awarded funding is the City of Grand Forks' Transportation Enhancement project to fund an extension of a sidepath along DeMers Avenue west under the I-29 Bridge to 48th Street. He said, however, that in 2015 NDDOT will be doing work on DeMers and will need to accommodate all modes of transportation, so it is anticipated that this will be part of that project as well.

Haugen commented that we will be adding a project to our list of Illustrative projects. He explained that as part of a statewide application, NDDOT submitted an application for the TCSP (Transportation, Community, and System Preservation Program). He stated that the application was actually to submit the Statewide FTA #5309 program request as a TCSP request. He said that the timeline for this application was very short and did not present the opportunity for a full MPO vetting of the project prior to submittal, however, since it was really a re-submit of an already approved project, just for a different funding source, the MPO staff felt comfortable with the request.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 15th, 2011**

OTHER BUSINESS

A. 47th Avenue South Corridor Study Public Meeting Schedule

Haugen reported that the 47th Avenue South Corridor Study Steering Committee will be meeting on Wednesday, June 22nd from 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. in Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101. The 2nd Public Open House will also be held on Wednesday, June 22nd at the South Middle School from 6:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m..

B. Transit Development Plan Public Meeting Schedule

Haugen reported there will be two open houses for the Transit Development Plan, the first on Wednesday, June 22nd from 6:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. in Grand Forks City Hall Conference Room A101, and will be broadcast on GFTV#2; and the second will be held on Thursday, June 23rd in East Grand Forks City Hall.

C. Grand Forks Downtown Parking Study Meeting Schedule

Haugen reported that the Grand Forks Downtown Parking Study Steering Committee will be holding its 3rd Public Meeting on Tuesday, June 21st at 2:00 p.m. in the Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers.

D. UND Shuttle Bus Route Study Meeting Schedule

Haugen reported that the UND Shuttle Bus Route Study will be holding its 2nd Focus Group meeting on Tuesday, June 21st and Wednesday, June 22nd. Time and location have not been determined.

Haugen stated that you can check on the MPO's website for possible meeting materials, and updates on each of these studies.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY POKRYZWINSKI, TO ADJOURN THE JUNE 15TH, 2011, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:56 P.M.

Voting Aye: Adams, Pokrzywinski, Powers, Grandstrand, Strandell, and Christensen.

Voting Nay: None.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, July 20th, 2011 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Warren Strandell, Chairman, called the July 20th, 2011, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:05 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Warren Strandell, Mike Powers, Mike Pokrzywinski, Tyrone Grandstrand, Doug Christensen, and Gary Malm.

Absent were: Steve Adams and Greg Leigh.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Nancy Ellis, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF Planner; Bryan McCoy, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Strandell declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 15TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY POKRYZWINSKI, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE JUNE 15TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Powers, Grandstrand, Strandell, Christensen, and Malm.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF MPO SEETTING UP DIRECT PAYMENT TO NDPERS FOR HEALTH INSURANCE PREMIUMS

Haugen reported that this is really just a simple name change on the check we send for our health insurance premiums. He explained that since the MPO hired its first full-time employee it has “piggy-backed” on the City of Grand Forks for several of its benefits, including its health insurance premium. He stated that, as with many of the other benefits we “piggy-backed” on the City for, a request was made that we pay for our employee’s coverage directly to the NDPERS rather than continuing to pay the City of Grand Forks, who then pays the NDPERS.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 20th, 2011**

Haugen stated that the MPO is already a member of the NDPERS Pension Plan, so this will be just one more step in our becoming an independent entity.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MALM, FOR THE GF/EGF MPO TO AFFIRM TO NORTH DAKOTA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM THAT THE GF/EGF MPO IS FORMED PURSUANT TO N.D.C.C. § (CHAPTER 4-22) AND IS NEITHER A NON-PROFIT NOR A FOR-PROFIT CORPORATION, TO JOIN THE NDPERS GROUP HEALTH PLAN AND OFFER THE PLANS TO ALL ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEES OF THE GF/EGF MPO. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY GRANDSTRAND. THE BOARD APPROVED JOINING THE NDPERS GROUP HEALTH PLAN EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 2012.

Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Powers, Grandstrand, Strandell, Christensen, and Malm.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF T.I.P. AMENDMENT

Haugen reported that at our last meeting we talked about a need to amend our T.I.P. for the 42nd Street Grade Separation project. He added that in addition to that project we were also awarded some FTA funds that need to be amended into the T.I.P. as well, so we will be addressing both issues at one time.

Haugen pointed out that a public hearing was scheduled to take place at this meeting, so it would be appropriate for the Board to open the public hearing. He pointed out that because there is no one present from the public for discussion, the motion could include closing the public hearing as well.

MOVED BY POWER, SECONDED BY MALM, TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING, AND, SITING NO ONE FROM THE PUBLIC WAS PRESENT FOR DISCUSSION, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.

Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Powers, Grandstrand, Strandell, Christensen, and Malm.

Voting Nay: None.

Haugen commented that the public hearing notice also indicated that written comments would be received until 12:00 noon today, however none were received.

Haugen reported that since our last meeting, in working with the NDDOT and Federal Highway, we reached the point where in order to get the 42nd Street Grade Separation Environmental Assessment document to be formally considered by Federal Highway this fall, we are amending our T.I.P. to include the 42nd Street Grade Separation Project as an Illustrative Project, which essentially means it is as desired project, but that there is no committed funding source for it. He explained that by having it listed as an Illustrative Project, it becomes a part of our T.I.P. document, which then makes its NEPA document eligible for Federal Highway's consideration.

Haugen commented that a secondary issue with this project is that there was an advanced right-of-way purchase done back in the mid-1990s, that had a 20-year repayment period which ends in

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 20th, 2011**

2014, so we are amending our current T.I.P., which covers the years 2011 through 2014, to include the Illustrative Project of the grade separation. He stated that next month, when we ask this body to approve the next T.I.P. document, which covers years 2012 through 2015, we will show the repayment in 2014 of that advance right-of-way purchase, at a cost of about \$350,000, using local dollars only.

Haugen reported that the other amendment deals with FTA funds. He explained that the City requested, and received roughly \$120,000 of JARC (Job Access Reverse Commute) monies to help pay 50% of the operational cost of Route 12/13. He said that the City also received a request for New Freedom funds to fund their Mobility Manager position, which is at an 80/20 cost ratio, so we are asking this body to amend the T.I.P. to include, as an Illustrative Project the 42nd Street Grade Separation Project, and also to amend it to include the JARC and New Freedom awards.

MOVED BY GRANDSTRAND, SECONDED BY CHRISTENSEN, TO APPROVE AN AMENDMENT TO THE 2011-2014 T.I.P. FOR THE 42ND STREET GRADE SEPARATION ILLUSTRATIVE PROJECT AND TRANSIT FTA AWARDS.

Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Powers, Grandstrand, Strandell, Christensen, and Malm.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SOUTH WASHINGTON WELLNESS CENTER TRAFFIC STUDY

Ellis reported that we are near the end of our South Washington Street Corridor Study, which is technically the Wellness Center site, or South Washington from 32nd down to 47th, a little bit of Cherry Street, a little bit of 40th and surrounding areas.

Ellis commented that they are looking at current and future conditions along this corridor; including issues such as vehicle mobility access points, multi-modal including transit; and are going to break it out into immediate needs for the Wellness Center site and surrounding streets, mid-term needs, and long-term needs for the area.

Ellis stated that she attached the Executive Summary to the study, adding that it is just a draft at this point. She explained that they hope to complete the final report in August, however at this time, with the dates and coordination issues with other groups involved, they may not be able to meet that deadline. She commented that the final report will need to go to the Service Safety Committee in August, as well as the Planning Commission, and then they will hold their final committee meeting that will include the neighborhood representatives, the Park District representatives, etc., after which they hope to present the final product to the City Council in September.

Ellis pointed out that the Executive Summary does cover the study's purpose, which is what she just explained. She added that in terms of the public involvement process they are done with all the public meetings; and for the technical analysis process they looked at two separate conditions; 2013, which is when the Wellness Center will be up and running; and 2035, which is the year the Long Range Transportation Plan is based on.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 20th, 2011**

Ellis referred to drawings of both the 2013 and 2035 recommendations, and went over them briefly.

Ellis stated that one of the major improvements, or recommendations, is a stop light at 40th and South Washington Street. She stated that this is currently programmed in our T.I.P. as a 2014 project, but Alliant Engineering, the consultant, is recommending that this project be rotated with the 2013 signal improvement project, which is to put a permanent signal at 42nd and 11th. Christensen asked how much it costs for a signal. Ellis responded that they currently have \$475,000 programmed for a signal. Christensen asked where the funds come from for signals. Ellis responded that it comes from the Urban Roads Funds. She added that there are some HSIP funds that could be applied for as well.

Ellis reported that another area of concern is the area where there have been improvements made recently, Washington and 32nd Avenue Intersection, at which they did put in a pork-chop island and did some other improvements, but we are now noticing that there are already some capacity issues, specifically not enough through lanes in both direction, so the consultant is recommending we remove the pork-chop island, and add a through return heading west bound. She added that another traffic study is recommended, however the responsible agency for this intersection is the NDDOT, and they do not have any plans to improve this intersection, so getting it up to the 2035 standards will require another through lane in addition to some other improvements.

Ellis referred to a map illustrating multi-modal and transit improvements; pointing out that anything shown in pink is an existing trail, anything in black is an existing sidewalk, and any sidewalks or multi-use trails being recommended are shown with dashed lines. She went over the various recommendations briefly.

Ellis referred to the Implementation Plan and Cost Estimates Tables, and stated that she does have them broken down into time periods. She explained that it breaks it out into vehicle mobility and safety by intersection and by corridor improvements. She said that it basically takes the improvements shown on the drawings she just went over and gives a description of the proposed improvements at each intersection. She added that it also gives each improvement a priority rating and talks about implementation triggers as well.

Ellis commented that the responsible agency may be changed. She explained that what they are actually referring to is the agency that will actually put the project into the program, and that will decide where the funding will come from.

Christensen stated that it's great that the MPO is doing all this, but what action are you looking for from the Executive Policy Board. Ellis responded that this is a draft report, so she would appreciate any comments or recommendations you might have on the recommendations.

Christensen asked if anyone has studied this in order to give input on what we are going to recommend. He stated that his recommendation is that whoever want what on this project should find the money needed to get them done. Ellis responded that she agrees. She added that having the Park District and Engineering on it, really a lot of these recommendations come from those entities, so we want to make sure we have something available for them, and they look at the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 20th, 2011**

traffic analyses so that the Park District is aware of what kind of traffic we've got, and Engineering is aware that they have modeling and such to go off of so they know what triggers a right or left bound turn lane.

Christensen commented that he is kind of aware of what kind of revenue the Park District has to work with, and he doesn't think they have any spare revenue to do a lot of these recommendations for several budgeting sessions going forward.

MOVED BY CHRISTENSEN TO RECEIVE AND FILE THE DRAFT SOUTH WASHINGTON STREET CORRIDOR STUDY REPORT.

Motion died for lack of a second.

Haugen stated that he believes our intention today is just to inform this body of what the recommendations are that are going to be presented to the various bodies down the line, such as Public Service Safety, Planning and Zoning, Park District, City Council, etc..

Malm stated that he has one questions. He said that we do this all the time, and we keep trying to move traffic and put in stop signals in the middle of these major thoroughfares, and he is wondering if it has ever been taken into consideration to build frontage roads in this town correctly so you can move people in and out at only a few points, and thus let the major thoroughfare remain free. Ellis responded that that is why they recommended frontage roads continued in this plan, but, again, this comes through the planning office. Malm said that he understands where it comes from, but we never do it ahead of time and say that this is something that we should look at because you are going to have four or five stop lights along this corridor as time goes on, and as soon as they get out of sync, which they all do, you have traffic at certain times of the day getting all fouled up. Ellis commented that the nice thing about all this is that the traffic signalization plan that we implemented has improved travel quite a bit on some of those major thoroughfares, and she thinks it will just continue on here as well. She added that they already added on the interconnect system for those traffic signals, so, hopefully we won't see as many traffic issues.

MOVED BY CHRISTENSEN, SECONDED BY MALM, TO RECEIVE AND FILE THE DRAFT SOUTH WASHINGTON STREET CORRIDOR STUDY REPORT.

***Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Powers, Grandstrand, Strandell, Christensen, and Malm.
Voting Nay: None.***

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SOUTH WASHINGTON STREET UNDERPAS STUDY

Haugen reported that this is an update on where we are at with the South Washington Street Underpass Study. He said that they held a public meeting/open house last night, and he would like to give the presentation provided at that meeting to this body.

Presentation ensued (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request).

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 20th, 2011**

Haugen went over the issues they found with the underpass structure itself. He explained that there are two different things going on: 1) the first is petrographic analysis, which is macro-cracks and micro-cracks of up to 6-inches. The other actually involves two different reactions; the first is ACR (Alkali-carbonate reaction), which is a very rare reaction in which carbonates in aggregate react with alkalis in cement to form a gel which absorbs water causing it to expand, which allows more water to get in, and the gel expands even more, so it is a viscous cycle; and the other is ASR (Alkali-silica reaction), which is more a more common reaction, however it ends up with the same results as the ACR.

Haugen commented that, again, the west side of the underpass is 80 years old so it is more likely to see an acceleration in its deterioration, and there are no repairs available to reverse these reactions, so the only real option is to replace the columns. He stated that there is a potential for doing some sort of sealant to slow the process, but it is a very temporary solution.

Haugen then went over the options available for the underpass bridge: 1) replace the west span with span of same length; 2) replace west span with a longer span to allow for an additional land and wider sidewalk; and 3) replace entire bridge to accommodate more traffic lanes and wider sidewalks.

Haugen referred to a slide of the 2035 traffic forecast, and commented that we have seen some moderate growth during the history of the DeMers/Washington intersection, and we are forecasting continued moderate growth in the future.

Haugen reported that the intersection crash analysis shows that we have, perhaps, too many driveways, alleys, and off-setting street intersections, as there have been over 300 crashes over the last few years. He stated that there are intersections that have experienced a higher than expected rate of crashes, so we do have crash problems along the corridor. He referred to several slides containing crash information, and went the information briefly.

Haugen stated that, as they were presenting this information at the public meeting last evening to the 12 or so property or business owners attending, as they saw the information on the crashes they started to understand that there is room for looking at the access management policies. He said that the access management policies will be covered in their next presentation, suggesting ways to improve or reduce the points of conflict along the corridor.

Haugen commented that the next few slides will cover just the intersection of DeMers and Washington. He pointed out that this has been the most studied intersection in the Greater Grand Forks area. He explained that the purpose of this was to find out if there are any other alternatives that haven't been considered for this intersection. He stated that several alternatives were studied including: 1) Washington Street Underpass; 2) Washington Street Overpass; 3) Interchange; 4) Jughandle; 5) Flyover; 6) Roundabout, but all were eliminated from consideration.

Haugen reported that they did look at one alternative that hadn't been considered in the past, a Continuous Flow Intersection. He explained that this type of intersection shifts the left turns to a different location on the intersection. He then showed a video illustrating how this type of intersection works.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 20th, 2011**

Christensen asked how many cars would be allowed to stack up. He stated that he asks this question in light of the fact that when he came here today he noticed that, because of construction on the overpass, cars were backed up considerably on DeMers. He said that this is because DeMers is a serious street that carries a ton of traffic, so if you do this there will be a lot of traffic coming over that bridge and he would like to know where you are going to back it up from the fire station, where do you have the space necessary to play with this one. Haugen responded that the ability to have the traffic flowing more frequently on the left turns, you are able to cut down, right now we know we have the dual left turn lanes already, we can cut that into almost two-thirds of storage space because left turns are occurring more frequently. He said that we would be shifting traffic back, but would also, then, be cutting considerably the storage lane required for those left turns.

Haugen commented that this alternative would allow us to keep the fire station where it is, and will allow us to keep the south curb line on DeMers as it is so we wouldn't be impacting those businesses along there, and the only place we would need to purchase additional right-of-way would be on the BNSF property.

Christensen stated that he thinks this is a potentially good solution, but what he is curious about is the back-up and stacking issues because he doesn't see anything changing on the east side, and this has become quite the thoroughfare. Haugen agreed, but added that with the ability of having these left turns happening twice as often as they currently are we are able to substantially reduce the storage length. He stated that he will get more detail on this for everyone to review.

Haugen summarized by stating that the two most surprising things they have found with this study so far is that the underpass is actually two structures, with one half in real trouble and the other not as bad, and that there is an alternative for DeMers/Washington that seems to have a lot of benefits that none of the other alternatives previously looked at achieved without having considerable impact to adjacent properties.

Grandstrand asked about pedestrian traffic. Haugen responded that this alternative actually does a better job for the pedestrian/bike traffic crossing because you are creating refuge/pedestrian islands, so it will make is safer for those types of movements.

Haugen reported that the next public meeting will be next month, at which they will be presenting the information discussed today, although more fleshed out, as well as information on access management options along the corridor to help minimize conflicts that are occurring with turning movements along the corridor, and also will look at the 17th and University intersections as well.

Pokryzwinski asked how the replacement or repair of the underpass affect the BNSF railroad operations. Haugen responded that as part of the construction costs they will have to build a "shoo-fly" structure that will allow the railroad to continue with its operation throughout the process. He commented that, as will be with the 42nd Street Overpass project, it is an investment that is needed to get the project done.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 20th, 2011**

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY POKRYZWINSKI, TO ADJOURN THE JULY 20TH,
2011, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:00 P.M.***

Voting Aye: Adams, Pokrzywinski, Powers, Grandstrand, Strandell, and Christensen.

Voting Nay: None.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, September 21st, 2011 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Warren Strandell, Chairman, called the September 21st, 2011, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:03 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Warren Strandell, Mike Powers, Mike Pokrzywinski, Steve Adams, Greg Leigh, and Doug Christensen.

Absent were: Gary Malm and Tyrone Grandstrand.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Nancy Ellis, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF Planner; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF Office Manager.

Guest(s) present were: Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Strandell declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JULY 20TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY POKRYZWINSKI, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE JULY 20TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Powers, Pokrzywinski, Adams, Strandell, Leigh, and Christensen.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF STATUS OF SAFETEA-LU

Haugen reported that back in December there was concern amongst surface transportation groups in the United States that what happened to federal aviation, or aircraft transportation could happen to surface transportation as well. He explained that this concern was due to the fact that at the end of September the federal surface transportation act would have expired, and along with it the ability to collect fuel tax, but as of today both Chambers of Congress extended it another six months, therefore SAFETEA-LU authorization has been extended until at least the end of March.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 21st, 2011**

Haugen stated that the next question is, how much funding will be appropriated. He said that the Senate is going down a path of maintaining current funding levels, but the House is going down a path of reducing funding by 30%. He added that at the end of the month the federal fiscal year ends and a new one begins, and without an agreement, it would appear that they will just kick that can down the road until March as well which would mean that they would just continue current funding levels.

Haugen reported, however, if the House prevails we will need to go back and revisit all our documents as a 30% cut in funding would be substantial, and we would no longer be fiscally constrained. He added that the MPO would continue to operate, however many projects would have to be put on hold until funding would become available.

Haugen commented that there is also a possibility that the administration's job bill might get traction. He stated that if this were the case, the way it is currently fashioned for surface transportation, things would resemble what happened with the last stimulus whereby funding would be spent using a formula.

Information only.

MATTER OF SELF-CERTIFICATION

Haugen reported that annually we need to do a self-certification with our DOT partners indicating that we are following the federal rules and regulations as we progress through our Annual Unified Work Program. He stated that this is specifically schedule to occur when we approve our T.I.P., which identifies what projects get what funding. He commented that the actual self-certification is also included as an appendix in the T.I.P. document, however Federal Highway requests that we have it as a separate agenda item, and act on it specifically.

Haugen concluded, stating that this is just something we do annually during our T.I.P. approval process to show that we are maintaining our Long Range Transportation Plan, and that the projects being programmed are valid.

MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE 2011 SELF-CERTIFICATION, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Powers, Pokryzwinski, Adams, Strandell, Leigh, and Christensen.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF THE 2012-2015 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that this is the time when we renew what our four year T.I.P. document has identified what projects will receive funds for the next four years. He added that we also, in the appendices, show the current status of projects, how they are progressing, and which ones are still awaiting bids.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 21st, 2011**

Haugen referred to Appendix 2 of the T.I.P. document, and pointed out that it shows the actual funding spent on projects programmed in 2010.

Haugen commented that a public hearing was held on this at last week's Technical Advisory Committee meeting. He stated that no one was present for discussion, and no written comments were submitted either.

Haugen reported that the T.I.P. document has been reconciled to match what each state is showing in their draft S.T.I.P. document. He added that since last month the only significant changes were the awarding of a Safe Routes To School project in East Grand Forks and a significant increase in cost for an enhancement project out on U.S. Highway 2 by the Grand Forks Airport. He stated that these changes were implemented into the document.

MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE FINAL FY 2012-2015 T.I.P., AS SUBMITTED.

***Voting Aye: Powers, Pokryzwinski, Adams, Strandell, Leigh, and Christensen.
Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO LONG RANGE
TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

Haugen reported that this is to formally begin the process of amending our Long Range Transportation Plan.

Haugen pointed out that, essentially, Columbia Road south of 36th Ave S is identified in the latter stage of our plan, and the City of Grand Forks would like to have it considered in the current stage of our Long Range Transportation Plan instead. He stated that in order to make that change we needed to identify a project that we could move to our later years, and the City of Grand Forks identified the 17th Avenue Overpass project to fulfill that requirement.

Haugen commented that action today would be to preliminarily approve this change, and allow us to go through the formal public hearing process. He added that it will be back before this body in November for final approval.

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY CHRISTENSEN, TO GRANT PRELIMINARY
APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE LONG RANGE
TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Powers, Pokryzwinski, Adams, Strandell, Leigh, and Christensen.
Voting Nay: None.***

Leigh asked when the 17th Avenue Overpass would be done. Haugen responded that it would not be eligible for funding until after 2022, under our current plan.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF SOUTH WASHINGTON STREET WELLNESS
TRAFFIC STUDY**

Ellis reported that she is bringing a request for final approval of the South Washington Street/Choice Health and Fitness Traffic Study, explaining that it is no longer called “the Wellness Center”.

Ellis reminded the board that she did present a draft final report at the last meeting. She explained that they held their last committee meeting on September 10th, at which there were some minor changes required to the cost estimates. She stated that she did present this to the Park Board, and they were receptive to the plan, however they did comment on the two bus route alternatives and the two bus shelters shown. She said that no decision has been made yet as to whether or not they are going to build a bus shelter onto the building, or if Altru will be building a shelter on their property instead, so that is still be worked out with Cities Area Transit staff.

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY CHRISTENSEN, TO GRANT FINAL APPROVAL OF THE SOUTH WASHINGTON STREET/CHOICE HEALTH AND FITNESS TRAFFIC STUDY, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Powers, Pokryzwinski, Adams, Strandell, Leigh, and Christensen.

Voting Nay: None.

**MATTER OF DRAFT RFP FOR SOUTHWEST GRAND FORKS STREET NETWORK
STUDY**

Ellis reported that this is the third study that involves 47th Avenue South and South Columbia Road. She stated that they are now looking at that section of property located west of Columbia Road, between I-29 and South Columbia Road, with 47th Avenue South being the southern border, and 32nd Avenue South would be the northern border.

Ellis gave a brief overview on the need for the study, explaining that in the past there have been a number of different plans on how to address north/south road connections to 47th Avenue South, as well as east/west road connects, but each time someone changes their mind. She stated, then, that this study will attempt to determine the best alternatives in order to give developers and city staff an idea of what right-of-way needs to be reserved.

Ellis referred to a map of the area and went over it briefly; pointing out where right-of-way currently exists, where various connection possibilities are located, what property is owned by the Park District, what property is owned by developers, what property is owned by the City, etc..

Ellis reported that in recent months there has been discussion that we need to get some right-of-way established so that we can plan future streets and highways, reserve right-of-way, and do some planning for future roadway, and that is why the MPO was asked to conduct this study.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 21st, 2011**

Ellis stated that, based on what we have in the RFP, what we are hoping to do is to establish some sort of map that shows/establishes right-of-way, shows where we would like to see both the north/south and east/west collector connections. She said that there will be representatives from the Park District, engineering, and developers on the steering committee in order to establish a plan or a map that can be agreed upon by all and that can then be moved forward by the City.

Christensen asked what the size of the study area is. Ellis responded that it is about 1 square mile. Christensen asked how much the study will cost. Ellis responded that it will cost about \$50,000. Christensen asked why we need the MPO to do this study when we have engineering people that could do it. He said that he sees absolutely no reason for the MPO to do this study. Ellis responded that the MPO was not the one who proposed the study, we were asked by the engineering and planning departments to try to get all the...

Christensen commented that this is a pretty small area to study, and it is \$50,000, but you already have engineering and CPS involved, so who do you expect to hire to assist everyone. Ellis reported that this study has been included in the MPO Annual Unified Work Program for a number of years, but we have actually postponed it, or not done it, because engineering and the Park District have come to us and said that they have come to an agreement, however the issue is that engineering and planning have had a number of different plans, and the Park District either agrees to that plan and then backs out of it, or they don't like it at all, so we have been asked to bring everyone to the table and get an official, formal agreement between everyone, so the MPO will facilitate that agreement.

Christensen stated that he doesn't think we need to spend \$50,000 to get people to agree. He referred to the map of the area and pointed out that if the Park District doesn't want a road going through their park, then why don't we just build the road here, and be done with it, that doesn't take \$50,000, it takes fifteen minutes. Adams responded that the issue is that that road is not wide enough to handle traffic all the way through, but 34th was, so it becomes an issue of where we stand as a City. Christensen said that he understands that, but then we can widen 38th. Adams responded that it cannot be widened at the intersection, and that is what is creating some of the problems we are having going to the south. Haugen added that we really need to have 34th connect to 47th somehow, so the MPO is acting as a mediator between the two sides to try to get that accomplished.

Christensen asked if they couldn't find something else to spend the \$50,000 on. He stated that if they want to get this done, they are going to get it done. He added that he doesn't think the Metropolitan Planning Organization should be a mediation organization, it isn't in your job description. He said that they can hire their own engineers to do this, and it sounds like there is already money invested with CPS.

Christensen commented that Curt Kreun and himself have been working back and forth with these people for two years, and they have attempted to get some land, but it has gone back and forth and it seems like the Park District just can't make up its mind. He added that the last time he checked the City does have the ability to take land, even from another government agency, and if they decided to take and extend 34th, they could do that, so is you want to spend \$50,000 to help a bunch of adults make a decision, and hire another engineering firm, then your welcome to that, but he doesn't think it is necessary.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 21st, 2011**

Leigh stated that if it were him he would run 34th straight south, he would take the land from the Park District and run it straight south. He said it is a main street, it is wide enough to carry the traffic, and he would take the land and move the park somewhere else as there are enough parks in town. Christensen agreed, adding that they are going to sell that land, that they have already raised the rates and mills for the wellness center, and they don't have capacity to do that without selling this land. He stated that although he doesn't think they will sell Kiwanis Park, this is a really good piece of development land, and they'll have to focus so he would just let it sit for a while because they have to sell it just like they have in the past.

Haugen reported that, just to explain how this got here; city staff requested, through the Service Safety Committee and the City Council, that we do this study, and that is how it got here today, so it wasn't just staff coming to the MPO Board and asking that the MPO do this, it went through the process, but we don't have to do it.

Leigh commented that he is voting no against this because he thinks city staff should be able to get together with the Park District and figure this out. He added that he thinks the road should go straight through there, it is a major arterial street. Pokryzwinski asked if this went through the City Council. Haugen responded that it did. Christensen said that it got to the council level but they didn't know what it was about. Pokryzwinski suggested, then, that this go back to the city council for further discussion.

MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY CHRISTENSEN, TO DENY APPROVAL OF THE SOUTHWEST COLLECTOR STREET NETWORK STUDY RFP.

Leigh asked if Christensen could ask his city council if they want the study. He stated that if they do, he has no problem with it, but it should come from them. Christensen asked what there is to study. Leigh commented that negotiations between the city and the Park District is to have that road go straight south. Christensen asked what there is to study. Leigh responded that negotiations between the city and the Park District is to have that road go straight south.

Pokryzwinski said, suppose for the sake of this session, that you get outvoted six to one, and it comes back to this body, would we then go forward. Christensen responded that by the time it gets back to us some of us may no longer be on the council. Adams added that the developer could also work things out as well.

Powers stated that he wishes he had more background on the Park District's feelings on this. Adams responded that he has a lot of history on that because he worked for Art Greenberg when it was all going through, and he has done a lot of work for Mr. Useldinger, and attended a lot of the meetings that were going on then. He stated that the original issue was that when the wellness center was proposed to go there, they didn't want a street going through because it would screw up the development, but the wellness center isn't going there anymore so the Park District should be more flexible in working out a road configuration for that area. He added that he knows they don't want the land they got from Mr. Greenberg because it is a big park in the wrong spot.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 21st, 2011**

Christensen commented that Mr. Adams is right, it is going to get sold, and Mr. Kreun and himself have dealt with the Park District a couple of times in the past, specifically on issues like the fire station where we gave them some land and they gave us some land, and he is thinking this is the same thing.

Leigh asked, in the future, when Useldinger comes to plat his property will they take into consideration they want 34th to go straight south, how do you eliminate the problem we have now in the future. Christensen stated that you say it will be a three lane, so when they come in to plat the property we will say it is a thoroughfare, or a collector.

Williams reported that this is part of what this study is all about. She said that models will be run, and they also want to address Ruemmele Road, as it is now acting as more than a local road and that shouldn't be happening, so they want to reroute traffic so there isn't as much traffic on that roadway.

Williams commented that in order to design this area they also want to take into account that if there were an interchange at 47th, where would the road alignment be for 38th, and do we need some kind of outer highway configuration or something, does 38th need to come straight south, does it need to come down and bend to the east in order for us to get our road alignments in there. She stated that all of this is going to require modeling runs, and staff does not have the software and everything necessary to do this, and this is what the MPO does, it does the modeling, and this is actually part of the circulation that the MPO does, so this is why they turned to the MPO to do this because in order to plan all this out, determine the sizes of the roads, and figure the different scenarios, we need their modeling expertise.

Christensen stated that this is much bigger than what Ms. Ellis said. Ellis responded that she is sorry, but she didn't get to finish, but the RFP does say all the things that Ms. Williams just said.

Christensen said that he is more concerned with what the plan is for 47th, is that what this study is about. Williams responded that it is. She added that we need to look at this link and ask what is going to happen, and she is going to let Ms. Ellis take it from here because it is included in the RFP. Ellis responded that it is included in the RFP. She added that she was asked to give some background as to why this section was, and why we don't have the north/south collectors, and the reason is because of the park land, but we also need to address another road that will lead into this area, what is going to happen in this area, and what is going to happen with this section in conjunction with 47th. She added that if commercial development should go in we also need to address how the roadways will network to accommodate that traffic as well.

Christensen commented that you all have to remember that we just kicked the can down the street, to 2023, for 17th Ave S overpass; and now we are talking about extending 47th to the interstate, which will require another interchange. He stated that if the study is as big as she says, than that is another story, but just to get the Park District on board then he is against it. He asked when the study would be completed if done. Ellis responded that it would be completed in June 2012.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 21st, 2011**

Christensen asked for an overview on the modeling needed. Haugen responded that, if you aren't going to extend 34th, and that is where the hang-up is now, where the two staff have tried to agree as to how 34th can extend out, then the question is can you can make that decision sooner than June, because once the decision is made then the modeling and stuff would be part of our normal Long Range Transportation Plan update, but in order to help the Park District, city staff, and others try to see what other options are available for 34th and 38th, we would need to do the modeling now. Christensen stated that he would like to wait on this for another six weeks or so to see what he and Mr. Kreun can get done with these guys.

Leigh reiterated that he feels that 34th needs to go straight south, and once that determination is made then you can do all the modeling you want because you have something to go off of.

MOVED BY CHRISTENSEN, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO AMEND THE MOTION TO POSTPONE ACTION ON THIS ITEM UNTIL THE NOVEMBER 16TH MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD.

Voting Aye: Powers, Pokryzwinski, Adams, Strandell, Leigh, and Christensen.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF PROPOSED UPDATE TO FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION AND URBAN ROADS MAPS

Kouba reported that the City of Grand Forks, as well as the County of Grand Forks, have made some changes to the street network. She stated that one of those modifications, 1st Avenue North, has been vacated between 5th and 4th Streets so that needs to be taken off our functional class map. Leigh asked which street this is, is it between the school and City Hall or the ramp and the school. Kouba responded that it is the one between the ramp and the school. Haugen commented that this is where the new performing arts theater is going to be located. Williams added that they just narrowed the right-of-way so it is no longer a classified street, it is just a local street now. Leigh asked if it will be a dead end now. Williams responded that it will not be a dead end, it will just be a local street.

Kouba stated that they modified, this was once a planned minor arterial and since it's there they have changed it to an existing, and 17th Avenue linking up to in-between the interstate is still planned and won't change until the interchange is built.

Kouba said that another change is towards the south there, on Columbia, where there is a red dotted line, underneath that red dotted line there is a yellow line that indicates that the County has changed that road to a County Major Collector, and then we are still planning on, once it comes in closer to that area, we will classify it as a Principal Arterial.

Kouba commented that they also moved 47th out more to connect up with South 38th Street just so that it will be matching up with the rest of the network.

Kouba reported that, with those changes, they have also made similar changes to the Urban Roads Map as well. She stated that they will be looking for approval of these changes.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 21st, 2011**

MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY CHRISTENSEN, TO APPROVE THE CHANGES TO THE NORTH DAKOTA FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION AND URBAN ROADS MAPS, AS DISCUSSED.

Voting Aye: Powers, Pokryzwinski, Adams, Strandell, Leigh, and Christensen.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF 47TH AVENUE SOUTH STUDY PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION

Leigh asked how this agenda item is different from the Southwest Collector Street Network study just discussed, other than that one is west of Columbia Road and this is one is east of Columbia Road, because it is still dealing with 47th Avenue South, so isn't this a duplication. Ellis responded that we only studied to South Columbia, what was in city limits. Leigh said, though, that had we approved that RFP you were going to go to Columbia and 47th, so you would still be dealing with 47th, just from South Washington to I-29 instead of Columbia to I-29. Ellis responded that they did this same thing with their South Washington Study, they did 47th all the way out to Belmont, and looked at it in sections.

Ellis reported that this is an informational agenda item only. She stated that the draft document includes recommendations for the intersections of South Columbia Road and 47th Avenue South, and 20th Street South and 47th Avenue South. She explained that 20th Street is the street that leads north/south by Walmart, and directly connects with the South Middle School entrance. She added that there are also recommendations for all modes of transportation, including bike/ped and transit.

Ellis stated that the draft addresses issues we have been having on 47th Avenue South; mainly such things as safe bike/pedestrian crossings, and school drop-off and pick-up concerns, etc. She added that they are looking at this with the knowledge that this is still a rural section of road, and we need to determine how we are going to urbanize it. She said that they have put everything into short-term and long-term improvements, along with some cost estimates.

Ellis referred to slides illustrating the various alternatives being proposed, and went over them briefly (copies are included in the file and available upon request).

- 1) 47th Avenue South and South Columbia Road Intersection Improvements – Signalization is the preferred alternative.
- 2) 20th Street South and 47th Avenue South Intersection Improvements – Roundabout is the preferred alternative.
- 3) 47th Avenue South Corridor Improvements – There were two alternatives discussed:
 - a) Three lane section with a center left turn lane.
 - b) Two lanes with turn lane pockets and concrete median in center.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 21st, 2011**

Because this is a complete reconstruct, the road would have to be lowered, and curb and gutter and storm sewers would need to be put in.

The cost difference between the median and the three lane section is not a real noticeable difference.

The feeling at this time is that the median would not be completely necessary, so the most feasible option would be the three lane section road.

- 4) Bike/Pedestrian Accommodations:
- a) A suggestion was made that we add a 10-foot multi-purpose trail on the north side of 47th Avenue South. There is currently a trail on the south side that connects from the front of the school and dead-ends at the Ulland complex. The request is to provide some sort of complete street scenario where you would have trails on both sides.
 - b) Because of the amount of morning pedestrian traffic crossing via the roundabout, a request was made to look into some alternatives that would make that crossing safer. Two options were given:
 - 1) Underpass.
 - 2) Hawk Signal.

Although the Underpass alternative is the preferred one of the School Board, because of concerns that once you have an underpass, issues such as bullying can become a problem, she would like to keep both alternatives in the plan.

Ellis added that they haven't addressed any engineering, groundwater, EDA, etc., issues they aren't sure yet if, when it comes down to the design phase, what alternatives will make the most sense.

Ellis reported that the bus currently travels on 47th at an hourly headway. She stated that they try to get the school buses to go around to the back side of the school, however there are some students that are riding the City Bus, and to go there they still have the option of them crossing the street, so at the time of rebuild they have added some bus pull-outs so that the bus can pull off the road, and continue to allow traffic to move in an east/west direction, and then the students can either use the Hawk Signal or use the other crossing to get to school property.

Ellis commented that the three lane, as well as the two improvements to the intersection, are what are termed, mid- or long-term improvements. She explained that this means that they are not necessary within the next five years based on the level of service, and the fact that there isn't any crash data that supports them being done in the near future. She added, however, that when the road is urbanized the possibility of adding the roundabout then would seem to be the most

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 21st, 2011**

logical time because you could do all the construction at once which would help save on costs, but those plans are in the mid-term to long-term timeframe, anywhere from 2015 out to 2035.

Ellis stated that you did ask them to consider what would happen if we had average daily traffic numbers that would require a four-lane roadway, and they did provide us with a drawing for improvements past the 2035 timeframe should an interchange come in, or if there were any other type of improvement that would cause an increase in traffic there. She pointed out that it does show that the road itself would fit within the existing right-of-way, however the bike/pedestrian path might need to be pushed outside of the right-of-way, so when we ask them to redo the draft we will ask them to include that as part of the right-of-way to make sure we don't have to do any property acquisition.

Ellis pointed out that the document also shows any accesses that have been planned, so we know how to accommodate it.

Christensen asked where the consultant, Bonestroo, is from. Ellis responded that they have offices in Rochester, Minneapolis, and Fargo. Christensen said, then, this is our first roundabout being proposed. Ellis responded that there is a roundabout included in the T.I.P. for construction by the Columbia Mall. Christensen stated that this is a major thoroughfare. Leigh commented that his personal opinion is that he doesn't like roundabouts, he doesn't like the one out at the airport, and while that is neither here nor there, it is his personal opinion. Christensen said that he is curious as to how the School District would approve a roundabout in that location, because you are talking about the safety of children. He asked when 47th would be built out. Ellis responded that it would be sometime after 2017.

Leigh stated that his recommendation, if it counts for anything, would be to have stop-lights there because he doesn't like roundabouts, but that is his opinion and he isn't sure if this is the right place to say this. Christensen responded that he thinks this is the place to say it because we are supposed to be the people to look at this from the macro level, the 20,000 feet, or the metropolitan area, so you have to ask yourself is the right place to put in a roundabout, at a major thoroughfare. Leigh suggested that they could have a push button right there at the corner, just like a lot of our cities have. Christensen commented that you don't see very many roundabouts in Minneapolis either. He said that you might think he is just a stick in the mud by saying this, but why wouldn't you wait to see how a roundabout is accepted behind Columbia Mall before you plan to put one in here. Ellis responded that administration at South Middle School thought it was a very good idea because those children that will go to South Middle School and are now at Century Elementary School, which is within a block of the proposed roundabout at 34th and 24th, so they thought that a majority of those parents will already have more than enough practice on a roundabout to be comfortable with the one proposed at South Middle School. Christensen said, that is very nice, Miss Ellis, but I'll tell you what, that's a small area of town, and most of the people using 47th, from the south end of town, they don't access that roundabout, and will have no experience on a roundabout unless they choose to use it to go to Alerus Financial. Ellis commented that it takes a lot of education. Christensen said, then, that you have to ask yourself when do you start the education, and where, and he is glad the parents feel that way because your not going to cause the people that live in his area, and Mr. Sande's area, to have the same

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 21st, 2011**

experience with a roundabout, so he is going to suggest that you get two recommendations on the intersection – signal or roundabout - so a future council can make a decision rather than be driven by this one. Ellis responded that they are both in the study, and, again, when they are in the design phase it is the city that makes the decision on the design.

Williams reported that what they did on the Choice Wellness Center was to ask that the MPO refer the study to the City as being the best information available at the time so that the city could use the information, and then make a final determination with the realization that it is consistent with the existing Long Range Transportation Plan, but also knowing that things change over time so when we get far enough along to consider doing some of these things, it may have changed, so that way on these studies it doesn't lock the city in to doing something. She added that she thinks that addresses what Mr. Christensen is talking about, so that when the recommendation actually comes in, it is to accept it with the best information available at the time, but it doesn't lock us in to doing something specific ten years from now. Christensen said that that makes sense.

Christensen stated that what is going on here is that this planning body is being ingrained with the current vogue of transportation designs, specifically roundabouts, and we should all be thinking about wanting data to support these kinds of designs and recommendations. He added that he has been out on the east coast, and there are a lot of roundabout out there, but there aren't many out here in the mid-west, he doesn't see any in Minneapolis. Ellis responded that there are quite a few in Minneapolis. Christensen asked where they were located. Ellis responded that they are located around schools. She added that Fargo/Moorhead has twelve of them. Christensen said that this is one of those discussions on where you want to see your community go, when you start getting these plans, and you should have a philosophy of some of these things that you would like to see in your plan rather than get it piecemeal. He said that we are supposed to be doing long range planning, so you just said you don't like the roundabout at the airport, let's get a sense of the community before you just adopt some of these plans. Pokryzwinski commented that he thinks this does leave the option of the roundabout in the plan, but he isn't in favor just deciding today that in fifteen years our eyes are closed and we aren't going include both options, but he also thinks there are some situations that are unique, and he thinks there are one or two in East Grand Forks where roundabouts, while hard to get used to, are the best solution, so just because we have never done it before doesn't mean it isn't a good idea, so as leaders we maybe should be willing to climb out on a limb once in a while and try something new. He added that he has traveled in a lot of areas that have roundabout, and, yes, they are hard to get used to but they do make sense. Christensen said that he agrees that we need to be cognizant of the future, but we need to look at all options available.

Haugen stated that he would provide this body with a presentation on roundabouts at its next meeting.

MATTER OF SOLICITATION FOR 2013-2016 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that we just approved the 2012-2015 T.I.P., and now we have to start the next T.I.P. cycle process. He pointed out that he included copies of the North Dakota and Minnesota T.I.P. process schedules in the packets. He stated that the important thing is that anything that is going to be suggested for federal funding needs to be submitted to the MPO by November 30th,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 21st, 2011**

which means it has to go through the various committees, and the City Council for their approval prior to that date. He said that in December we will consider those projects. He added that on the Minnesota side, it's a month later, January 4th, that we need all the Minnesota projects we want to seek federal funds for submitted to the MPO.

**MATTER OF ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTS FOR WASHINGTON STREET AND
UNDERPASS CORRIDOR STUDY**

Haugen reported that they spent all day yesterday working on the Washington Street Corridor Study. He stated that they had meetings for the north end property owners in the morning and for the south end property owners in the afternoon, and finished with a public meeting last evening.

Haugen commented that they are looking at three major improvements that are necessary:

- 1) Street pavement needs to be redone along the corridor
- 2) Intersection improvements at DeMers/Washington
- 3) Underpass needs to be reconstructed or repaired

Haugen reported that the major issue discussed yesterday was how we can improve safety along the corridor. He stated that there are essentially two different concepts:

- 1) Introducing a median down the middle
- 2) Leaving the median out

Haugen commented that the main difference between the two concepts is that a median requires we have a larger footprint, which would require we purchase more property; and without a median we are able to meet minimum standards, and improve safety without having to purchase additional property.

Haugen stated that they identified where we have direct driveways onto Washington, as well as where there are alleys or side streets available that could accommodate those accesses instead. He said that they are suggesting that we could remove some of these driveways to improve safety along the corridor.

Haugen referred to slides illustrating the north side properties, where accesses are located, as well as where there are alleys and side streets available to provide that access, and went over the information briefly. He stated that they are suggesting that wherever alternative access is available to a business, the direct driveways be closed. Leigh asked who would pay for these changes. Haugen responded that it would be part of the construction costs. He explained that another reason they are suggesting this option is because if they have to rebuild all of the existing driveways, and meet ADA requirements, we would actually have to go into their property to do that.

Haugen then referred to slides illustrating the south side properties, pointing out where there are misaligning streets, 8th Avenue and 10th Avenue, and stated that they are suggesting that they can

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 21st, 2011**

align these two streets. He explained that the reason they are showing them being aligned to the north instead of to the south is that they feel there is an opportunity to purchase just parking lot area versus getting into a business area. He added that, based on turning movement data, it is felt that 9th Avenue is not as critical to remain open so they are trying to work with Paradiso to get this done with a possible swap to allow them a larger parking lot on the north side of their building.

Haugen commented that most everyone agrees that there are too many driveways along the corridor, but there are some businesses where that is their only access, so we have to maintain them. He stated that the most affected business was Mr. Tire/Sinclair, although they are recommending that only one of their driveways be eliminated, but when you look at the improvements to the DeMers/Washington Intersection, a median will most likely be recommended simply because we have a tremendous amount of left turns taking place to go west bound on DeMers, which would already more or less close off any left turn access into this property.

Haugen stated that the comment period for this study ends October 5th. He added that they distributed the maps as best they could, and at the next Executive Policy Board meeting they will have recommendations as to how to best phase these three improvements in, and their cost estimates.

Christensen asked how they were going to establish the value of taking property, will the City of Grand Forks be responsible. Haugen responded that everyone maintains access, just not necessarily direct access, but they will all still have access to their property.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO ADJOURN THE SEPTEMBER 21ST, 2011, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:26 P.M.

Voting Aye: Powers, Pokryzwinski, Adams, Strandell, Leigh, and Christensen.

Voting Nay: None.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, October 19th, 2011 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Warren Strandell, Chairman, called the October 19th, 2011, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:10 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Warren Strandell, Mike Powers, Mike Pokrzywinski, Steve Adams, Greg Leigh, and Doug Christensen.

Absent were: Gary Malm and Tyrone Grandstrand.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Nancy Ellis, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF Planner; Bryan McCoy, GF/EGF Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF Office Manager.

Guest(s) present were: Mark Nelson, MNDOT; Jon Markusen, KLJ Engineering; Mike Bittner, KLJ Engineering.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Strandell declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 21ST, 2011, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 21ST, 2011, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Powers, Adams, Strandell, and Leigh.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF PRESENTATION OF DRAFT MINNESOTA GO VISION

Nelson reported that he was here today to give a brief presentation on the Draft Minnesota GO Vision (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request).

Nelson commented that, as an agency they did internal strategic planning shortly after Commissioner Sorrell took his position, and one of the areas we really wanted to focus on was

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19th, 2011**

global integration. He explained that what they mean by global integration is, they are the public transportation area, not the Department of Highways, which is how most people interact with them.

Nelson stated that last year their office was created in February 2010, after which they worked with all the MPOs and Regional Development Commissions, and developed a 20-Year Multi-Modal Plan, which is a federally required plan that must be completed and updated to be eligible for federal funding.

Nelson reported that one area they were asked to really focus on was the development and articulation of a long-term vision. He explained that they defined “vision” as a description of a desired future, and used it to answer the question “what are we trying to achieve?”

Nelson said that over the last nine months they have been working with a lot of folks across the state, and held a series of Advisory Group meetings, at which they brought people in for a full day; they talked to their traditional stakeholders; and they talked to people that aren’t their traditional stakeholders such as utility groups, Chamber of Commerce, Council on Aging, and advocates from other areas to facilitate a discussion of what it is we want to do with transportation, what we want to do as a State, and what is the role of transportation.

Christensen reported present.

Nelson reported that they did a series of ten public workshops in which they really got people involved in the scenario planning. He stated that they laid out three different alternative futures; one pretty rosy, one fairly blue, and one in the middle; and then they posed the question: “this is the future, what do we need to know when we think about transportation for these futures.” He said that they looked for a common thread, so if all three groups came up with the same answer they knew they were on the right track with that one.

Nelson commented that they came up with some challenges and opportunities: including aging population; urbanization; energy shifts; automation; persistent budget challenges; health care costs; increased global competition; changing work environments, telecommunications and access to services; and floods/water quality. He gave a brief overview on each of the challenges/opportunities.

Nelson stated that they also developed some guiding principles to go along with the vision. He said that some of these principles we will want to apply to our decision making in the future. They include: leverage public investments to achieve multiple purposes; ensure accessibility; build to a maintenance scale; ensure regional connections; integrate safety; emphasize reliable and predictable options; strategically fix the system; and use partnerships. He also gave a brief overview on each of these principles as well.

Nelson said that they were accepting comments on this draft until Friday, October 21st, at 4:30 p.m. He added that they held a public hearing on October 4th, and details are available at WWW.minnesotago.org.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19th, 2011**

Nelson reported that when they finish the vision, they will really just be getting started. He stated that they will then start updating the Statewide Multi-Modal Transportation Plan, and Mr. Haugen and himself talked prior to this meeting about how they can effectively get the MPOs involved in that process. He added that once the Statewide Multi-Modal Transportation Plan is completed they will then move on to the Policy Plan; then to the Highway Investment Plan; and then to other Multi-Modal Investment Plans.

Discussion/Questions:

None.

Information only.

MATTER OF CONSIDERATION OF GRAND FORKS COUNTY PROJECT FOR 2013-2016 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that, as everyone knows, the federal projects that are in the MPO study area need to show up in our T.I.P. document. He stated that this is the first time that Grand Forks County is proposing a project using federal funds.

Haugen commented that this is a basic mill and overlay project, scheduled for 2013, that involves DeMers Avenue, west of the Amtrak Station, or west of 55th Street out to Airport Road, or County Road 25. He said that the federal share is \$536,896.80, and the local share \$134,224.20, for a total project cost of \$671,121.00.

Haugen stated that both staff and the Technical Advisory Committee recommend the MPO Executive Policy Board approve this project, and give it a priority ranking.

MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE LIST OF GRAND FORKS COUNTY CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE FY2013-2016 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING.

Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Powers, Adams, Strandell, Leigh, and Christensen.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON NORTHWEST EAST GRAND FORKS TRAFFIC CIRCULATION STUDY

Ellis reported that she will be giving a brief update on where we are with this study. She stated that they held their last Steering Committee meeting at the end of September, as well as a public open house. She said that at that time they were looking, again, at the intersection of U.S. Highway 2 and 5th Avenue N.W., as well as River Road, 12th Avenue N.W. and 17th Street N.W., and reviewing our traffic improvements, or traffic control for the Central Avenue Corridor to make sure that any changes that we see with traffic or signal timing will affect the actual study done before.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19th, 2011**

Ellis said that at the last meeting they went over all of the alternatives that were proposed by the consultants. She referred to a power point presentation and went over these alternatives briefly.

Alternatives for U.S. Highway 2/5th Avenue N.W. intersection included:

1. Do Nothing
2. Westbound Left Only Access
3. Three-Quarter Access
4. Signalized Full-Access

Pokrzywinski asked of the Westbound Left Only Access alternative also offer the opportunity to close the off-ramp. Ellis responded that, quite frankly, there is an option to close that off-ramp no matter what. Pokrzywinski explained that it is a road to no-where, that used to lead to River Road, but now the dikes is in the way. Ellis commented that the City should consider that it is very limited on its access so it would be a nice location for the T.E. project we have planned, and for which we have received funding, that currently is planned with a full intersection at 5th Avenue N.W., but that we are having to redesign because that intersection will not go in before the T.E. project.

Ellis pointed out that if you look at these alternatives, none of them affect right-of-way at all, nor do any of them affect the pool, nor is there any consideration for any commercial zoning changes either.

Ellis stated that during the public meeting there was some concern with not having a signal at the intersection of U.S. Highway 2 and 5th Avenue N.W., specifically with the left turn alternative, and whether or not crossing there would be a safety issue as you would be turning across two lanes of traffic. She added, however, that it would, during a flood event, give additional ins to the northend without having to go all the way to U.S. Highway 2 and 220, and then having to go back into the northwest corner. She pointed out that it doesn't provide straight across traffic so you will see some traffic increase, but not a lot. Pokrzywinski commented that it will allow for emergency vehicles to cross, correct. Ellis responded that they are considering allowing that, but other alternatives are also being considered as well.

Ellis reported that the cost of a three-quarter access is high, however not as high as a full signalized access, which has been the preferred alternative for two past studies, one in 1994 and one in 2006, and it is currently programmed in our T.I.P. for 2014. She stated that there have now been concerns with the cost, as well as the need for a full intersection at that location.

Ellis referred to a slide of U.S. Highway 2 and 5th Avenue N.W. Intersection Alternatives and went over it briefly.

Ellis stated that they have looked at all four of the alternatives, however at this point in time they just don't have a consensus as to which one of the four we want. She added that in speaking with the neighborhood, obviously nobody wants to see increased traffic by their homes, but at the same time those that live in the northeast corner see a lot of people crossing back and forth,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19th, 2011**

and a lot of pedestrian traffic, so, while they don't like the signal or the increased traffic, they do like the fact that if it were signalized it would allow for pedestrians to cross at a light.

Ellis commented that they did not have representation from the property owners on 5th Avenue N.W. on the Steering Committee, but that has now changed. She added that they are also working with MNDOT. She explained that in the State of Minnesota you have to go through a couple of different things to warrant a traffic signal, one is the Intersection Control Evaluation, consideration of a roundabout, and ample traffic to warrant a signal, and we aren't sure we meet the criteria to warrant a signal now, or in 2014, so we are looking at the modeling data to see when we might, so it may be an alternative that we keep in the plan, but it isn't something that we can do at this point.

Ellis reported that the next intersection is the River Road/12th Avenue N.W./17th Street N.W. intersection. She explained that where these three roads connect there is a very large, expansive intersection and right-of-way area. She stated that, although there isn't a lot of crash data available for this intersection, a lot of people have concerns, especially with left turns from 17th onto River Road because of the flood control structure, and having to watch traffic coming from two different roadways makes it harder.

Ellis stated that the first thing they looked at for intersection control here was a roundabout, and it does fit nicely here, and meets all the criteria, however the cost is high, and they aren't sure it is really necessary at this time, so, while they will keep it in as an alternative, it probably won't be considered at this time.

Ellis said that the second thing they looked at were changes to the curb so that 12th and 17th stop, and then merge and stop again, so the River Road north/south access would be the uncontrolled portion of the intersection. She stated that there would be very little cost associated with this, but it was kind of confusing to make traffic stop, move forward briefly, and stop again, so it didn't seem like a very logical choice. Pokrzywinski added that this option doesn't seem to really solve the problem with northbound traffic taking a left turn either. Ellis agreed.

Ellis reported that that last option would be to change curb lines so that it comes to more of a 90-degree, brings River Road in and it would now stop when heading south, and then through movement would be River Road onto 12th. She stated that this option provides a better site line, and the cost is very, very low as you are really just moving curb. She said that everyone at the meeting liked this option.

Ellis commented that they were asked to look at frontage roads. She referred to Exhibit 8, and stated that the first one, shown in black, is a frontage road that was planned in the 1994 study. She stated that since the 1994 study was done a lot has changed in this area, the right-of-way has been given back to the property owners, so if we do any sort of improvements to U.S. 2 and 5th that frontage road intersection gets awfully full so it becomes a conflict point, so they did look at another one, shown in red. She explained that this one is absolutely opposed by the neighborhood, and not really seen as necessary, so a frontage road idea has more or less been eliminated from the plan.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19th, 2011**

Ellis reported that the last thing they looked at was their Transportation Enhancement, or bikepath options. She stated that the first option is, if we do not close the off-ramp, to find a location for the bikepath on the south side of 10th. She said that it would require the removal of parking on the southend. She explained that as it turns and heads north, it would either run between the dike and the park facility, or in front of it. She added that the up and over option has been scraped as the dike facilities were not designed to have pedestrians traveling over it, so it has been removed. She stated that the second option would be to close the off-ramp and put the bike trail there. She referred to the matrix for this information, and went over it briefly.

Ellis referred to Exhibit 11, and explained that it shows, again, what the traffic improvements were, consideration of right-in/right-out, closing some of the intersections that have high crash rates. She pointed out that it also shows future roundabouts or traffic signals, explaining that roundabout must be considered in the State of Minnesota before we consider traffic signals.

Ellis said that they were also asked to look at what type of average daily traffic we would have in 2035 with all of the different options. She referred to Exhibit 12, and went over that information briefly.

Ellis reported that they have presented all of the alternatives, they have had public involvement, and will continue to develop the alternatives to provide better engineering and cost estimates. She stated that the final committee and public meetings on November 10th. She said that the committee meeting will be held here in the training conference room at 1:30 p.m. and the public meeting is at 5:30 that evening, also in the training conference room. She added that everyone is also welcome to submit any comments to her as well.

Strandell asked when the final decision would be made, and by whom. Ellis responded that she doesn't know if they are going to whittle it down to one alternative in the draft report, but she thinks they will provide the final draft with all alternatives in it, and then the City Council and MPO can make a decision.

Strandell asked what the City Council's opinions are on this. Pokrzywinski responded that there is considerable opposition to a fully signalized intersection at this time. He said that his position is, knowing that it probably isn't possible in 2014, as was scheduled, but he would like to at least leave the fully signalized intersection option in the plan, and take a step-by-step approach by initially adding the left turn lane for westbound traffic to open up more opportunities for people to get to the downtown. He added that he also feels the off-ramp should be closed because it really doesn't serve any useful purpose.

Pokrzywinski commented that one point Councilmember DeMers brought up was, if and when the Kennedy Bridge needs to be replaced, it will probably be raised, and we need to consider how that will affect River Road. He stated that if we have to build a new bridge, is that corridor going to be useful, so taking this option off the table is something that ???

Leigh stated that he is not in favor of a full intersection, and never was, but he thinks he could live with a three-quarter intersection.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19th, 2011**

Pokrzywinski commented, however, that another issue is funding, and there are some other projects that are eligible for City Sub-Target funds that the City Council is more in favor of doing.

Discussion ensued.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON WASHINGTON STREET/UNDERPASS STUDY

Haugen referred to slide 16 of the presentation (a copy of the presentation is included in the file and available upon request), explaining that at the last MPO Executive Policy Board meeting he went over some of these access management options, which are shown in the first few slides. He stated that he would also like to acknowledge the KLJ team present today, Jon Markusen and Mike Bittner, who have been involved on this study.

Haugen reported that they have engaged the public on this, and they have provided feedback. He stated that currently we have assembled, and presented to our Steering Committee, what the individual component costs are, and later in this presentation we will see how they are suggesting they be packaged and the timeframe for implementing them is.

Haugen stated that for the DeMers Avenue Intersection they are suggesting a continuous flow intersection concept be implemented. He pointed out that the cost of implementing this concept would be about \$14,000,000. Leigh asked what a continuous flow intersection is. Haugen referred to a slide illustrating how a continuous flow intersection looks, and explained how traffic would begin making left turns before they actually get to the intersection so that when they actually reach the intersection they would not be opposing the through movements.

Christensen asked, and he knows that it's on the agenda, but why are we even doing this, when are you presenting this to the City Council. Haugen responded that next week they are meeting with upper management for the NDDOT in order to get their feedback, so they would be looking at either late November or early December to give a presentation to the City Council and Service Safety. Christensen asked, just out of curiosity, why they wouldn't present this to the council now, so they can give some input before you just roll it out and give it to us, because, obviously this is a pretty big decision for their city. He added that this is true about the last item on the agenda as well, a presentation on roundabouts, as he just heard now that it is mandated in Minnesota to consider them, but it is not mandated in North Dakota. He said that this is all politics, but why wouldn't you get the City of Grand Forks' council involved so they know what you are doing rather than just rolling these out and saying that this is what the MPO says to do. He said that he is going to vote no on all these things until their council knows what is going on, and, although, he is here, and Mr. Adams is here, but he is on the Planning Commission, which, quite frankly is somewhat irrelevant, but your talking money, so why wouldn't you guys come over there and give us a couple presentations so we get a feel, and then he would like their council to make a policy decision on whether they are going to embrace MPOs, or not waste

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19th, 2011**

their time with them any longer, or they will do them, because, to him, that is good planning. He stated that this is an opinion, they'll get the presentations, but you've got to get the council to understand about roundabouts before you start planning them because one little roundabout is going in north of the, where is it again, is it 24th and something on the way into the mall. He asked what Mr. Adams thinks, as he is a representative, because he doesn't think he is speaking out of turn. Adams responded that he is just following what the MPO does. Haugen responded that on this particular study they have a steering committee, on which they have a City Council representative, and they invite all council members to those meetings. Christensen stated that they are all part-time, they all have day jobs so they can't come during the day, they can't come to the meetings, they set aside 5:30 every week for a meeting, but they could have a joint meeting on Wednesday, but nobody knows about roundabouts on their council, except maybe Mr. Kruen.

Haugen reported that with this particular study they worked through all the alternatives, and are still presenting those alternatives. He said that they do have, from a technical perspective, the recommendations for that particular intersection, but it is a State Highway so they are going to upper management to get their perspective on it. He explained that their program schedule is to go to both Service Safety and the City Council, but they can go before the Finance Committee as well if you want, but the process, as we understood the City wanted to be engaged on this study, and all studies, was for us to work through your technical issues, to have representatives from the City Council, Planning Commission, and our staff to work through the issues, and then, once we get to the point where we have something to recommend, then engage at the Service Safety Committee, then to the City Council, but now are you suggesting something different. Christensen stated that Mr. Glassheim, who is not on the Service Safety Committee, that is his ward, so what he would ask is, rather than going through the Service Safety Committee with something as big and expensive as this, is schedule one or two meetings with the council so they get a feel for it, that's the number one thing he would ask, and if you're going to give presentations on roundabouts in the future, and he would ask that you do that, and it is going to be at his committee, because he wants to get resolution as to what their appetite is for roundabouts.

Christensen pointed out that your affecting an awful lot of businesses on North and South Washington by your proposal here, and he notices your cutting off access to Simonson Gas Station, Burger King, taking some of Paradiso's lot, and he is sure that the owner of Paradiso doesn't know about this yet, Mr. Anbery, and he should be told. He added that he is also sure that Mr. Simonson would have concerns, as would Mr. Marshall. He stated that he thinks there has got to be a little bit more informed input when studying these things. Haugen responded that they will certainly re-evaluate the input that they have had during the process so far, but they have done quite a bit of outreach to the public on this study, sending individual mailings to the properties along the corridor, physically sitting along the corridor at times, and getting the Chamber involved as well. Christensen stated that the Chamber isn't affected, property owners are affected and he is just trying to make sure that the people your going to affect know what the rest of you all are doing as far as planning their future. Haugen responded that he understands, but the reason for including the Chamber is because they have more interaction with those

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19th, 2011**

property owners, so they have more opportunity to interact to make sure the owners are receiving the mailings, that they are being informed, and if they aren't comfortable giving feedback, the Chamber can provide that feedback for them. He added, again, that they will certainly re-evaluate where they are at, and if the direction is that you want council presentations early and often, we will do that, but that hasn't been our directive to-date. Christensen stated that he will see if the council wants to change that direction.

Haugen stated that the purpose of this particular presentation is to keep the board informed as to where we are at with the study. He pointed out that we now have costs associated with all the alternatives we previously discussed. He then went over those costs briefly.

Haugen then referred to slides discussing the implementation of these alternatives, and went over them briefly.

Haugen commented that the MPO is currently soliciting for projects for our next T.I.P.. He stated that last year the district did submit a request to consider replacing the underpass structure, and, based on this study, and what we have from upper management, we are anticipating a similar request this year, however, it doesn't seem like there is a lot of support to do the DeMers Avenue Intersection at the same time.

Haugen reported that on October 27th they will be presenting the corridor study, to-date, and instead of monthly meetings they will be going to upper management and take them from cradle to what we have now in the study process to get their feedback. He said that they will adjust their recommendations based on that feedback.

Information only.

MATTER OF PRESENTATION ON ROUNDABOUTS

Haugen reported that he submitted, via e-mail, several sites for the board to check out on roundabouts. He said that he would like to play a movie from FHWA on roundabouts today. He stated that he also wanted to mention that on the State of Minnesota's maps you will see that they highlight roundabouts. He added that he also gave everyone a spreadsheet that shows how many roundabouts there are in Minnesota, with around a hundred currently, and more planned in the future. He stated that in both North Dakota and Minnesota, when you take your driver's test there is a section on roundabouts that you are tested on. He commented that he also e-mailed everyone about a project in Killdeer, ND, where two state highways intersect, where one of their alternatives is to consider a roundabout. He stated that they are currently assembling a list of roundabouts in North Dakota, similar to the Minnesota list. He said that currently they are most prevalent to the south of us, there are about a dozen in place, with more planned for the future.

Movie ensued.

Haugen stated that back in 2008 the MPO did a study for the City of Grand Forks of their collector to collector intersections. He said that before we engaged in this they went through a

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19th, 2011**

process of identifying whether Grand Forks wanted us to look at roundabout or not, and the decision at that time was that they did want them to be considered as one of the alternatives for their collector to collector intersections. He commented that not all intersections merit roundabouts, but there were some that did that are part of the study.

Haugen reported that on the 47th Avenue Study that Ms. Ellis gave an update on last month, one of the reasons, in addition to what you just saw, why roundabouts were identified as a good solution is that the cost of one is about \$150,000 less than putting in a traffic signal at 20th and 47th, so on top of all the other benefits, the cost to implement it is \$150,000 less, and it will be cheaper to maintain in the future as well.

Haugen stated that he would be happy to give this presentation to the Finance Committee if you wish, or to any other committee/commission you want. Christensen asked for a copy of the report Mr. Haugen is referencing. Haugen gave him a copy of the report as requested.

Christensen said that \$150,000 is insignificant to him, in the study you presented, because this will be a major thoroughfare in our city for years to come, and this piece you put up says that you have to have stakeholder involvement, which means that there has to be education, and it is also saying that you have to have, there is going to be a whole bunch of old people driving through those, so why would you ??? those old people. He commented that your population is going to age significantly in the next 20 years, and there will be more old people than young driving through that intersection, and they have to be trained, so there is a reason why people say "you can't teach an old dog new tricks". He added that if you are going to implement one of these, implement it someplace where people get an opportunity to learn rather than on some major thoroughfare. He stated that another thing, and you don't mention it in the study, but your going to have kids walking across here, so the stakeholders weren't thinking about their kids walking across a roundabout to go to that school, and he also heard something about an underpass and Mr. Leigh saying that they didn't want an underpass because of bullying. He said that this is something that your all taught wherever you go to school, and then you come back and you are engaged in planning, and the campaign is to do this, make sure that as the campaign to do this is there that the people that you are going to ask to take an appropriateness, and go to the grocery store and listen to the comments, can support it.

Christensen commented that is isn't going to be there five or ten year when that roundabout is built, but there are going to be people there so be careful how you think it, and the people that your talking about building that little three-way roundabout behind Target, that isn't a high traffic area, it is cleverly hidden, and if your going to really believe what your saying as far as Fargo, then get stakeholders from there to come up and present as to why their good, and get stakeholders to present as to why they were a "Doubting Thomas" ????. He said that these are very, very new and novel, and the cynic in him would just say, if you want a roundabout then put one in at DeMers and South Washington if it is so safe. Haugen responded that they studied that, but the footprint would be so huge.

Powers shared that he was recently on a trip to Michigan, and on the way home they went through Duluth to avoid all the traffic on 35W, and they went through a roundabout. He stated

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19th, 2011**

that he wasn't driving, his brother-in-law was, but there was a semi in front of us, and just like on the video we just saw, he went around that thing and made a left hand turn and it was incredibly smooth, and he was impressed, but, there again, like Mr. Christensen said, these people have probably been through them more than once, but the traffic movement hardly slowed down.

Christensen stated that when you hit a roundabout for the first time your scared silly, and he has been through them. He shared that twenty-five years ago, when he was in Massachusetts, and he went through one and he drove the circle a couple of times trying to get out of it.

Haugen reported that if you go to a hockey game in Fargo you will be driving through a roundabout, if you go to the new high school you will be going through a roundabout to get there. He said that those are the areas in Fargo, the growth areas, that they are putting them.

Haugen commented that, as you can see in our studies we are considering them, and as you'll see when you read this we aren't always recommending them, and we are a little bit more judicious on where we think they will work best. He pointed out that, as Ms. Ellis mentioned earlier, putting one in East Grand Forks would work very well, but the cost is high so we aren't suggesting one be put in at this time.

Christensen stated that you aren't going to get one built until you build it, and your not going to get one approved until people understand how they work. Ellis said that it is an alternative in the study, but it doesn't mean it will be done. Christensen added that the issue is, if your going to build it, then build it where there is limited use, not where there is high use. Haugen stated that he thinks the one at 24th and 34th, which came from this study, is programmed to be built in 2014, so it would be in use for a few years before the one at 47th would be considered, so people can get used to one.

Strandell commented that the two concerns he has are snow removal and night driving, because you would have lights coming from you from a number of areas. Ellis responded that they would similar to a cul-de-sac, in terms of snow removal, and they seem to be able to get the snow out of them. Strandell said, however, that cul-de-sacs don't have the traffic issue a roundabout would. Ells responded that there are definitely ways that Fargo/Moorhead has dealt with that. Christensen stated that there are several council members that are dead set against cul-de-sacs as well.

Christensen concluded by stating that he is simply suggesting that if your going to put in roundabouts you educate people more so that they know they are coming and how they work. He added that when it comes to the one on 47th, things will be real interesting, and you can rest assured that there will be more than one public hearing on that one before it is ever built because it is a high traffic area.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19th, 2011**

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO ADJOURN THE OCTOBER 19TH,
2011, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:40 P.M.***

Voting Aye: Powers, Adams, Strandell, Leigh, and Christensen.

Voting Nay: None.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, October 19th, 2011 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Warren Strandell, Chairman, called the October 19th, 2011, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:10 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Warren Strandell, Mike Powers, Mike Pokrzywinski, Steve Adams, Greg Leigh, and Doug Christensen.

Absent were: Gary Malm and Tyrone Grandstrand.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Nancy Ellis, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF Planner; Bryan McCoy, GF/EGF Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF Office Manager.

Guest(s) present were: Mark Nelson, MNDOT; Jon Markusen, KLJ Engineering; Mike Bittner, KLJ Engineering.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Strandell declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 21ST, 2011, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 21ST, 2011, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Powers, Adams, Strandell, and Leigh.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF PRESENTATION OF DRAFT MINNESOTA GO VISION

Nelson reported that he was here today to give a brief presentation on the Draft Minnesota GO Vision (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request).

Nelson commented that, as an agency they did internal strategic planning shortly after Commissioner Sorrell took his position, and one of the areas we really wanted to focus on was

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19th, 2011**

global integration. He explained that what they mean by global integration is, they are the public transportation area, not the Department of Highways, which is how most people interact with them.

Nelson stated that last year their office was created in February 2010, after which they worked with all the MPOs and Regional Development Commissions, and developed a 20-Year Multi-Modal Plan, which is a federally required plan that must be completed and updated to be eligible for federal funding.

Nelson reported that one area they were asked to really focus on was the development and articulation of a long-term vision. He explained that they defined “vision” as a description of a desired future, and used it to answer the question “what are we trying to achieve?”

Nelson said that over the last nine months they have been working with a lot of folks across the state, and held a series of Advisory Group meetings, at which they brought people in for a full day; they talked to their traditional stakeholders; and they talked to people that aren’t their traditional stakeholders such as utility groups, Chamber of Commerce, Council on Aging, and advocates from other areas to facilitate a discussion of what it is we want to do with transportation, what we want to do as a State, and what is the role of transportation.

Christensen reported present.

Nelson reported that they did a series of ten public workshops in which they really got people involved in the scenario planning. He stated that they laid out three different alternative futures; one pretty rosy, one fairly blue, and one in the middle; and then they posed the question: “this is the future, what do we need to know when we think about transportation for these futures.” He said that they looked for a common thread, so if all three groups came up with the same answer they knew they were on the right track with that one.

Nelson commented that they came up with some challenges and opportunities: including aging population; urbanization; energy shifts; automation; persistent budget challenges; health care costs; increased global competition; changing work environments, telecommunications and access to services; and floods/water quality. He gave a brief overview on each of the challenges/opportunities.

Nelson stated that they also developed some guiding principles to go along with the vision. He said that some of these principles we will want to apply to our decision making in the future. They include: leverage public investments to achieve multiple purposes; ensure accessibility; build to a maintenance scale; ensure regional connections; integrate safety; emphasize reliable and predictable options; strategically fix the system; and use partnerships. He also gave a brief overview on each of these principles as well.

Nelson said that they were accepting comments on this draft until Friday, October 21st, at 4:30 p.m. He added that they held a public hearing on October 4th, and details are available at WWW.minnesotago.org.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19th, 2011**

Nelson reported that when they finish the vision, they will really just be getting started. He stated that they will then start updating the Statewide Multi-Modal Transportation Plan, and Mr. Haugen and himself talked prior to this meeting about how they can effectively get the MPOs involved in that process. He added that once the Statewide Multi-Modal Transportation Plan is completed they will then move on to the Policy Plan; then to the Highway Investment Plan; and then to other Multi-Modal Investment Plans.

Discussion/Questions:

None.

Information only.

MATTER OF CONSIDERATION OF GRAND FORKS COUNTY PROJECT FOR 2013-2016 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that, as everyone knows, the federal projects that are in the MPO study area need to show up in our T.I.P. document. He stated that this is the first time that Grand Forks County is proposing a project using federal funds.

Haugen commented that this is a basic mill and overlay project, scheduled for 2013, that involves DeMers Avenue, west of the Amtrak Station, or west of 55th Street out to Airport Road, or County Road 25. He said that the federal share is \$536,896.80, and the local share \$134,224.20, for a total project cost of \$671,121.00.

Haugen stated that both staff and the Technical Advisory Committee recommend the MPO Executive Policy Board approve this project, and give it a priority ranking.

MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE LIST OF GRAND FORKS COUNTY CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE FY2013-2016 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING.

Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Powers, Adams, Strandell, Leigh, and Christensen.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON NORTHWEST EAST GRAND FORKS TRAFFIC CIRCULATION STUDY

Ellis reported that she will be giving a brief update on where we are with this study. She stated that they held their last Steering Committee meeting at the end of September, as well as a public open house. She said that at that time they were looking, again, at the intersection of U.S. Highway 2 and 5th Avenue N.W., as well as River Road, 12th Avenue N.W. and 17th Street N.W., and reviewing our traffic improvements, or traffic control for the Central Avenue Corridor to make sure that any changes that we see with traffic or signal timing will affect the actual study done before.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19th, 2011**

Ellis said that at the last meeting they went over all of the alternatives that were proposed by the consultants. She referred to a power point presentation and went over these alternatives briefly.

Alternatives for U.S. Highway 2/5th Avenue N.W. intersection included:

1. Do Nothing
2. Westbound Left Only Access
3. Three-Quarter Access
4. Signalized Full-Access

Pokrzywinski asked of the Westbound Left Only Access alternative also offer the opportunity to close the off-ramp. Ellis responded that, quite frankly, there is an option to close that off-ramp no matter what. Pokrzywinski explained that it is a road to no-where, that used to lead to River Road, but now the dikes is in the way. Ellis commented that the City should consider that it is very limited on its access so it would be a nice location for the T.E. project we have planned, and for which we have received funding, that currently is planned with a full intersection at 5th Avenue N.W., but that we are having to redesign because that intersection will not go in before the T.E. project.

Ellis pointed out that if you look at these alternatives, none of them affect right-of-way at all, nor do any of them affect the pool, nor is there any consideration for any commercial zoning changes either.

Ellis stated that during the public meeting there was some concern with not having a signal at the intersection of U.S. Highway 2 and 5th Avenue N.W., specifically with the left turn alternative, and whether or not crossing there would be a safety issue as you would be turning across two lanes of traffic. She added, however, that it would, during a flood event, give additional ins to the northend without having to go all the way to U.S. Highway 2 and 220, and then having to go back into the northwest corner. She pointed out that it doesn't provide straight across traffic so you will see some traffic increase, but not a lot. Pokrzywinski commented that it will allow for emergency vehicles to cross, correct. Ellis responded that they are considering allowing that, but other alternatives are also being considered as well.

Ellis reported that the cost of a three-quarter access is high, however not as high as a full signalized access, which has been the preferred alternative for two past studies, one in 1994 and one in 2006, and it is currently programmed in our T.I.P. for 2014. She stated that there have now been concerns with the cost, as well as the need for a full intersection at that location.

Ellis referred to a slide of U.S. Highway 2 and 5th Avenue N.W. Intersection Alternatives and went over it briefly.

Ellis stated that they have looked at all four of the alternatives, however at this point in time they just don't have a consensus as to which one of the four we want. She added that in speaking with the neighborhood, obviously nobody wants to see increased traffic by their homes, but at the same time those that live in the northeast corner see a lot of people crossing back and forth,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19th, 2011**

and a lot of pedestrian traffic, so, while they don't like the signal or the increased traffic, they do like the fact that if it were signalized it would allow for pedestrians to cross at a light.

Ellis commented that they did not have representation from the property owners on 5th Avenue N.W. on the Steering Committee, but that has now changed. She added that they are also working with MNDOT. She explained that in the State of Minnesota you have to go through a couple of different things to warrant a traffic signal, one is the Intersection Control Evaluation, consideration of a roundabout, and ample traffic to warrant a signal, and we aren't sure we meet the criteria to warrant a signal now, or in 2014, so we are looking at the modeling data to see when we might, so it may be an alternative that we keep in the plan, but it isn't something that we can do at this point.

Ellis reported that the next intersection is the River Road/12th Avenue N.W./17th Street N.W. intersection. She explained that where these three roads connect there is a very large, expansive intersection and right-of-way area. She stated that, although there isn't a lot of crash data available for this intersection, a lot of people have concerns, especially with left turns from 17th onto River Road because of the flood control structure, and having to watch traffic coming from two different roadways makes it harder.

Ellis stated that the first thing they looked at for intersection control here was a roundabout, and it does fit nicely here, and meets all the criteria, however the cost is high, and they aren't sure it is really necessary at this time, so, while they will keep it in as an alternative, it probably won't be considered at this time.

Ellis said that the second thing they looked at were changes to the curb so that 12th and 17th stop, and then merge and stop again, so the River Road north/south access would be the uncontrolled portion of the intersection. She stated that there would be very little cost associated with this, but it was kind of confusing to make traffic stop, move forward briefly, and stop again, so it didn't seem like a very logical choice. Pokrzywinski added that this option doesn't seem to really solve the problem with northbound traffic taking a left turn either. Ellis agreed.

Ellis reported that that last option would be to change curb lines so that it comes to more of a 90-degree, brings River Road in and it would now stop when heading south, and then through movement would be River Road onto 12th. She stated that this option provides a better site line, and the cost is very, very low as you are really just moving curb. She said that everyone at the meeting liked this option.

Ellis commented that they were asked to look at frontage roads. She referred to Exhibit 8, and stated that the first one, shown in black, is a frontage road that was planned in the 1994 study. She stated that since the 1994 study was done a lot has changed in this area, the right-of-way has been given back to the property owners, so if we do any sort of improvements to U.S. 2 and 5th that frontage road intersection gets awfully full so it becomes a conflict point, so they did look at another one, shown in red. She explained that this one is absolutely opposed by the neighborhood, and not really seen as necessary, so a frontage road idea has more or less been eliminated from the plan.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19th, 2011**

Ellis reported that the last thing they looked at was their Transportation Enhancement, or bikepath options. She stated that the first option is, if we do not close the off-ramp, to find a location for the bikepath on the south side of 10th. She said that it would require the removal of parking on the southend. She explained that as it turns and heads north, it would either run between the dike and the park facility, or in front of it. She added that the up and over option has been scraped as the dike facilities were not designed to have pedestrians traveling over it, so it has been removed. She stated that the second option would be to close the off-ramp and put the bike trail there. She referred to the matrix for this information, and went over it briefly.

Ellis referred to Exhibit 11, and explained that it shows, again, what the traffic improvements were, consideration of right-in/right-out, closing some of the intersections that have high crash rates. She pointed out that it also shows future roundabouts or traffic signals, explaining that roundabout must be considered in the State of Minnesota before we consider traffic signals.

Ellis said that they were also asked to look at what type of average daily traffic we would have in 2035 with all of the different options. She referred to Exhibit 12, and went over that information briefly.

Ellis reported that they have presented all of the alternatives, they have had public involvement, and will continue to develop the alternatives to provide better engineering and cost estimates. She stated that the final committee and public meetings on November 10th. She said that the committee meeting will be held here in the training conference room at 1:30 p.m. and the public meeting is at 5:30 that evening, also in the training conference room. She added that everyone is also welcome to submit any comments to her as well.

Strandell asked when the final decision would be made, and by whom. Ellis responded that she doesn't know if they are going to whittle it down to one alternative in the draft report, but she thinks they will provide the final draft with all alternatives in it, and then the City Council and MPO can make a decision.

Strandell asked what the City Council's opinions are on this. Pokrzywinski responded that there is considerable opposition to a fully signalized intersection at this time. He said that his position is, knowing that it probably isn't possible in 2014, as was scheduled, but he would like to at least leave the fully signalized intersection option in the plan, and take a step-by-step approach by initially adding the left turn lane for westbound traffic to open up more opportunities for people to get to the downtown. He added that he also feels the off-ramp should be closed because it really doesn't serve any useful purpose.

Pokrzywinski commented that one point Councilmember DeMers brought up was, if and when the Kennedy Bridge needs to be replaced, it will probably be raised, and we need to consider how that will affect River Road. He stated that if we have to build a new bridge, is that corridor going to be useful, so taking this option off the table is something that ???

Leigh stated that he is not in favor of a full intersection, and never was, but he thinks he could live with a three-quarter intersection.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19th, 2011**

Pokrzywinski commented, however, that another issue is funding, and there are some other projects that are eligible for City Sub-Target funds that the City Council is more in favor of doing.

Discussion ensued.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON WASHINGTON STREET/UNDERPASS STUDY

Haugen referred to slide 16 of the presentation (a copy of the presentation is included in the file and available upon request), explaining that at the last MPO Executive Policy Board meeting he went over some of these access management options, which are shown in the first few slides. He stated that he would also like to acknowledge the KLJ team present today, Jon Markusen and Mike Bittner, who have been involved on this study.

Haugen reported that they have engaged the public on this, and they have provided feedback. He stated that currently we have assembled, and presented to our Steering Committee, what the individual component costs are, and later in this presentation we will see how they are suggesting they be packaged and the timeframe for implementing them is.

Haugen stated that for the DeMers Avenue Intersection they are suggesting a continuous flow intersection concept be implemented. He pointed out that the cost of implementing this concept would be about \$14,000,000. Leigh asked what a continuous flow intersection is. Haugen referred to a slide illustrating how a continuous flow intersection looks, and explained how traffic would begin making left turns before they actually get to the intersection so that when they actually reach the intersection they would not be opposing the through movements.

Christensen asked, and he knows that it's on the agenda, but why are we even doing this, when are you presenting this to the City Council. Haugen responded that next week they are meeting with upper management for the NDDOT in order to get their feedback, so they would be looking at either late November or early December to give a presentation to the City Council and Service Safety. Christensen asked, just out of curiosity, why they wouldn't present this to the council now, so they can give some input before you just roll it out and give it to us, because, obviously this is a pretty big decision for their city. He added that this is true about the last item on the agenda as well, a presentation on roundabouts, as he just heard now that it is mandated in Minnesota to consider them, but it is not mandated in North Dakota. He said that this is all politics, but why wouldn't you get the City of Grand Forks' council involved so they know what you are doing rather than just rolling these out and saying that this is what the MPO says to do. He said that he is going to vote no on all these things until their council knows what is going on, and, although, he is here, and Mr. Adams is here, but he is on the Planning Commission, which, quite frankly is somewhat irrelevant, but your talking money, so why wouldn't you guys come over there and give us a couple presentations so we get a feel, and then he would like their council to make a policy decision on whether they are going to embrace MPOs, or not waste

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19th, 2011**

their time with them any longer, or they will do them, because, to him, that is good planning. He stated that this is an opinion, they'll get the presentations, but you've got to get the council to understand about roundabouts before you start planning them because one little roundabout is going in north of the, where is it again, is it 24th and something on the way into the mall. He asked what Mr. Adams thinks, as he is a representative, because he doesn't think he is speaking out of turn. Adams responded that he is just following what the MPO does. Haugen responded that on this particular study they have a steering committee, on which they have a City Council representative, and they invite all council members to those meetings. Christensen stated that they are all part-time, they all have day jobs so they can't come during the day, they can't come to the meetings, they set aside 5:30 every week for a meeting, but they could have a joint meeting on Wednesday, but nobody knows about roundabouts on their council, except maybe Mr. Kruen.

Haugen reported that with this particular study they worked through all the alternatives, and are still presenting those alternatives. He said that they do have, from a technical perspective, the recommendations for that particular intersection, but it is a State Highway so they are going to upper management to get their perspective on it. He explained that their program schedule is to go to both Service Safety and the City Council, but they can go before the Finance Committee as well if you want, but the process, as we understood the City wanted to be engaged on this study, and all studies, was for us to work through your technical issues, to have representatives from the City Council, Planning Commission, and our staff to work through the issues, and then, once we get to the point where we have something to recommend, then engage at the Service Safety Committee, then to the City Council, but now are you suggesting something different. Christensen stated that Mr. Glassheim, who is not on the Service Safety Committee, that is his ward, so what he would ask is, rather than going through the Service Safety Committee with something as big and expensive as this, is schedule one or two meetings with the council so they get a feel for it, that's the number one thing he would ask, and if you're going to give presentations on roundabouts in the future, and he would ask that you do that, and it is going to be at his committee, because he wants to get resolution as to what their appetite is for roundabouts.

Christensen pointed out that your affecting an awful lot of businesses on North and South Washington by your proposal here, and he notices your cutting off access to Simonson Gas Station, Burger King, taking some of Paradiso's lot, and he is sure that the owner of Paradiso doesn't know about this yet, Mr. Anbery, and he should be told. He added that he is also sure that Mr. Simonson would have concerns, as would Mr. Marshall. He stated that he thinks there has got to be a little bit more informed input when studying these things. Haugen responded that they will certainly re-evaluate the input that they have had during the process so far, but they have done quite a bit of outreach to the public on this study, sending individual mailings to the properties along the corridor, physically sitting along the corridor at times, and getting the Chamber involved as well. Christensen stated that the Chamber isn't affected, property owners are affected and he is just trying to make sure that the people your going to affect know what the rest of you all are doing as far as planning their future. Haugen responded that he understands, but the reason for including the Chamber is because they have more interaction with those

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19th, 2011**

property owners, so they have more opportunity to interact to make sure the owners are receiving the mailings, that they are being informed, and if they aren't comfortable giving feedback, the Chamber can provide that feedback for them. He added, again, that they will certainly re-evaluate where they are at, and if the direction is that you want council presentations early and often, we will do that, but that hasn't been our directive to-date. Christensen stated that he will see if the council wants to change that direction.

Haugen stated that the purpose of this particular presentation is to keep the board informed as to where we are at with the study. He pointed out that we now have costs associated with all the alternatives we previously discussed. He then went over those costs briefly.

Haugen then referred to slides discussing the implementation of these alternatives, and went over them briefly.

Haugen commented that the MPO is currently soliciting for projects for our next T.I.P.. He stated that last year the district did submit a request to consider replacing the underpass structure, and, based on this study, and what we have from upper management, we are anticipating a similar request this year, however, it doesn't seem like there is a lot of support to do the DeMers Avenue Intersection at the same time.

Haugen reported that on October 27th they will be presenting the corridor study, to-date, and instead of monthly meetings they will be going to upper management and take them from cradle to what we have now in the study process to get their feedback. He said that they will adjust their recommendations based on that feedback.

Information only.

MATTER OF PRESENTATION ON ROUNDABOUTS

Haugen reported that he submitted, via e-mail, several sites for the board to check out on roundabouts. He said that he would like to play a movie from FHWA on roundabouts today. He stated that he also wanted to mention that on the State of Minnesota's maps you will see that they highlight roundabouts. He added that he also gave everyone a spreadsheet that shows how many roundabouts there are in Minnesota, with around a hundred currently, and more planned in the future. He stated that in both North Dakota and Minnesota, when you take your driver's test there is a section on roundabouts that you are tested on. He commented that he also e-mailed everyone about a project in Killdeer, ND, where two state highways intersect, where one of their alternatives is to consider a roundabout. He stated that they are currently assembling a list of roundabouts in North Dakota, similar to the Minnesota list. He said that currently they are most prevalent to the south of us, there are about a dozen in place, with more planned for the future.

Movie ensued.

Haugen stated that back in 2008 the MPO did a study for the City of Grand Forks of their collector to collector intersections. He said that before we engaged in this they went through a

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19th, 2011**

process of identifying whether Grand Forks wanted us to look at roundabout or not, and the decision at that time was that they did want them to be considered as one of the alternatives for their collector to collector intersections. He commented that not all intersections merit roundabouts, but there were some that did that are part of the study.

Haugen reported that on the 47th Avenue Study that Ms. Ellis gave an update on last month, one of the reasons, in addition to what you just saw, why roundabouts were identified as a good solution is that the cost of one is about \$150,000 less than putting in a traffic signal at 20th and 47th, so on top of all the other benefits, the cost to implement it is \$150,000 less, and it will be cheaper to maintain in the future as well.

Haugen stated that he would be happy to give this presentation to the Finance Committee if you wish, or to any other committee/commission you want. Christensen asked for a copy of the report Mr. Haugen is referencing. Haugen gave him a copy of the report as requested.

Christensen said that \$150,000 is insignificant to him, in the study you presented, because this will be a major thoroughfare in our city for years to come, and this piece you put up says that you have to have stakeholder involvement, which means that there has to be education, and it is also saying that you have to have, there is going to be a whole bunch of old people driving through those, so why would you ??? those old people. He commented that your population is going to age significantly in the next 20 years, and there will be more old people than young driving through that intersection, and they have to be trained, so there is a reason why people say "you can't teach an old dog new tricks". He added that if you are going to implement one of these, implement it someplace where people get an opportunity to learn rather than on some major thoroughfare. He stated that another thing, and you don't mention it in the study, but your going to have kids walking across here, so the stakeholders weren't thinking about their kids walking across a roundabout to go to that school, and he also heard something about an underpass and Mr. Leigh saying that they didn't want an underpass because of bullying. He said that this is something that your all taught wherever you go to school, and then you come back and you are engaged in planning, and the campaign is to do this, make sure that as the campaign to do this is there that the people that you are going to ask to take an appropriateness, and go to the grocery store and listen to the comments, can support it.

Christensen commented that is isn't going to be there five or ten year when that roundabout is built, but there are going to be people there so be careful how you think it, and the people that your talking about building that little three-way roundabout behind Target, that isn't a high traffic area, it is cleverly hidden, and if your going to really believe what your saying as far as Fargo, then get stakeholders from there to come up and present as to why their good, and get stakeholders to present as to why they were a "Doubting Thomas" ????. He said that these are very, very new and novel, and the cynic in him would just say, if you want a roundabout then put one in at DeMers and South Washington if it is so safe. Haugen responded that they studied that, but the footprint would be so huge.

Powers shared that he was recently on a trip to Michigan, and on the way home they went through Duluth to avoid all the traffic on 35W, and they went through a roundabout. He stated

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19th, 2011**

that he wasn't driving, his brother-in-law was, but there was a semi in front of us, and just like on the video we just saw, he went around that thing and made a left hand turn and it was incredibly smooth, and he was impressed, but, there again, like Mr. Christensen said, these people have probably been through them more than once, but the traffic movement hardly slowed down.

Christensen stated that when you hit a roundabout for the first time your scared silly, and he has been through them. He shared that twenty-five years ago, when he was in Massachusetts, and he went through one and he drove the circle a couple of times trying to get out of it.

Haugen reported that if you go to a hockey game in Fargo you will be driving through a roundabout, if you go to the new high school you will be going through a roundabout to get there. He said that those are the areas in Fargo, the growth areas, that they are putting them.

Haugen commented that, as you can see in our studies we are considering them, and as you'll see when you read this we aren't always recommending them, and we are a little bit more judicious on where we think they will work best. He pointed out that, as Ms. Ellis mentioned earlier, putting one in East Grand Forks would work very well, but the cost is high so we aren't suggesting one be put in at this time.

Christensen stated that you aren't going to get one built until you build it, and your not going to get one approved until people understand how they work. Ellis said that it is an alternative in the study, but it doesn't mean it will be done. Christensen added that the issue is, if your going to build it, then build it where there is limited use, not where there is high use. Haugen stated that he thinks the one at 24th and 34th, which came from this study, is programmed to be built in 2014, so it would be in use for a few years before the one at 47th would be considered, so people can get used to one.

Strandell commented that the two concerns he has are snow removal and night driving, because you would have lights coming from you from a number of areas. Ellis responded that they would similar to a cul-de-sac, in terms of snow removal, and they seem to be able to get the snow out of them. Strandell said, however, that cul-de-sacs don't have the traffic issue a roundabout would. Ells responded that there are definitely ways that Fargo/Moorhead has dealt with that. Christensen stated that there are several council members that are dead set against cul-de-sacs as well.

Christensen concluded by stating that he is simply suggesting that if your going to put in roundabouts you educate people more so that they know they are coming and how they work. He added that when it comes to the one on 47th, things will be real interesting, and you can rest assured that there will be more than one public hearing on that one before it is ever built because it is a high traffic area.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19th, 2011**

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO ADJOURN THE OCTOBER 19TH,
2011, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:40 P.M.***

Voting Aye: Powers, Adams, Strandell, Leigh, and Christensen.

Voting Nay: None.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Thursday, December 15th, 2011 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Warren Strandell, Chairman, called the December 15th, 2011, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:05 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Warren Strandell, Mike Powers, Mike Pokrzywinski, Steve Adams, Gary Malm, and Doug Christensen.

Absent were: Greg Leigh and Tyrone Grandstrand.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Nancy Ellis, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF Planner; Bryan McCoy, GF/EGF Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF Office Manager.

Guest(s) present were: Bill Troe, URS; and Rich Romness, GF City Engineering.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Strandell declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 19TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY POKRZYWINSKI, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 19TH, 2011, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Powers, Pokrzywinski, Malm, Adams, Strandell, and Christensen.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF AMENDMENT TO THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Haugen reported that this is the final step of a request made by the City of Grand Forks to flip-flop a couple of projects. He explained that currently the 17th Avenue Overpass project is programmed to occur mid-term in our Long Range Transportation Plan; however the City wants to switch that project with the South Columbia Road, South of 36th Avenue, conversion project that is currently programmed to occur long-term in the plan.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, December 15th, 2011**

Haugen commented that both the Technical Advisory Committee and the MPO Executive Policy Board gave the amendment preliminary approval back in September; that both the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council gave it final approval; and yesterday the Technical Advisory Committee approved forwarding a recommendation to this body to also give it final approval.

Haugen pointed out that a copy of the proposed resolution adopting this amendment was included in the packets. He explained that the document itself will only need to have a couple of changes made, not a whole rewrite. He stated that they have noted that the 17th Avenue Overpass project will be moved to the long-term portion of the document, and the Columbia Road Reconstruction project will be moved to the mid-term portion of the document.

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN TO MOVE THE 17TH AVENUE OVERPASS PROJECT TO THE LONG-TERM PORTION OF THE DOCUMENT, AND THE COLUMBIA ROAD RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT TO THE MID-TERM PORTION OF THE DOCUMENT.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF CANDIDATE NORTH DAKOTA PROJECTS FOR THE 2013-2016 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that in December of each year staff asks this body to consider candidate projects for the next T.I.P./S.T.I.P. cycle, and this year they are doing the same for Fiscal Years 2013-2016, however they are only asking for consideration of North Dakota projects at this time.

Haugen commented that it is this body's responsibility to review all of the candidate projects and determine whether or not they are consistent with the MPO's Long Range Transportation Plan, and to prioritize the projects in the event there are more than one.

Power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) ensued.

Haugen stated that they did address the year of expenditure issue. He explained that last year at this time they were being told that they should use a revenue forecast of 3% per year growth in our revenue forecasts, however this year they were informed that we need to project zero growth with regards to revenue, thus this T.I.P. cycle has \$800,000 less than we did last year going into it.

Haugen commented that North Dakota is also using their obligation limit, which is typically around 90%. He explained that last year we started off with a \$3,000,000 program, but this year it is down to \$2,600,000, which means we lost \$400,000 right from the start. He added, however that the program will now remain flat for the next four years, so it has taken a total hit of about \$2,000,000.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, December 15th, 2011**

Haugen reported that the programs he will be covering today are: Transportation Enhancements; Safe Routes To School; Urban Local; Urban Regional; and County Roads, which was actually done last October, and involved a mill and overlay of DeMers Avenue out by the Airport. He explained that for all of the projects we currently have programmed in our T.I.P., the amounts shown are available to that project, so we didn't lose any of the funds that are currently programmed. He stated that we still have to show that the plan is fiscally constrained; which means that there aren't the additional funds we would seek if it were possible. He pointed out that those projects shown in the red box appear as they are currently programmed; however, we are submitting to NDDOT, for consideration, illustrative projects that are the same projects for which we have the most current cost estimates. He added they then had to address those cost estimates at a higher amount to allow for the State to determine whether or not they still want to do the project.

Haugen continued with the presentation, going over the status of each of the current T.I.P. projects briefly.

Powers asked, in regard to the Safe Routes To School FY2013 Project, will any of the schools be affected by the proposal to close some of the schools in the area. Haugen responded that they may be. He stated that there may be some boundary changes, as well as some school closings, which could result in us no longer needing crossings at all in some locations, and ultimately in a need to relocate additional beacons as well.

Haugen reported that in FY2016 there are two new projects, one being the Kennedy Bridge Rehabilitation Project. He explained that, as stated earlier, because the project development for this project is still ongoing, there is a slight possibility that they may replace the Kennedy rather than rehabbing it, but at this time we are still looking at a rehabilitation project. Pokryzwinski asked if they would address better pedestrian access on the Kennedy whether it is rehabbed or replaced. Haugen responded that they have to address that issue in the project development, however he has not seen anything yet, but will follow up to see what is being proposed. Pokryzwinski asked if there would be public hearings held before they make any final recommendations, and will we have the opportunity to provide input on those recommendations. Haugen responded that there will be public hearings, and you will have the opportunity to provide input.

Haugen commented that beyond the final T.I.P. year of 2016 we show some additional projects. He stated that in FY2017 the Washington Street Underpass Replacement Project is shown with a cost estimate of \$14.1 Million, however this may change once the study we are currently doing is completed. He said that in FY2018 the Sorlie Bridge Replacement Project is shown with a cost estimate of \$25 Million. He explained that the cost will be split 50/50 split between Minnesota and North Dakota, with NDDOT being the lead agency, and they are still working out the memorandum of understanding that identifies the relationship each agency has to the other.

Haugen reported that, in summary on the Urban Local side, there aren't too many changes to the current program, however we are also submitting several illustrative projects to reflect higher costs to hopefully get higher federal participation for those projects. He stated that on the Urban

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, December 15th, 2011**

Regional side they had kind of the opposite occur in that we re-scoped projects to lower the costs and add an additional project in FY2013. He commented that for the Transportation Enhancement projects there are two, with the South 20th Street Multi-Purpose Trail Reconstruction Project being the top priority. He stated that for Safe Routes To School they are looking at remote radio controlled beacons for 22 locations.

Haugen reported that the Technical Advisory Committee reviewed these projects, and, along with staff, are recommending that they are consistent with the MPO's Long Range Transportation Plan, and that they should be approved in the order they are identified.

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE LIST OF NORTH DAKOTA CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE FY2013-2016 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO RANK THEM IN THE ORDER THEY ARE IDENTIFIED.

Pokrzywinski asked what contributed to the lower costs on the Urban Regional projects. Haugen responded that a lot of the work involved with the Gateway Drive projects is the same work that was just done on Gateway Drive. He explained that when the estimates were done before they based it on what they thought the cost would be, without an actual bid, but now they have a more realistic cost to base the estimates on.

***Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Powers, Adams, Strandell, Malm, and Christensen.
Voting Nay: None.***

MATTER OF UPDATE TO THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN, THE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MANUAL, AND THE TITLE VI PLAN

Haugen explained that essentially these are some of the requirements we have to meet in order to have access to federal transportation funds. He stated that back in May Federal Highway identified that we needed to update our Public Participation Plan, and when we did that it caused us to have to also look at our Environmental Justice Manual and also our Title VI Plan as well. He added that, for the most part, the updates are just to the demographic data in each of the plans, so we will now have Mr. McCoy walk us through those changes.

McCoy referred to a slide presentation, and went over the changes made to each of the plans.

Presentation ensued.

Haugen commented that staff is seeking preliminary approval to these documents. He stated that because this impacts the Public Participation Plan, there is a federal requirement that there be a 45-day comment period, so action today would start that process. He said that once the 45-day period is completed they will adjust the plan to reflect any comments received and seek final approval of the documents.

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY MALM, TO GRANT PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN, ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

MANUAL, AND TITLE VI PLAN; AND TO RELEASE THEM TO A 45-DAY PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.

Malm asked where all the statistics discussed are obtained. Haugen responded that the 2010 Census is where they get the block-by-block level data, the ethnic minority. He added that for the poverty and limited English proficiency (LEP), that data comes from the American Community Survey, which is a census product that involves an annual survey of a sample of the population. He stated that once they do the survey they build up the samples, and we are using five-year rolling data that comes from those surveys. He added that, if you will recall, in the past they used both a short-form and a long-form survey to gather census information, and the long-form had a lot of detailed questions and was sent out every ten years, but now that long-form is essentially mailed out every year to a small sample area, and they use it as a rolling generation of population characteristics. Pokryzwinski asked what percentage of the long-form surveys are not returned. Haugen stated that he would research that and give an answer at the next meeting.

Pokryzwinski asked if area near UND, shown in blue box, was an area where there is a higher incidence of poverty. Christensen asked why he would think the area was poor, they're paying tuition. Pokryzwinski responded that that area is one that reaches a level of poverty that is high enough that it qualifies for Environmental Justice considerations. Christensen commented that that area is owned by the State of North Dakota, so we don't care, we don't have to concern ourselves with that area. Pokryzwinski responded that he isn't concerned himself, but he is curious as to why, in this whole community, that area stands out above anyplace else. Christensen stated that it is all University Housing. Pokryzwinski asked, then, why isn't there any other spot on the University Campus that reaches that level. Haugen responded that this is a very compact, dense geography that has a lot of population in it, and right above it you see a larger geography, which has less people, and is more diverse so it does not qualify for Environmental Justice consideration.

Haugen reported that the intent of this is that wherever we show any larger than average poverty or minority population we should make sure that we aren't adversely affecting them. Christensen asked how does the MPO adversely impact this area, deny them streets. Haugen responded that we identify the population, then we determine if there is an adverse impact, and there isn't, so then we are done with the Environmental Justice manual, but if the City or State were to do a project, such as University Avenue, they would have to go a little bit further in the document.

Voting Aye: Pokryzwinski, Powers, Adams, Strandell, Malm, and Christensen.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE SOUTH WASHINGTON WELLNESS CENTER STUDY

Ellis reported that they are in the final stages of approving the report for the South Washington Street/Wellness Center Study. She stated that the final report has been presented to all of the pertinent boards and commissions, and no changes have been made, and it has been available for review on the MPO website for some time, so she is now seeking final approval from the MPO Executive Policy Board as well.

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY MALM, TO GRANT FINAL APPROVAL OF THE SOUTH WASHINGTON STREET/WELLNESS CENTER STUDY FINAL REPORT.

Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Powers, Adams, Strandell, Malm, and Christensen.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF UPDATE TO THE TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Bill Troe, consultant from URS Corporation, was present for a brief presentation on the Transit Development Plan Update.

Troe reported that over the course of this week they met with the Transit Development Steering Committee, held a public open house in Grand Forks last evening, and will hold a public open house in East Grand Forks tonight.

Troe referred to a power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request), and gave a brief update on the Transit Development Plan Update.

Presentation ensued.

Troe stated that he is looking for input.

Christensen asked if this report was presented to the Service Safety Committee last Tuesday. Haugen responded that it was, that one council member, Councilman Bjerke, remained for the presentation, one had to leave early, and the other was absent. Christensen asked what the remaining council member's thoughts were. Haugen responded that Councilman Bjerke knows that, as presented, our current routes cannot remain as they are as they have on-time performance problems, so we have to do something to those routes. He added that we not only need to address the on-time performance issues, but we also have issues with the productivity performance of some of the routes as well. He explained that we have some routes that are considerable higher in the ridership of other routes, but overall our system is substantially underperforming what our peers are doing on a per mile and per hour basis, in terms of ridership. Christensen asked why we care. Haugen responded that it gives us an idea of how unproductive or productive our routes are. He stated that we can invest the same amount of money, and only carry a third of the people that we can in other areas, or we can invest the same amount of money and try to get more productivity out of a route that is going to areas that might generate more ridership if we have more frequent service.

Christensen asked the MPO gets involved other than you have to run it by us. Haugen responded that we have to ultimately approve what is being done with the federal resources in the City's overall system. He added that we also have to approve all of the requests for funding assistance. Christensen stated then, that this is just a review, so when is the City of Grand Forks going to actually get involved in helping change the ridership review. Haugen responded that it will be in January or February. He stated that they have gathered and prioritized all the data, have received public input, have given some ideas on some of the changes that could be made, and now we have to analyze these findings.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, December 15th, 2011**

Christensen asked how many people actually attended the public meetings. Troe responded that they had two people attend last evening's meeting, prior to that there were maybe a dozen people at the Grand Forks meeting and none at the East Grand Forks meeting, and prior to that maybe twenty total.

Christensen commented that, let's assume those attending were riders, and having seen this now more times than anyone else in this room, other than Earl and yourself, if your going to mess with the stops where the people are expecting to get picked up as they have been, your going to have some issues. He added that, if you also think you are going to consolidate the people that are coming on South Washington, it is his experience that the people that ride the bus aren't that ambulatory, and you will need to address that as well. He stated that another thing is, if you are going to mess with Columbia Mall and Altru, then he would suggest that you work with them to add a drop-off spot from which they can shuttle people to and from their establishment. He commented that the problem is you have all those people riding the bus to get to a specific place, and you are going to make it harder for them to get there, they aren't going to be happy, so we aren't going to be able to take it away without a good alternative. He added that you can suggest whatever you want to suggest in the interest of two or three minute savings, but he is more concerned with people expecting a certain kind of service, and you are going to take that away in the interest of keeping with a 30-minute schedule, then you have to have a place to drop them off and move them around on the property.

Christensen stated that, as far as the Industrial Park area is concerned, been there, done that, and we don't have to spend a lot of time on that one. He asked if East Grand Forks has only one bus route. Troe responded that there are two routes, but it is operated by one bus.

Christensen said that he appreciates Mr. Troe's presentation, but some of the things he is suggesting are going to cause problems, and he knows that the pushback will be at the council, and anytime you change the norm, you have to have a solution. Troe asked what the solution would be for the performance issues, are you willing to add more revenue to the transit system to rework the routes in order for them to stay on time but still maintain the same level of service. Christensen responded that, until he is convinced that there is a reason for him to put an additional \$350,000 into this program, of city monies as opposed to federal monies, he doesn't care about two or three minutes.

Christensen commented that areas where you really get slowed down are Target, Altru, and Columbia Mall, and you could save and get these things set up by telling Altru to get their own campus transit, and you could do the same at Columbia Mall. Malm stated that the problem is there are several stops at each of these campuses. Christensen responded that we need to tell them that there will only be one stop from now on, and they will then be responsible to moving their clients from that stop to any other stops they want to provide. He added that he is sitting here, and he is a member of the public and is giving his time to do this, and the long and short of this is we don't need to sit here and solve a management problem, take this back to the person running the buses, Mr. Bergman, and get him to take care of it. Malm stated that Mr. Bergman

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, December 15th, 2011**

wants to do that. Christensen asked why he doesn't then. Troe responded that he doesn't do it due to a policy from the City Council that flag stops is the way to do things. Christensen directed that this be given back to the Public Safety Committee, rather than spend a lot of time on this, give it back to them and say, what is your recommendation, and see if you can get the other two members there, or we'll have a task force look at it. He added that he could get it done next week, we can get Mr. Feland, or whoever, and get it done. Haugen responded that the issue is, because it is affecting federal funds we have to follow a certain process. Christensen stated that they will speed things up at a local level. He added that they don't need 60 or 70 people, plus two or three meetings, and a whole bunch of people telling us that we are going to have to shut down our bus service, and talking about all our empty buses, which happens every time.

Christensen commented that he thinks Mr. Troe is doing a great job, and has provided some really good information, but it points out a problem in management, and maybe it's policies.

Information only.

MATTER OF AUTHORIZING THE CHAIRMAN AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO SIGN THE MINNESOTA CALENDAR YEAR 2012 STATE PLANNING AGREEMENTS

Haugen reported that each year we get a contract with Minnesota for state funds, and he is requesting the board authorize the Chairman and the Executive Director sign those contracts to give us access to those funds for the calendar year 2012.

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING THE CHAIRMAN AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO SIGN THE MINNESOTA CALENDAR YEAR 2012 STATE PLANNING AGREEMENTS.

***Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Powers, Adams, Strandell, Malm, and Christensen.
Voting Nay: None.***

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF HOLIDAY BONUS HOURS

Haugen reminded the board that the MPO follows the City of Grand Forks personnel policies, He stated that on their agenda for their meeting next Monday night is consideration of granting approval of four holiday bonus hours, so we are asking that you grant the same for MPO employees, subject to Grand Forks City Council adopts that Monday night.

MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY POKRZYWINSKI, TO APPROVE A FOUR HOUR HOLIDAY BONUS FOR MPO EMPLOYEES, SUBJECT TO THE GRAND FORKS CITY COUNCIL ADOPTING THE SAME.

***Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Powers, Adams, Strandell, Malm, and Christensen.
Voting Nay: None.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, December 15th, 2011**

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Thank You

Williams stated that she would like to take this opportunity to thank the MPO, Nancy Ellis, and all the staff members that worked on the Wellness Center traffic report. She said that traffic information from that report was submitted to the state for a traffic signal at 40th and Washington, and this saved them a lot of staff time.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY POKRZYWINSKI, TO ADJOURN THE DECEMBER 15TH, 2011, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:16 P.M.

Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Powers, Adams, Strandell, Malm, and Christensen.

Voting Nay: None.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager