

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE  
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

**Friday, April 16, 2004 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers**

Dick Grassel, Chairman, called the meeting to order with the following members present: Gary Malm, Eugene (Jeep) Mattson, Proxy for Warren Strandell; Gary Sanders, and Doug Christensen. Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Ryan Brooks, GF/EGF MPO Planner, Senior; Lane Magnuson, GF/EGF MPO Planner, Senior; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Administrative Specialist, Senior.

Guests present were: Al Grasser, GF City Engineer.

A quorum was present.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

*Moved by Malm, seconded by Sanders, to approve the March 12, 2004, minutes of the MPO Executive Policy Board, as read. Motion carried unanimously.*

**MATTER OF DRAFT FY2005-2007 T.I.P.**

Haugen referred to the packet and reported that copies of the Draft FY2005-2006 T.I.P. tables that were distributed for public comment, as well as colored table sheets, on which it was hoped all the corrections had been made, however, at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting on Wednesday, April 14, 2004, some additional change were made. He added that a public hearing was held at that meeting as well, and no comments were received from the public, nor did he receive any during the ten-day comment period prior to the public hearing.

Haugen distributed copies of the latest revised copies of the Draft FY2005-2006 T.I.P. tables, and went over the changes that occurred at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting, which are different than those changes reflected in the colored sheets.

Haugen referred to Page 7, Grand Forks Project #14, and explained that this is the 42<sup>nd</sup> Street Underpass Project. He pointed out that the colored sheets show that Project #14 has a total federal amount of \$6,972,000, and that we tried to note in the remarks section that only \$400,000 of that amount will be available in 2007, with the remaining \$6,572,000 anticipated being funded in 2008. He commented that NDDOT requested that we only show \$400,000 in the actual federal dollar amount, so you will see on the revised tables that only \$400,000 is shown, and then next year, when we do a T.I.P. document for FY2006-2008, we will show the remaining federal dollars necessary for this project. He added that the project will still be done in 2007, with advanced construction dollars. Grassel asked if the total amount of this project is \$10,224,000.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Friday, April 16, 2004**

Haugen responded that it is was. He went on to explain that they had previously been using a \$6,700,000 cost of construction amount, and that cost was developed back in 1998 or 1999, and was just carried forward, but since the decision to actually get the project done and completed, city staff in Grand Forks reviewed the cost, and using actual inflation factors, they brought the cost up to where it should be.

Grassel asked what design concept is being used, and whether or not there are any drawings of the design available. Haugen responded that there are drawings available, that this was actually part of the 42<sup>nd</sup> Street Project Concept Report, that was done when 42<sup>nd</sup> Street went from a two lane rural section to the urban section it currently is, however, at that time the decision was made to not do the underpass. He added that the basic concept is, taking the current alignment of 42<sup>nd</sup> Street, going north and south, that movement will swing slightly to the west, go underneath DeMers Avenue and the railroad track, and then come back up and swing slightly to the east to reach University Avenue. He said that the connection back to DeMers Avenue, the actual intersection for the southern leg of 42<sup>nd</sup> Street will remain in place, and a small connecting roadway will be constructed to get you back to 42<sup>nd</sup> Street.

Haugen reported that on the Minnesota side, the transit numbers show that the total cost of the fixed route system and the dial-a-ride system were altered from what was shown on the colored sheets. He stated that he could go over each of them individually if desired, however, the whole purpose of the MNDOT requested changes was to allow East Grand Forks to have a slightly higher operating cost in place, and the State funds remained the same.

Haugen stated that, with those changes, the Technical Advisory Committee, and staff, recommend you adopt the Draft FY2005-2007 T.I.P..

Christensen referred to the East Grand Forks project list, and asked when the Visitor's/Tourist Information Center is going to be built. Haugen responded that it is programmed in 2005, however there is still some work being done with the State's involvement, which is shown as being \$2,700,000, and both the DNR and the City of East Grand Forks are still trying to get it part of a bonding bill. He added that they did apply for enhancement dollars, and were awarded them, so until that project is a complete flop and pulled totally, it will still show up in the T.I.P. document as being a possible project. Christensen asked if this project was going to happen. Grassel responded that their intentions are to build this, however we have to go to the State every year and beg that it be put in the bonding issue, but it did not make it this year. Sanders commented that what has happened is, DNR is the entity building this, and they are not very happy about having to use money unless it is used inside for an Interpretation Center, and if the State bonds for it, they don't want to have to put up the federal money.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Friday, April 16, 2004**

Grassel referred to East Grand Forks Project #17 – 13<sup>th</sup> Street S.E. Project, and reported that on Tuesday, Congressman Peterson was here to announce that we received \$1,200,000 in funding for this project. Haugen commented that this is correct, that the City has been awarded these monies in the House version of the Highway Bill, however, until the House and Senate Conference Committee report comes out and says that it has been passed by both Chambers, and also signed by the President, we don't know for certain that the project is funded. He pointed out that because of this, we actually have this listed twice; first as Project #17, which shows the ATP money we got through the ATP Subtarget process, with which we will do half of the project. He explained that what happened then was that when we went to the ATP stating that we really need this connection, and that it would be much easier if we just do the new road rather than reconstruct the road in front of South Point, we received the \$255,000. He referred to the Illustrative Project List, the last project on the list, and explained that the \$1,500,000, once again, is for the total project, and that \$1,200,000 has been earmarked. He stated that as soon as we get that information in the final Highway Bill, then we have a couple of options available to us: 1) if you want to construct in 2005, and if we know that before final approval is given in June or July, then we can add it in; and 2) if you want it done in 2006, 2007, or another year, then, next year when we do the T.I.P., we will just plug it into the appropriate year.

*Moved by Sanders, seconded by Malm, to approve adopting the Draft FY2005-2007 T.I.P. as revised. Motion carried unanimously.*

Christensen stated that he would like to take this opportunity to thank everyone for doing such a great job getting the 42<sup>nd</sup> Street Underpass Project up and programmed, that it was just such a great effort and he really likes to see staff do those kinds of things, so, for the record he is really complimenting staff for all their hard work.

**MATTER OF AUTHORIZING THE FINANCE COMMITTEE TO EXECUTE THE  
CONTRACT FOR THE MERRIFIELD BRIDGE STUDY**

Haugen commented that, in looking at future schedules, it appears that we may want to consider authorizing the Finance Committee to be able to enter into a contract to do the Merrifield Bridge Study. He explained that, in the past, this has been done to help expedite the process by doing this, and if you do not do so now, we can certainly schedule another Executive Policy Board Meeting, but for only one agenda item, it would seem more appropriate to allow the Finance Committee to handle it. He added that proposals are due April 27<sup>th</sup>, after receiving those proposals the Selection Committee would review them, hold interviews, and make a recommendation on who should be hired by May 5<sup>th</sup>, so the Finance Committee could then meet on May 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, or 7<sup>th</sup>, so we can have a consultant on board as soon as possible to get that project underway.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Friday, April 16, 2004**

*Moved by Christensen, seconded by Malm, to approve authorizing the Finance Committee to Execute the Contract for the Merrifield Bridge Study. Motion carried unanimously.*

After some discussion, consensus was that the meeting be held on May 6<sup>th</sup>, at 12:00 Noon.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

*Moved by Malm, seconded by Christensen, to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried unanimously.*

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis  
Administrative Specialist, Senior