

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

**Thursday, December 18th, 2008 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers**

CALL TO ORDER

Punky Beauchamp, Chairman, called the December 18th, 2008, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:09 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Punky Beauchamp, Gary Malm, Dick Grassel, Greg Leigh, Warren Strandell, Steve Adams, and Doug Christensen.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Chairman Beauchamp declared a quorum was present.

APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 20TH, 2008, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY GRASSEL, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 20TH, 2008 MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Malm, Leigh, Grassel, Strandell, Beauchamp, and Adams..

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MINNESOTA/4TH AVENUE CORRIDOR STUDY FINAL REPORT

Ellis reported that we are nearing the end of completion of the Minnesota/4th Avenue Corridor Study. She reminded the board that she did present the draft report and recommendations at the November 20th meeting, at which time Mr. Christensen asked that a flow chart be developed for the Grand Forks City Council, Safety Service Commission, etc., that would show all of the funding options available to us, which she did include copies of in the packet.

Ellis commented that other than the flow chart, no changes have been made to the document. She stated that it has been submitted to the Service Safety Committee, the Committee of the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, December 18th, 2008**

Whole, and the City Council, and has been approved by all. She added that it also received verification from the Historic Preservation Commission as well stating that they were in general agreement and understanding of the recommendations and were pleased with the process and happy with those recommendations.

Ellis referred to the flow chart and went over it briefly (a copy of which is included in the packet and available upon request) explaining that it includes the cost, how, and what type of funding options are available to use for the Minnesota/4th Avenue Corridor project if they were ever to program it in the T.I.P., and if they decide that they are going to proceed with construction or repair of that road. She stated that the total project cost is a little over \$4,000,000, with the base cost, if they were to just do a new concrete roadway and curbing, being \$3,000,000.

Ellis commented that the mitigation items, which are required because it is on the Federal Register; include the stamped concrete, the removal of the granitoid, and reuse in other locations, etc.. She stated that there is only one major funding source, the Urban Roads Program, which is an 80/20 split. She added that based on what most of you know in regards to funding, and what the actual split is, they can pull out the engineering costs, etc., and it may not necessarily be an 80/20 split then, but federal funds would cover up to 80%.

Ellis stated that the remaining portion, the context sensitive solutions, which include things like the roundabout, the entrance markers, the medians, the lighting, etc., are estimated to cost \$340,000. She said that there are a couple of different funding sources that can be used, including the Urban Roads Program, Urban T.E. funds, Historic T.E. funds (T.E. funds cannot be used to fund the roundabout); and HSIP/Safety funds, which can be used to fund a roundabout, using a 90/10 split.

Ellis commented that the project could also qualify for earmarks, which at this time are still available, but that may change in the future; or CDBG funds, so there are a couple of different funding sources available.

Ellis reported that this project is not included in the current T.I.P., but when asked why we would fix it, the response was that you to look at it as you would any arterial roadway in your city, and at some point all roadways need to be repaired, and this is no exception, so everyone was in agreement that, based on 2018, and the possibility of the Sorlie Bridge being replaced, it may need repair sooner than later. She stated that they did approve the study document, and the Historic Preservation group did send a letter of approval of the basic recommendations, so she is asking this body for their approval as well.

Grassel asked if staff feels that this project will get done. Ellis responded that she does feel it will get done, but the question will be how it gets done. She explained that historic mitigation is required, however, determining how that that process will be accomplished will need to be handled by the City and the Historic Preservation group. Haugen agreed that he too feels the project will get done. He explained that the next agenda item is a vehicle that can be used a little

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, December 18th, 2008**

more than it has been in the past to ensure that something like this project gets done, and that is programming of projects. He reported that in the past we have always reacted to the projects that have been forwarded to us, but we do have the ability to let everyone know ahead of time that we are looking for specific projects to be a priority for our funding decisions. He stated that in the future, next year when we program projects, this body can let it be known ahead of time that they are interested in funding certain projects; however, absent of doing that he thinks this project is to the point where a consensus has been reached on the scope and concepts for that corridor, and have received general agreement from the City Council that with the two bridge projects coming up this corridor will be very vital during those projects.

Grassel asked if they were trying to remove the historical mitigation costs from the \$4.1 million dollar total. Ellis responded that she doesn't think they can remove those costs because the granitoid is on the historical register, so they don't really have an option on whether they want to do the mitigation or not. She explained that they just broke the total out to show you what it would cost if it were any other road that would need the concrete replaced, minus the stamped concrete.

Grassel asked what they are looking at stamping, the total roadway or just the curb line, or what. Ellis responded that the recommendation in the study was to stamp the entire roadway, from approximately a block east of Cherry to 4th, about 8 blocks, and not just the curb line. Grassel asked if he was correct that there wouldn't be any widening of the roadway. Ellis responded he was correct that there wouldn't be any widening of the roadway. Grassel stated, then, that it would be the same width it is now, even at intersections, with no turning lanes. Ellis responded that that was correct. Leigh asked if that was true at the intersection of Minnesota and 4th as well, and would they round it off more and take part of the park out. Ellis responded that the recommendation is to put in a roundabout, and based on the studies a roundabout should fit without taking any more right-of-way, however a more detailed analysis will need to be done prior to its construction.

Christensen reported present.

Grassel gave a brief overview on the discussion that has transpired on this agenda item, and asked if Mr. Christensen felt that this project would be done in the future. He explained that main concern is, of course, with the Sorlie and Kennedy Bridges being replaced or repaired in the future, how this corridor will be able to handle the additional traffic that would be using it during those construction periods. Christensen responded that he doesn't know. He added that they did receive the report, but it seems like there is a lot of engineering that needs to be done, and, of course, we will need to find the funding to do that. He stated that there is about \$500,000 in engineering costs involved with this project. Ellis pointed out that they did figure \$500,000 of engineering costs into the total project cost. Christensen stated that his guess is that the earliest it would get done would be 2011, adding that the support to get it done is there, but that would be the earliest they could get the funding necessary to do the engineering work.

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY GRASSEL, TO APPROVE THE FINAL
MINNESOTA/4TH AVENUE CORRIDOR STUDY REPORT.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, December 18th, 2008**

*Voting Aye: Malm, Leigh, Grassel, Strandell, Beauchamp, Adams, and Christensen.
Voting Nay: None.*

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2010-2013 T.I.P. PROJECTS

Haugen reported that at this time every year we forward a list to the State Department of Transportations to say that these are the projects we would like to have considered for federal funding for the next four year period. He stated that the four-year period we are talking about today is 2010-2013.

Haugen commented that, getting back to the Minnesota/4th Avenue Corridor project, it is not appearing on the list that is going forward today, however there are still chances for it to appear during this time period through this time next year. He stated, however, that assuming things remain as they are, it may show up in 2014, and since it takes about two years to do the engineering, we would be looking at a budget timeframe of 2012 for the city to get the monies needed to do the project concept report document and cover the engineering costs involved.

Haugen stated that we are dealing with 2010-2013 projects today, and he has a presentation that highlights what is talking place this go-around. He added that this just reminds us of what our responsibilities are; and that is to look at the projects being submitted to ensure that they are consistent with our planning documents, and to prioritize them.

Presentation ensued.

Haugen referred to a map of the study area and reported that everything within the study area that will receive federal funds that impact the transportation system needs to go through this process, which is important for projects that are not inside the city limits of Grand Forks or East Grand Forks, but that are close to us that we need to be aware of.

Haugen stated that our current T.I.P. document covers the four-year period of 2009-2012. He explained that he just wanted to highlight that the funding decisions made in 2009 actually took place back in 2006, and are being carried through to now, and that the funds that were committed in 2011 were committed a year ago, and those in 2012 were committed this past August.

Haugen reported that on the North Dakota side there is more flexibility as to how funds can be moved between T.I.P. years, and between projects, but we still have to be cautious with the fiscal constraint requirement we have to follow.

Haugen commented that on the Minnesota side, looking at the same years, the year of commitment of those dollars are the same, but the difference is that there is much less flexibility on how funds can be moved between T.I.P. years, and between projects.

Haugen stated that the T.I.P. process is a twelve-month process, and we just finished one T.I.P., have already taken action on some T.E. projects, and will carry this process through until August when we approve the 2010-2013 T.I.P., and then will begin the 2011-2014 T.I.P..

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, December 18th, 2008**

Haugen gave a brief refresher on terminology, explaining that on both sides of the river there are some federal terms that are the same such as transportation enhancements, highway safety improvements, and safe routes to school; but on the Minnesota side they have combined a lot of funds. He stated that some funding programs that are important to us are the City Sub-target program, which East Grand Forks is eligible for every fourth year, with the next eligible year being 2010. He reported that they have identified a full intersection at US 2 and 5th Avenue N.W.. He added that there are some other subtargets within the State of Minnesota that the ATP can use to fund projects submitted to them that they deem significant enough to fund.

Haugen reported that on the North Dakota side there are basically three different programs. He stated that Urban Roads is a direct allocation that the State of North Dakota gives the City of Grand Forks in the amount of \$3,000,000 to spend on functionally classified roadways in Grand Forks that are not on the State Highway System. He said that for those roads that are on the State Highway System; such as DeMers, Gateway Drive, 32nd Avenue, Washington Street, that are separated into the regional program. He pointed out that there is the regional primary, regional secondary. He added that there is a different funding share for the local funds for those programs.

Haugen referred to the staff report and went over, year-by-year, the necessary changes to the T.I.P.:

North Dakota Side:

Regional Highway Program

- | | |
|--------|--|
| FY2010 | Rehab work on DeMers between the Central Fire Station and 5 th Street. – Estimated Cost of \$1,365,000 with Federal participation in the amount of \$1,092,000. |
| FY2010 | Pier repair for Kennedy Bridge – Estimated Cost of \$1,000,000 with 50/50 cost share with MNDOT. |

Urban Roads Program

- | | |
|--------|---|
| FY2010 | Cherry Street Reconstruction Project – New Estimated Cost of \$2,000,000 with Federal Participation in the amount of \$1,600,000. |
| FY2010 | South 48 th Street Project – New Estimated Cost of \$7,900,000 with a Federal Participation in the amount of \$6,320,000 |

Transit

- | | |
|--------|--|
| FY2010 | Minnesota – there is a likelihood that these programs will not be applied for. The basic reason for not applying is because of the |
|--------|--|

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, December 18th, 2008**

administrative headache involved with applying versus the amount of monies East Grand Forks would be eligible for, would spend \$2.00 for every \$1.00 received, therefore it is felt it wouldn't be worthwhile to apply.

North Dakota – will applying for three different funding programs:
1) Capital 5309 Funds - \$1,842,000 with a federal share of \$1,525,000; 2) JARC 5316 - \$201,418.55 with a federal share of \$100,710; 3) New Freedom 5317 - \$36,500 with a federal share of \$30,295.

Transportation Enhancement Program

FY2011 Gateway Drive Landscape Project between the Airport and 55th Street – Estimated Cost of \$200,000 with Federal Participation of \$160,000.

Urban Roads Program

FY2011 47th Avenue and South Washington Street Intersection Improvement Project – Estimated Cost of \$500,000 with Federal Participation of \$400,000.

FY2012 Upgrade Downtown Traffic Signals – Estimated Cost of \$1,700,000 with Federal Participation of \$1,360,000. There is a considerable increase in federal funding request – from \$800,000 to \$1,360,000 so will have to see how it fares with the State.

FY2012 Gateway Drive and North Columbia Road Intersection Improvement Project – Estimated Cost of \$2,220,000 with Federal Participation of \$1,125,000.

Regional Highway Program

FY2012 Upgrade Downtown Traffic Signals – Estimated Cost of \$1,700,000 with Federal Participation of \$1,360,000. There is a considerable increase in federal funding request – from \$800,000 to \$1,360,000 so will have to see how it fares with the State.

FY2012 Gateway Drive and North Columbia Road Intersection Project – Amending Federal Participation to the Regional portion – Total Estimated Cost of \$1,850,000 with an Amended Federal Participation of \$1,125,000

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, December 18th, 2008**

New Projects For T.I.P. Year 2013:

Minnesota Side

FY2013: Haugen commented that 2013 is the new T.I.P. year, so the following are all new projects to us. He stated that on the Minnesota side there is the Transportation Enhancement application that you already approved to construct a multi-purpose trail along the west side of Central Avenue between Gateway Drive north to 23rd Street N.W., at an estimated cost of \$280,874, and a federal funding request of \$204,272.

North Dakota Side

Urban Roads Program

FY2013: Reconstruct South Columbia Road from the southend of the overpass to 11th Avenue South, plus add in a continuous right-turn lane from the ramp to Altru. Cost estimate is \$2,962,000 with federal participation of \$1,920,000.

FY2013: Extend 20th Avenue South from its current termini at South 25th Street to intersect with South Columbia Road. Cost estimate is \$650,000 with federal participation of \$368,000.

FY2013: Construct a roundabout at the intersection of South 34th Street and 24th Avenue South. Cost estimate is \$690,000 with federal participation of \$360,000.

FY2013: Reconstruct 47th Avenue South between South Washington Street and South Columbia Road. Cost estimate is \$6,400,000 with federal participation of \$3,680,000.

Regional Highway Program

FY2013: Overlay project on 32nd Avenue South. Cost estimate is \$4,650,000 with federal participation of \$3,680,000.

Haugen explained that North Dakota always asks that our T.I.P. includes projects for the T.I.P. years plus one year on the regional system so they have an idea of what is being contemplated down the road. He stated that we have included three projects for FY2014:

- 1) Rehabbing of Gateway Drive - First segment would be the section between I-29 to North 55th Street at an estimated cost of \$2,300,000 with \$1,840,000 in federal participation.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, December 18th, 2008**

- 2) Rehabbing of Gateway Drive - Second segment would be the section between Columbia Road and the Red River at an estimated cost of \$3,220,000 with \$2,576,000 in federal participation.
- 3) Reconfiguration of east ramps on I-29/32nd Avenue South at an estimated cost of \$7,700,000. The City of Grand Forks and NDDOT are still working on the cost share and corresponding match ratio for this project.

Haugen stated that there are a couple of other programs, federal programs, that we eventually have to include in our T.I.P., but at this time they have not yet been approved as being consistent with our plan, nor have they been prioritized.

Haugen explained that a portion of the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) is set aside to address railroad crossings, and NDDOT has already solicited projects and the City of Grand Forks submitted four crossings for consideration. He stated that those projects are, in priority ranking:

- 1) University Avenue crossing with State Mill track
- 2) 5th Avenue North crossing with State Mill track
- 3) 8th Avenue North crossing with State Mill track
- 4) 2nd Avenue North crossing with State Mill track

Haugen added that on the Minnesota side they just announced their HSIP solicitation, so next month there may be a project or projects on the Minnesota side as well.

Haugen reported that all of these programmed projects that we have identified have been reviewed and found consistent with our planning documents. He stated that there is no issue with how they are being presented for priority ranking, and a public hearing was held at the last Technical Advisory Committee meeting a week ago, and no comments were received either in person or in written form, so both staff and the Technical Advisory Committee are recommending approval of these projects and submit them to the DOTs.

MOVED BY CHRISTENSEN, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE FY2010-2013 T.I.P. PROJECT APPLICATION AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND GIVE HIGH PRIORITY RANKING.

Voting Aye: Malm, Leigh, Grassel, Strandell, Beauchamp, Adams, and Christensen.

Voting Nay: None.

Leigh excused.

Haugen commented that last month we discussed the possibility that Congress may pass a Stimulus Package, and that there may be a need for a special meeting to address possible changes to the T.I.P., but that did not occur. He added, however, that all indications now are that we will

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, December 18th, 2008**

need to meet sometime in February to approve an amendment to the T.I.P. once the Stimulus Package is approved by Congress in January. He stated that staff is working with both cities and States to ensure that the projects being considered are consistent with our planning documents and the cost estimates are still reflecting what is in our planning documents as well.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2009-2010 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM

Haugen reported that a copy of the full document was included in the packets (a copy is included in the file and available upon request). He explained that staff has worked with both agencies to have them identify to us what work activities and studies they would like to see us do.

Haugen referred to the staff report and pointed out that he highlighted, for 2009, the separate studies we will be doing versus the studies programmed for 2010. He stated that East Grand Forks did not have any real specific projects they wanted to see included other than the pavement management and aerial photo projects that are done in conjunction with Grand Forks. He added that Grand Forks did have several projects they wanted to see included, however some did not get included due to funding issues.

Haugen briefly went over the projects programmed in 2009, explaining that the aerial photo project has actually been requested by more than just the two engineering departments, and because we had a lot of comments on the signal coordination that was done on 32nd Avenue we will start working on the other corridors, with Columbia Road being the first one done in 2009, and then we will progress through the corridors and will finish up what isn't done in 2009 in 2010. He added that, also in 2010, we will look at railroad crossings. He stated that the two issues with this study are: 1) On the State Mill line, on the North Dakota side, there are a lot of crossings that don't meet any minimum for potential quiet zones, so we will look at the possibility that some of them may be able to be closed instead of investing a quarter of a million dollars on each crossing just so we can get one train running there daily to not have to use it's horn. He said that we may be able to eliminate some of those crossings at a cheaper cost; and 2) Look at all crossings to see if they meet the quiet zone minimums, and see what may or may not need to be done to them to bring them up to the safety standards that may allow a quiet zone.

Christensen asked about the possibility of having a whistle at a crossing that blares out. Haugen asked if he was referring to a wayside horn. Christensen responded that that was what he was referring to. Haugen reported that it is a cheaper alternative, and is a horn that is very focused in its noise contour at an intersection. He said that because it is stationary, it is more focused. He explained that normally a train that is moving through has to start blaring it's horn at quite a distance from an intersection, and carries it on through, so it impacts a wider area, and using a wayside horn would eliminate some of that noise. Christensen asked what the cost of such a horn would be. Haugen responded that it would cost about \$100,000, including engineering costs, for each crossing; versus the cost of putting in four quadrant gates, or medians, at each crossing to achieve a true quiet zone.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, December 18th, 2008**

Christensen asked if, when the engineer gets to a certain point do they just push a button to engage the horn. Haugen responded that when they get to a certain point the horn would just automatically blare. He added that one thing that is required at every crossing is what is called a “power out” light. He explained that you will notice that there is a tin hut at each crossing that has a light fixture hanging on the outside of it that indicates to the engineer whether or not there is power at that crossing. He said that if the light is out the engineer knows that there is an issue with power at that crossing so he has to blare his horn whether he is in a quiet zone or not.

Christensen asked how much of the \$100,000 would be federally funded, and how much would be locally funded. Haugen responded that it would typically be funded 80% federal funds and 20% local funds, and would come out of your Urban Roads fund on the North Dakota side and from the City Sub-target program on the Minnesota side. He explained that neither State DOT will allow any of their railroad funds be used to get to a quiet zone status.

Christensen asked what we need to do, then, to try this system. Haugen responded that basically, on the North Dakota side, you need to find \$100,000 and direct staff to install one.

Christensen asked how much money has been programmed to do this study, and added that he understands closing the crossings by the State Mill. Haugen responded that they have programmed \$70,000 in 2010 to do both parts of the study, the first would be the State Mill crossings and the second would be all the remaining crossings in the metro area.

Christensen suggested that it would make more sense to study the crossings at the University instead of the State Mill as we don’t have anyone complaining about noise in the State Mill area. Haugen disagreed, explaining that they do get complaints from residents all along 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th Avenues, as the horn has to be blown all along the tracks there.

Beauchamp asked, when you are referring to the State Mill you aren’t just talking about the switch-yard are you. Haugen responded that he is talking about the entire State Mill line. Christensen asked if it is the one that runs by the YMCA. Haugen responded it is. Malm added that it runs all the way from the Kennedy Warehouse to the State Mill.

Haugen reported that North Dakota solicited railroad crossings for the HSIP program. He said that the City submitted four of those crossings along the State Mill line to get raised up to the gates and flashing lights, or the minimum for a quiet zone. He stated that the four crossings are: University Avenue, 5th Avenue, 8th Avenue, and 2nd Avenue; and added that the other three crossings are felt may be good candidates to close, but we have to do a study to determine if that is in-fact the case.

Christensen stated that, although he doesn’t know the streets along this area as well as staff, but there is only a crossing on Highway 2 isn’t there. Haugen responded there is a crossing on Highway 2, but as you come south, towards the YMCA, you have a crossing at 10th Avenue. Christensen said, however, that there aren’t any gates at those crossings, so what are you studying to close, you still have to go through there. Haugen responded that they would be

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, December 18th, 2008**

studying closing the street, to not allow traffic to cross there at all. He said that they would primarily be studying 7th, 6th, and 4th Avenues. Christensen commented that he doesn't care which streets are being studied, he is just thinking that the crossing by Vilandres, are you suggesting closing the street there. Haugen responded that they aren't suggesting closing the street at that location, but possibly closing those that are on residential streets such as 7th and 8th Avenues. Christensen asked which streets they are thinking could be closed. Haugen responded that University Avenue would remain open, they may close 4th Avenue, and 5th Avenue would remain open. Christensen asked where traffic would go if 4th were closed. Haugen responded that they would either go to 5th or University Avenue.

Christensen stated that if this is done we are going to have all kinds of people yelling at us for closing their street. Haugen responded, however, that we also have a lot of people yelling at us about the horn. Christensen said that he would think we would have less people yelling at us about the horns than we will about closing their streets. Haugen reported that this is all coming through the Near North Neighborhood process. Christensen stated that there are about three people attending those meetings, as he recalls, so he thinks staff better brief the City Council a little bit about this before we start doing it. Haugen responded that they will do that, and reminded that it won't be happening until 2010.

Beauchamp asked how these horns work, if it is just a shorter blast, or you don't hear it as far away as a regular train horn. Haugen responded that it is fixed so its noise contour is very small versus a moving train.

Christensen asked, assuming you close the streets, would you then put these horns at the remaining locations. Haugen responded that the wayside horn is not something that we are considering along the State Mill line at all. He explained that they feel that by closing some of the streets there would no longer be a need for a horn at those locations, and at the remaining streets we could then use the HSIP program to get the flashing gates and lights installed, and once that is done, because there is only one train a day we can say that all the safety measures needed are there to do a quiet zone without any additional costs.

Christensen commented, here is what I just heard you say – you are going to spend \$75,000 to \$100,000 to study something, you're going to close some people's streets, which will cause angst, which he guesses is just how it works, and then you're going to put in some gates and flashing lights that don't exist, so its pure government at its worst, at its absolute worst, as we have gotten by for years without it, and your studying something that doesn't need to be studied and trying to remediate something that, in his opinion, simply does not need remediation. He added that where we need remediation is at the University and along DeMers, so does the City Council get to vote on this. Haugen responded that they have already voted on it. Christensen stated, then, that we need to take it back as this is beyond dumb.

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE 2009-2010 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM.

Voting Aye: Malm, Grassel, Strandell, Beauchamp, Adams, and Christensen.

Voting Nay: None.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, December 18th, 2008**

Christensen excused.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL APPLICATION

Ellis reported that the non-infrastructure application by Safe Kids included an activity that was not eligible for Safe Routes To School Funding, which they were asked to remove. She explained that they did remove that item, and then added an activity which involves that their Coordinator do more crossing guard training, thus the original application has been amended, and approval is necessary.

Ellis commented that they did verify with the North Dakota Safe Routes To School Coordinator that should the application be amended, and approved at this meeting, it would still be accepted, so she is now requesting approval of the amended application.

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE AMENDED NON-
INFRASTRUCTURE SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL APPLICATION FROM THE GRAND
FORKS SCHOOL DISTRICT.***

Voting Aye: Malm, Grassel, Strandell, Beauchamp, and Adams.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF ITS REGIONAL ARCHITECTURE PLAN UPDATE

Haugen reported that it is a federal requirement that we have an update to our ITS Regional Architecture Plan at this time. He pointed out that a copy of the document was included in the packets for review, and stated that the Technical Advisory Committee did recommend approval at their last meeting.

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY GRASSEL, TO APPROVE THE UPDATE TO THE
ITS REGIONAL ARCHITECTURE PLAN AS SUBMITTED.***

Voting Aye: Malm, Grassel, Strandell, Beauchamp, and Adams.

Voting Nay: None.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Holiday Bonus Hours

Beauchamp explained that the MPO tries to mirror all of the benefits awarded the City of Grand Forks employees, and this year a four hour holiday bonus was approved.

***MOVED BY GRASSEL, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE A FOUR HOUR
HOLIDAY BONUS FOR MPO EMPLOYEES TO BE USED BY JULY 1, 2009.***

Voting Aye: Malm, Grassel, Strandell, Beauchamp, and Adams.

Voting Nay: None.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, December 18th, 2008**

2. Election Of Officers For 2009

Beauchamp reported that this is the end of the year, and with the new-year his term as Chairman will end, and Mr. Malm will take over. He added, however, that we do need to nominate a new Secretary, someone from Minnesota as per the MPO By-Laws, who will serve in that capacity for two years and will then assume the Chairmanship at that time.

MOVED BY GRASSEL, SECONDED BY MALM, TO NOMINATE WARREN STRANDELL FOR SECRETARY.

Voting Aye: Malm, Grassel, Strandell, Beauchamp, and Adams.

Voting Nay: None.

Beauchamp asked where Mr. Malm would like to hold the meetings during his term as Chairman. Malm responded that he would like to hold them in the Grand Forks County Building, in the Commissioners Chambers on the 6th Floor.

Discussion was held on the meeting dates, and it was determined that the meetings would be held the Wednesday following the second city council meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY MALM TO ADJOURN THE DECEMBER 18TH, 2008, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:00 P.M.

Voting Aye: Malm, Bakken, Adams, Grassel, Beauchamp, and Christensen.

Voting Nay: None.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Executive Assistant