

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

**Thursday, November 20<sup>th</sup>, 2008 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Punky Beauchamp, Chairman, called the November 20<sup>th</sup>, 2008, 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: Punky Beauchamp, Gary Malm, Craig Buckalew (Proxy for Dick Grassel), Art Bakken, Greg Leigh, Warren Strandell, 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; Ali Rood, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF Executive Assistant.

Guests present were: Brad Gengler, GF City Planner.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Chairman Beauchamp declared a quorum was present.

**APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 18<sup>ST</sup>, 2008, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY BAKKEN, TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 20<sup>TH</sup>, 2008 MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Bakken, Malm, Leigh, Buckalew, Strandell, and Beauchamp.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON IMPROVEMENTS TO KENNEDY AND SORLIE BRIDGES**

Haugen reported that the information he just distributed are copies of notes from two meetings concerning the fates of the Kennedy and Sorlie Bridges. He stated that the first set of notes are from a meeting in which representatives from the NDDOT and MNDOT met and discussed the bi-state crossings over the Red River; and the second set of notes are from the MPO Technical Advisory Committee meeting that took place last Wednesday, at which information concerning the Kennedy and Sorlie Bridges was shared by Les Noehre, NDDOT.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, November 20<sup>th</sup>, 2008**

Haugen commented that earlier this spring MNDOT announced, because of the Bridge Bonding Bill the Minnesota Legislature passed, that they were scheduled to replace the Kennedy Bridge by 2018 and that the Sorlie would receive some rehab work. He stated that the result of the meeting held on November 4<sup>th</sup>, actually states the opposite of that, that the Kennedy will receive some rehab work in 2016 and the Sorlie will be replaced in 2018.

Haugen stated that the Kennedy is also scheduled to have some work done to one of it's piers on the North Dakota side in 2010, the result of it slipping and rotating, so they will be spending \$1,000,000 to repair that pier. He reported that in 2016 a substantial rehab of the bridge is scheduled to occur that may include a new deck, painting, pigeon abatement; and, in the event the 2010 Pier Repair Project is not successful, possibly a pier replacement, at an estimated cost of \$10,000,000.

Haugen reported that in 2018, then, the Sorlie would be completely replaced. He stated that the new structure will basically have to be built in the same location as the current bridge, so we will be without a vehicle bridge crossing for approximately 12 to 18 months.

Haugen referred to the minutes from the Technical Advisory Committee, and pointed out that Les Noehre, NDDOT, does state that there is not a signed agreement regarding either of these bridges between MNDOT and NDDOT, but what we do have, though, is a general agreement from both DOTs as to the program of action we are going to work towards now as long as nothing new comes up.

Leigh asked if it would be too expensive to put up a temporary wooden bridge, structure, by the Sorlie, like down by the Grand Forks Chamber building. Haugen responded that the main issue is the dike, and specifically openings in the dike, that might preclude that from happening. He added that there may not be enough room with all the equipment that needs to be staged to have an opening in the dike to get down and over there. He stated that he does think that the DOTs will try their hardest to try to keep a vehicle crossing near that location if at all possible. Leigh commented that he was thinking that a good location might be near the Grand Forks Chamber building because of the parking lot down by the river that is already located there.

Haugen commented that the lead agency on the Kennedy Bridge will be MNDOT, and NDDOT will be the lead agency on the Sorlie Bridge project.

Information only.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF T.E. AND SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL  
APPLICATIONS**

Haugen stated that action is necessary on these applications today. He reported that all the applications are for North Dakota projects as Minnesota treats their Safe Routes a little bit

differently in that they don't need approval of their applications, but if the projects are awarded funding we then need to amend our T.I.P. to include them.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, November 20<sup>th</sup>, 2008**

Haugen stated that on the North Dakota side there was one application for Transportation Enhancement funds. He referred to a slide and pointed out that it illustrates the South 42<sup>nd</sup> Street Shared Use Path project the City of Grand Forks is submitting for consideration for T.E. funds. He explained that this is a multi-purpose path along the west side of 42<sup>nd</sup> connecting the existing multi-purpose path to the north. He said that the application shows the cost of the project as being about \$200,000, with \$160,000 being T.E. funds.

Haugen referred to the map and commented that the green line shows the existing path connecting to University and to DeMers Avenue. He said that T.E. funds were also used to construct the path along the linear parkway that separates the commercial area of 42<sup>nd</sup> and the residential area. He added that that path connects to 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue and gives us a trail all the way past Columbia Road and Red River High School on 17<sup>th</sup>.

***MOVED BY BAKKEN, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO APPROVE THE GRAND FORKS FY 2010 NDDOT TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT APPLICATION AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND TO GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING.***

***Voting Aye: Bakken, Malm, Leigh, Buckalew, Strandell, Beauchamp, and Christensen..  
Voting Nay: None.***

Haugen reported that the City of Grand Forks is submitting four applications for Safe Routes To School funds, and they are listed in priority ranking:

1. Radio controlled time switches for all 22 school flashing pedestrian lights – this will allow a better way to control the flashing pedestrian lights, specifically when they flash and when they don't, as they currently will flash even if the schools are closed for holidays, conventions, etc..
2. Construct a sidewalk around Ben Franklin on the south side of Westward Drive.
3. Construct a sidewalk on the south side of 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue South.
4. Install pedestrian count-down signals around elementary and middle schools.
5. Operate a bike and pedestrian safety program in the Grand Forks elementary schools. Haugen commented that this application is for a non-infrastructure grant. He explained that for the last couple of years Safe Kids has been able to partner up with the School District as their sponsor to apply for these non-infrastructure projects, which deal with educational type programs such as the one being applied for this year.

Haugen commented that one issue that needs to be addressed on the Non-Infrastructure project application is Item 9, the hiring of crossing guards. He explained that the hiring of crossing guards is not an eligible activity for Safe Routes To School monies, and needs to be removed from the application, therefore if you do approve this application we will need to amend it to deduct the \$10,800.00 cost of this activity from the total amount being requested, which would bring the total to \$27,635.50.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, November 20<sup>th</sup>, 2008**

Haugen stated that the Technical Advisory Committee did review these applications, and are recommending the MPO Executive Policy Board approve them and rank them in the same priority as listed, subject to the removal of the \$10,800 as discussed.

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY BAKKEN, TO APPROVE THE GRAND FORKS SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL APPLICATIONS, AS RANKED, SUBJECT TO REMOVAL OF THE \$10,800.00 FROM THE NON-INFRASTRUCTURE APPLICATION FOR THE HIRING OF CROSSING GUARDS.***

***Voting Aye: Bakken, Malm, Leigh, Buckalew, Strandell, Beauchamp, and Christensen.  
Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON MINNESOTA/4<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE CORRIDOR STUDY  
RECOMMENDATIONS**

Ellis reported that she attended the Grand Forks Service/Safety Commission meeting last evening, and presented this to them. She commented that they are basically in the final stages of the study, and do have a Draft Preliminary document prepared. She stated that she would like to briefly go over the recommendations and conclusions contained in that document, as well as the cost estimate.

Ellis said that, as you are already aware, they did have a number of groups that sat on the Steering Committee for this study; including a member from this body, from the Grand Forks Planning Commission, from the neighborhood, from the State and Local Historical Preservation Commissions, etc..

Ellis referred to a map of the corridor and pointed out the path the corridor takes. She stated that one unique thing about the corridor is that it has two things on the Historic Register: 1) granitoid pavement, and 2) the neighborhood.

Ellis stated that after reviewing everything; including traffic patterns, taking into account that this is an arterial roadway and does carry a lot of traffic, and the fact that it will carry more traffic in the future, with a projected total in 2035 of 12,000 a day (Editors Note: These figures are without future bridges), it would still be at a level of service that would not require that we widen it. She added, however that considering the pavement condition at this time, as we continue to get further out it will only continue to deteriorate to a point where it could actually become hazardous, so we need to consider what we can do to stop that from happening.

Ellis reported, then, that based on public meetings the following mitigation items were determined necessary:

1. Remove and replace the Granitoid with stamped concrete.
2. Salvage all the sandstone curbing that is four-feet or greater. Smaller pieces should be preserved for use in other locations.
3. An agreement should be further discussed between the City of Grand Forks and the State and local historic preservation offices for the identification and commitment to preserve and maintain segments of Granitoid in place that are in

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, November 20<sup>th</sup>, 2008**

good conditions. Some streets for consideration are 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South between Walnut and Chestnut; 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South eastern half of block between Cottonwood and Walnut; Cottonwood Street between 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South and 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue South; and 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue South between Cottonwood and Walnut. The final decision on which streets should remain intact will be determined once the State Historical Preservation Commission has completed their study of the corridor.

4. Alley entrances will remain in place where compatible with future street grades.

Leigh asked how much it is going to cost to stamp all the streets versus doing straight pavement. Leigh responded that she will cover the cost of the project later.

5. Reuse salvaged Granitoid in a public green space near the corridor. Kannowski Park was mentioned as a possible location.

Ellis stated that there are a number of context sensitive solutions listed in the document as well. She added that context sensitive solutions have been recognized by both the Federal Highway and the State DOTs for areas that are historic in nature, particularly if it has natural characteristics or other things that play a factor in their replacement, so context sensitive solutions would be eligible for federal funding. She said that these are things that, again, provide a historic quality for the neighborhood. She explained that some of these are:

1. Use pedestrian lighting that looks similar to that used in the Grand Forks Downtown area.
2. Traffic signals would be black in color.
3. Medians should be located at the entries to the corridor where the street right-of-way widens from 66-feet up to 73-feet and 80-feet.
4. Place entry monuments – columns - in the right-of-way on side of roadway.
5. Construct a mini roundabout at the intersection of Minnesota and 4<sup>th</sup> – preferred by the neighborhood but only if further analysis is done to determine if it will fit in the existing right-of-way.
6. Follow A.T.A.C. School Crossing Study recommendations.
7. All sidewalks and dimpled pavers found to be in bad conditions should be replaced.
8. Corridor landscape enhancement should compliment the reconstruction effort – replace trees that have been missing since the flood of 1997.
9. Project contract, if project is done, will hire someone to do some ground penetrating radar to determine where tree roots are, etc., in order to preserve as many trees as possible.

Strandell asked if the people that are promoting these roundabouts ever think about snow removal, and the problems they will cause. Ellis responded that they have these types of roundabouts in Fargo, West Fargo, and Moorhead, and they actually don't have regular curbing, but use a rolling curb instead, so they don't seem to have as much of a problem with snow removal as one might think.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, November 20<sup>th</sup>, 2008**

Ellis said that, before he needs to leave, she would like to respond to Mr. Leigh's question regarding the need to use stamped concrete versus regular concrete. She explained that because this corridor is on the National Historic Preservation Register, the only way we can replace the Granitoid is to do these mitigation items, therefore we have no choice but to use stamped concrete.

Christensen asked, then, what would happen if we just say we are done, if we say that we aren't going to play by these rules and this street can just deteriorate until such time as they understand we are just not going to put in stamped concrete at a cost of \$800,000. He asked when someone will say that to them if we want to bring the cost down. Ellis responded that that is something that would need to be argued over with the State. Christensen said that that wouldn't be hard. Ellis stated that the big issue is that the actual cost, the base cost is \$3,000,000, and to stamp the concrete and do the other mitigation items, and the context sensitive solutions adds another \$1,000,000. She reminded everyone that this is an arterial street, so it would be up to the City, like with any other arterial street, when it needs to be repaired. She added that when repair work is done on other arterial streets, there are costs, and how those costs are paid for is determined by the City. She explained that one way to do that is to use Urban Road funds, at an 80/20 split, with the 20% being special assessed, or not, but to leave it and do nothing, with it being an arterial street, should the Sorlie close in 2018, and you are down to two bridges, if nothing is done the pavement quality by then could be hazardous.

Ellis reported that what this document does is to provide a starting point for the City once a decision is made to do something with this corridor. She added that the issue of special assessing costs was included in the presentation, so if anyone says they were never informed that that could be a possibility down the road, it would not be true.

Beauchamp asked if the State and local historical preservation commissions have agreed to these things, and what kind of timeline can we expect to carry through, specifically if the City sits on this for two or three years, will we need to go through this whole process again, or will this plan, should it be approved, still be in effect. Ellis responded that the document itself already has the okay from both the State and local historical preservation commissions, but in terms of the mitigation plan she can't say because it would need a formal decision. Beauchamp stated that the reason he is asking is because they did a similar study in 1994, and it was a pretty good plan, however he thinks this plan is superior; but with costs continuing to go up, if it isn't done right away at what point might we need to hire a consultant and doing it all again, five years, ten years, or what. Christensen responded that he thinks that if this things rolls out of this place, its just done, and then it comes out of the City of Grand Forks' store, and their store has to figure out how to pay for it, so it really doesn't matter. Beauchamp stated that it matters if we have to budget again in the future to do another study, from the MPO's budget. Ellis commented that at this point this corridor isn't scheduled in the 2009-2013 T.I.P., but, again, and Mr. Haugen may address this further, it would be up to the City as to whether or not the pavement conditions warrant replacement, and if so, if the monies in their Urban Roads Program are sufficient to cover the costs.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, November 20<sup>th</sup>, 2008**

Christensen asked what the sources of funding would be if a decision is made to implement this study. Ellis responded that because this is an arterial roadway, all of the base project qualifies for the Urban Roads Program funds, so that is an 80/20 split. She stated that the context sensitive solutions, at least a portion of them qualify for Transportation Enhancement funds. She said that there may also be some historic preservation funds that might cover some as well. She added that the 20% would be dependent upon whether or not the City decides to special assess any of the costs, or take on the costs themselves, or find other means of funding it. She commented that the historic mitigation items, obviously, are part of Urban Roads, and are part of the regular construction.

Bakken reported that at the Safety Service Committee meeting last night it was discussed that we should go for every source of funding available to us for this project in order to help defray all or most of the 20% City share of the cost of the project. He added that they also talked about the possible need to special assess some of the costs, and the fact that because the circumstances here are similar to some other projects in which the City paid for some and then special assessed the remainder, making that an option as well. He stated that the Safety Service Committee approved moving this forward to the Council of the Whole next week.

Bakken said that this is the best program that he has seen in twelve years so far, and if we can get the State of North Dakota Historical Society to sign off on something like this, we need to do it, and we can't just let that street fall apart in any event because it is a major street. He added that if we can get through this once it is a one-time deal, and we won't have to deal with the historic part of the street again. Christensen stated, however, that we will have to deal with the little arterials that lead into it because they kind of said they will do this if we leave the rest of the Granitoid alone, so if the people really find out about this, they will realize that part of them were thrown under the bus, so to speak, because when their streets wear out one day we've made a deal that they can't get rid of it, so then I suppose we go through this again to get rid of it. Bakken commented that those are pretty low traffic streets though.

Haugen clarified that the \$4.1 million, all of those costs are federally eligible for reimbursement from the Urban Roads Program, so you wouldn't have to go after additional funding sources. He explained that what they have done was to label some of these items as Context Sensitive Solutions in order to open up some of these other programs so you don't have to take all the funding from your Urban Roads Program funds. He said, however, that it is your choice if you want to go after some other funds in order to free up some of your Urban Roads monies, but you can go strictly with Urban Roads dollars for 80% of this project. He added that there are some things that Grand Forks historically does not pay for with federal funds, and you will see that they have shown \$500,000 for engineering, which is an eligible activity, however Grand Forks typically doesn't have that participate in the federal funds share, but it can be, that is a local choice. He said, again, that the Context Sensitive Solution items are eligible for Urban Roads funds, but they are also eligible for other programs as well; but historic mitigation items are not eligible for other funds such as Transportation Enhancement dollars because they are mitigation to the project.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, November 20<sup>th</sup>, 2008**

Christensen asked if staff could put together a flow chart illustrating what is and isn't eligible for Urban Roads, Transportation Enhancement, and other funding programs for the Council of the Whole meeting. Haugen responded that staff would do that. Christensen stated that he is asking this because what he is hearing is that everyone wants this project done, but he doesn't want to use all his urban funds on this project. He asked how much Urban Roads Funds are allocated to Grand Forks each year. Haugen responded that \$2,900,000 is allocated each year. He added that \$340,000 would be eligible for Transportation Enhancement monies, but you need to remember that there is a statewide competition for these monies so you may or may not get any of those monies should you apply. Christensen said that he understands this, but he want to ensure that everyone understands that we need to find other funding sources because we don't want to use up all of Urban Road Funds for one project. Haugen commented, also, that part of the Transportation Enhancement program, a subcategory of the program, is funding for historic preservation projects.

Information only.

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON DOWNTOWN PLAN**

Haugen reported that he would like to give a brief update on the Downtown Plan Study that is being done to update the downtown plan adopted back in 1994.

Haugen reported that since the Flood of 1997 there have been several different plans adopted in reference to the downtowns. He stated that they all have common aspects as well as different aspects, therefore the MPO was asked to try to unify all these different plans and come up with a unified downtown plan instead.

Haugen commented that one of the things the MPO was asked to do to help support some of our recommendations was to do a market analysis. He stated that this has been completed and the information submitted to this body. He reported that they did find that there is a market for some of the components discussed: housing, office space and retail.

Haugen stated that one thing the board has not yet seen are the results of an East Grand Forks parking analysis we were also asked to conduct. He referred to the findings summary, included in the packet, and went over the information briefly.

Haugen referred to the Preliminary Priority Project map and explained that it offers some 2-D colors and suggested uses. He stated that they held a charrette back in October in order to garner information to be able to give the information shown on this map more life, a 3-D kind of concept. He then referred to the charrette concept maps included in the packet, and went over each suggested option briefly.

Haugen reported that earlier this summer a meeting was held with some University of North Dakota officials, and at that time they indicated that there was little interest in UND coming to the downtown. He explained that UND had looked into that possibility but found that it was not

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, November 20<sup>th</sup>, 2008**

conducive to do so, but if you heard President Kelly's address the other day, he did mention a renewed interest in possibly coming to the downtown area so we will follow up on that.

Haugen commented that they also indicate that there is a desire to have a separate bike/ped bridge in the downtown. He stated that there are two different concepts shown: 1) is a more iconic structure and, 2) to emulate the design of the Sorlie and Kennedy bridges. Haugen explained that this could actually be a possibility as a bike/ped bridge was included in the original flood protection project plan, so it is recognized that a bridge could be constructed. He stated that one of the reasons it wasn't done in conjunction with the Corp project was because they were proposing a very low structure, lower than anybody desired.

Haugen reported that they also did a study back in 2001 in which they looked at the proposed river crossings the Corp had in their plan. He stated that they were able to raise the two that were ultimately built to a higher elevation, and they did look at the Red Lake River and the downtown location as well. He explained that there was a slight hindrance in that we were doing the study at the same time they were working on the final design location and height of the dikes, therefore the hydraulic study didn't give a complete analysis. He added, however, that they did include a statement that suggested that if we attached anything to the pier that was left standing, the water surface elevation impact would be insignificant.

Haugen stated that we have always heard that better accommodations are needed now, but it is even more imperative now that a bike/ped structure be built in the downtown because when the Sorlie is replaced, there is a strong desire to have a connection to the downtowns even if it is only a bike/ped structure. He added that that bridge would also function as part of the Greenway system, which is a little different than the function of what the replacement for the Sorlie would do.

Haugen reported that MNDOT has criteria they follow when they do bridge work. He explained that they have their bridges graded out at three different levels, with Level A being the highest, and they automatically include 15%, or \$3,000,000 to the cost of the project for aesthetic things, so our downtown bridge will already have some aesthetic things built into it. He added that historic mitigation will be required as the Sorlie is on the National Register. He stated that this also leaves us with the issue of what do we do with the existing structure. He said that during one of their Steering Committee meetings someone suggested that we could move it to the north a few hundred feet and have it serve as our bike/ped structure. He stated that this suggestion actually garnered some enthusiasm as it is a very wide structure that would lead to a lot more activities on the bridge itself rather than having the bike/ped traffic move back and forth. He added that, again, as part of the replacement of the Sorlie in 2018, historic mitigation will be required, and one of the first things they look at is how they can reuse the existing structure.

Haugen commented that in terms of replacement impacts, we will be without a vehicle connection between the downtowns for 12 to 18 months. He stated, however, that we do have some things that will help us get through this; our Bridge Traffic Management Plan, Kennedy repairs will be completed, DeMers Avenue Overpass, and the downtown traffic signal upgrade.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, November 20<sup>th</sup>, 2008**

Haugen reported that we have also been asked to look at organization. He stated that all those previous plans; the River Fork Plan, as well as all subsequent plans kept discussing the need to form an organization to oversee both downtown facilities and functions. He said that we have begun to identify how such an organization should be developed, and one thing that everyone seems to agree on is that there should be one full-time person in charge. He added that with the Sorlie bridge being replaced in the near future, there will be a need for quite a bit of involvement from both communities, and from the downtowns in particular in that project development process, so if we could get this structure up and running, and get some legs underneath it, when that time comes we will already have an organization in place to assist us in the development process.

Information only.

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON FREIGHT STUDY**

Rood reported that since the last update she gave on the freight study she was able to gather some additional information from representatives from LM Glasfiber, Simplot, American Crystal Sugar, and a number of trucking companies. She stated that she did include that information in the packets for your review.

Rood commented that an open house is scheduled for this evening at the Holiday Inn from 5:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.. She explained that a brief power point presentation will be given on the study purpose and goals and the remaining timeline. She added that there will also be exhibits of the information gathered will also be on display.

Haugen reminded the board that the reason this study is being conducted is because it was one of the requirements the DOTs imposed on us as a result of SAFETEA-LU.

Information only.

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON POSSIBLE 2<sup>ND</sup> STIMULUS PACKAGE**

Haugen reported that the DOTs are becoming more actively engaged in the possibility of a second stimulus package, infusing a lot of funds for infrastructure. He stated that, as you will note, in some of the attachments and correspondence that has taken place, even though quick action will be necessary, the MPO Executive Policy Board will have to take action and meet on some of these items. He explained that any projects that are included in the stimulus package have to be consistent with our planning products and be programmed in our T.I.P., so if approved by Congress, the board will need to meet to approve any changes that may result because of it.

Haugen stated that on the North Dakota side there are very specific timelines that will need to be met for execution or awarding of the stimulus monies. He said that if Congress takes action by December 1<sup>st</sup> the MPO Executive Policy Board will need to meet no later than December 19<sup>th</sup> to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, November 20<sup>th</sup>, 2008**

make those actions consistent with our plan, and to include them in our T.I.P. He added that if Congress does not take action until February 1<sup>st</sup>, then we will need to meet by February 13<sup>th</sup>. He stated that he only mentions this because, in the event it does happen, special meetings may be necessary.

Information only.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Next MPO Executive Policy Board Meeting

Beauchamp asked when the next MPO Executive Policy Board meeting will be held. Haugen responded that the next scheduled meeting will be Monday, December 15<sup>th</sup>. He explained that it was set for that date due to the need for board approval of the North Dakota and Minnesota traditional street and highway projects, and it takes place the third week of the month so we should have full board representation at that meeting. He stated, however, that staff may canvas the board to see, if for some reason we do need to meet on December 19<sup>th</sup>, if we could delay the meeting on the 16<sup>th</sup> until the 19<sup>th</sup> so that two meetings would not be necessary, however he hopes that in the event two meetings are necessary, everyone is willing to meet on both days.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO ADJOURN THE NOVEMBER 20<sup>TH</sup>, 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