

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

**Thursday, July 24th, 2008 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers**

CALL TO ORDER

Punky Beauchamp, Chairman, called the July 24th, 2008, 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: Punky Beauchamp, Warren Strandell, Steve Adams, Dick Grassel, Greg Leigh, Doug Christensen, and Art Bakken.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Chairman Beauchamp declared a quorum was present.

APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 19TH, 2008, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE JUNE 19TH, 2008 MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Christensen reported present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE 2008-2011 T.I.P. TO INCLUDE THE EAST GRAND FORKS AWARD OF MNDOT TRANSPORTATION REVOLVING LOAN FUNDS FOR THE 23RD STREET N.W. PROJECT

Haugen reported that back in April this body approved the submittal of an application for MnDOT Transportation Revolving Loan funds for the reconstruction of a rural section of 23rd Street N.W. to an urban section. He explained that at that time it was identified that should these funds be awarded an amendment to our 2008-2011 T.I.P. would be necessary. He stated that the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, July 24th, 2008**

City of East Grand Forks was awarded the funds, therefore we do need to process an amendment to our current T.I.P. document to include them as a funding source for the 23rd Street N.W. project.

Haugen stated that the Technical Advisory Committee did hold a public hearing at it's July 9th meeting, and did not receive any comments, nor did they receive any comments during the ten day comment period advertised prior to that meeting. He referred to a copy of draft letter that will be sent to MnDOT informing them of the action this board takes today, hopefully being that it approves the request for an amendment to the T.I.P..

Haugen pointed out that back in April the loan amount was for \$3.1 million dollars, however the amount awarded was actually \$3.4 million dollars, with the additional amount being for some additional right-of-way costs that were included in the award.

MOVED BY GRASSEL, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE AN AMENDMENT TO THE 2008-2011 T.I.P. TO INCLUDE THE EAST GRAND FORKS AWARD OF MNDOT TRANSPORTATION REVOLVING LOAN FUNDS FOR THE 23RD STREET N.W. PROJECT.

Leigh asked if the cost estimate for the project includes the acquisition costs for the property north of the drainway. Grassel responded that it does include the acquisition costs for the property south of where the drainway will be located.

Strandell asked what the timetable will be for construction of the project. Haugen responded that it is scheduled to be constructed in 2009. Grassel added that it is a two-year project. He explained that the first year will most likely involve putting in the storm sewer, filling in the ditch, putting in the curb and gutter, and putting in crushed concrete for next fall, with the remainder of the project, including putting in the concrete taking place in 2010.

Beauchamp asked what will happen with the power lines south of 23rd Street N.W.. Grassel responded that they will remain where they are, however, he added that they may need to move some gas lines.

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

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF CONTRACT FOR DIGITAL RIGHT-OF-WAY

Nelson reported that this body did approve sending out an RFP for the update of the Right-of-Way Imagery that is currently on file for Grand Forks and East Grand Forks in June. She stated that they only received one proposal, from GoodPointe Technology, however the Selection Committee did meet and felt that GoodPointe was more than qualified, so they negotiated a price of \$42,000, which is below the \$50,000 allocated for the update, and are recommending the Executive Policy Board consider approving entering into a contract with GoodPointe Technology.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, July 24th, 2008**

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO APPROVE ENTERING INTO A CONTRACT WITH GOODPOINTE TECHNOLOGY TO DO DIGITAL RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR THE CITIES OF GRAND FORKS AND EAST GRAND FORKS FOR THE AMOUNT OF \$42,000.

Christensen asked what will be done with the results of this update. Nelson responded that pavement management of all the roadways will be calculated and analyzed for use by both City's engineers to determine the condition of the roadway system throughout the area.

Leigh asked what the difference is between the superintendent driving down each street to determine its condition versus using the pavement management system. Nelson responded that they can use the analyses to determine how much more life a roadway might have before something absolutely has to be done with it. Leigh asked if this was something new, as he hasn't heard about it before, and it seems to be a waste of money. Haugen responded that in 2003 we established the pavement management system for both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, and the base for that system is derived from digital imagery. He explained that from the right-of-way imaging a person is able to sit at their computer and map out the condition of the pavement on any given street, and then come up with a condition rate, and that is the core purpose of the digital imagery. He added that another purpose, or use of these images would be to allow someone to look at a photo, of a street they feel needs repair, and find that street in the system so that they can determine if it does indeed need repair without having to physically go to the street to do so.

Haugen reported that this is an update to our 2003 Pavement Management System. He stated that we did have this discussion when we approved this work activity earlier this year, when we added into the MPO's Annual Unified Work Program, and it is budgeted, and is highly desired by both Cities.

Christensen asked how this became outdated in just five years. Haugen responded that you have five more years of wear on streets that were marginal to begin with, that have not had any work done to them; and you have streets that have been reconstructed that should be updated as such; and then you have those additional new streets that should be added to the street system as well. Christensen stated, then, that we will be seeing an update every five years, and he agrees with Mr. Leigh's question as to what this gives us that our eyes don't.

Grassel asked if this information would be given to both engineers for both Cities. Haugen responded it would. He added that both Cities have the necessary software to be able to utilize the imagery, and to upgrade the system itself.

Leigh asked if this is a tool that is used when determining which neighborhoods will need paving in the next five years, if it used in completing the Long Range Transportation Plan. Haugen responded it was. He added that the software has the ability to do the "what if" scenario, that if you don't do a service project on a certain street what will be the anticipated impact several years ago, will you need to totally reconstruct it at that time when, if it had been done sooner, you

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, July 24th, 2008**

would have only needed to do some repair work. Leigh stated, then, that how he understands this is that instead of just walking up and down the streets throughout town and writing down the issues you see with it, by using this method you will have the ability to just pull up the street on the computer to determine what may need to be done with it at any given time, particularly during the winter months when you can't see the condition of the streets due to ice and snow, and be able to put together a reconstruction package. Haugen responded that that is correct.

Bakken reported present.

Christensen commented that this all comes down to, now you have the data, but what difference does it make because everyone knows that if you are bouncing up and down a street you are going to have to fix that street sooner than you have to fix one that isn't as bad. Beauchamp responded that hopefully you wouldn't let streets get that bad in the first place. Christensen said that it all comes down to the issue of money. Beauchamp responded that he understands that, but if we have the tools that allow us to look ahead for possible problems down the road, the funds can be found before the street needs to be repaired.

Leigh stated that ultimately how he understands this is that these pictures will be taken, the data will be implemented and used to determine which streets are in the most need of repair, which ones can wait, and all that information will be used to develop the Long Range Transportation Plan. Haugen responded that that is correct.

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

Haugen distributed updated T.I.P. tables illustrating changes made concerning both the Kennedy Bridge and the South 48th Street projects, which are discussed in the next two agenda items. He explained that next month the Executive Policy Board will need to finalize its T.I.P. document. He stated that both States released their draft S.T.I.P. documents, and discrepancies were discovered between the two documents, with the most significant involving the next two agenda items.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON KENNEDY BRIDGE REPAIR/REPLACEMENT

Haugen reported that last month we discussed the issue of MnDOTs desire to replace the Kennedy Bridge, and the fact that they have their funding in place while NDDOT does not. He stated, however, that NDDOT does have a pier replacement project programmed in their draft S.T.I.P. that MnDOT does not have in theirs, and so as they try to reconcile these projects, neither state is willing to give up this project, but MnDOT is not willing to fund its half of the project that is proposed by the State of North Dakota as they are not sure at this time if that is the project to do.

Haugen referred to the July Technical Advisory Committee minutes included in the packets, and pointed out that they also held discussion on this issue. He said that the solution they came up with was to list the pier replacement project as an Illustrative Project in our T.I.P. document. He

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, July 24th, 2008**

explained that this is something that we do on a frequent basis as it allows us to identify projects that are desirable, but that do not have the financial commitment needed to be able to actually program them, and while North Dakota does have the financial commitment to do their half of this project, Minnesota does not, so the two states will continue to try to iron out their differences concerning the Kennedy and Sorlie Bridges, but in order for this project to continue to be viewed by the public as a possible project, we are going to list it as an illustrative project in our T.I.P. document, which will then be included as such in each States S.T.I.P. document so that if/when they reconcile and go forward with this project during this T.I.P. cycle we can then do an amendment to bring it out of the illustrative listing and move it into the programmed listing instead.

Grassel asked how many vehicles cross the Kennedy each day. Haugen responded that approximately 22,000 to 23,000 cross each day. Grassel commented that when the Kennedy is reconstructed, it will mean that a good portion of those 22,000 to 23,000 vehicles will need to cross at either the Sorlie or the Point Bridges, thereby loading them up considerably. Haugen agreed, adding, however that not all of the vehicles using the Kennedy now will use either of those bridges, but there will be a considerable increase in any event. He stated that a bridge closure management plan was done a year or so ago, so we do have the ability to use our software and timing plans to allow us to try to make that a smooth as possible transition.

Haugen stated that MnDOT is still going to show their desire to replace the Kennedy Bridge in the document they are going to be adopting in the next couple of months. He said that they are in contact with North Dakota annually to see whether that 2018 timeframe is still on track or not. He added that MnDOT did indicate that they would be willing to do some innovative financing to assist the State of North Dakota in accomplishing that timeframe if necessary.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON FUNDING OF SOUTH 48TH STREET PROJECT

Haugen referred to the updated tables he distributed, pointing out that the one that his highlighted in yellow illustrates the change to this project. He explained that initially when North Dakota released its draft S.T.I.P., they removed \$3,000,000 of federal funding for this project so it dropped from a \$7,000,000 project to a \$4,000,000 project. He added that the \$3,000,000 was transferred to another City's urban project, and no communication was received from the State alerting us of this transfer.

Haugen reported that after the Technical Advisory Committee meeting he did drive to Bismarck for another meeting, but did take that opportunity to sit down with the Local Government Division and worked out what is highlighted on the table with them at that time. He explained that the \$7,000,000 will still be programmed, so there will not be any money lost for this project, although the State still has reservations as to whether or not this project actually does get completed, however they have committed that if it is done in 2010 they will fund the entire

amount of federal participation allocated. He added that if the City decides not to do this project, then in 2010 there will only be \$4,000,000 available to the City for other projects, and the State

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, July 24th, 2008**

is doubtful that they would be able to deliver a \$4,000,000 within that short timeframe, however the \$4,000,000 is available in 2010, and the additional \$3,000,000 is available in 2011 depending on the project submitted.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. MN/4th Avenue Corridor Study Timeline

Christensen asked when the final report would be available on the Minnesota/4th Avenue Corridor Study. Haugen responded that it should be completed by October or November.

Christensen stated that once we get the final report, what will need to be done to implement the findings of that report. Haugen responded that if an agreement is reached and adopted as to what we can do with the pavement, the City will then have an estimate of cost and can go through their typical C.I.P. process to identify what year and what funding sources they can use to get the project done. He stated that once that process is completed, the results will be submitted to the City Council, and to this board for inclusion in the next T.I.P. document, or for an amendment to the current T.I.P. document.

Christensen asked if there would be some type of negotiations done with the Historical Preservation Society on this, and who will the City of Grand Forks' representative be. Haugen responded that there is a representative from the City of Grand Forks on the Steering Committee, and when we get to the point where we have come to an agreement, that will be taken to the City Council for their consideration. Christensen asked what is felt the decision points are for agreement, where are you getting input as to what you have authority to negotiate, and are we locked out if we don't agree to some grantoid. Haugen responded that we don't know that yet as we are still exploring various options. Christensen said that he understands that, but you have a voice, and while we know its grantoid, and it's historical, we could just ignore that and move forward, so ultimately the City should have an idea of what the decision points are, what the negotiating points are, and should be given the opportunity to give some input before the negotiations are made.

Grassel asked if there was anyone from the City Council on the committee. Christensen responded that that is why he is asking the question, because we want to see something done with that corridor to improve it, and he wants to make sure you have good direction to accomplish that.

2. Update On Thompson Bridge Reconstruction Project

Strandell reported that he went out to Washington for a meeting with North Dakota and Minnesota Congressional Delegates and the results were that North Dakota DOT does not have funding programmed for the Thompson Bridge Reconstruction Project until 2012, while Minnesota DOT has the funds available now, therefore, unless some additional funding should become available for North Dakota before 2012, it won't get done until then.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, July 24th, 2008**

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY MALM, TO ADJOURN THE JULY 24TH, 2008,
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:35 P.M.***

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

Voting Nay: None.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Executive Assistant