

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, December 15th, 2010 – 12:00 Noon
Grand Forks County Commissioners Chambers**

CALL TO ORDER

Gary Malm, Chairman, called the December 15th, 2010, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:00 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

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

Absent were: Greg Leigh.

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

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Chairman Malm declared a quorum was present.

APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 17TH, 2010, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 17TH, 2010, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF THREE MONTH REVIEW OF PLANNING TECHNICIAN'S SALARY

Haugen reminded the board that when they approved the creation of the Planning Technician position, there was an addendum to the motion adopted requesting that in three months there would be a review of the salary for the position. He said, however, there wasn't any real guidance provided as to what should be looked at during that review.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 15th, 2010**

Haugen reported that, as the Executive Director, he struggled with this, and did ask the Finance Committee for their input on the issue. He referred to the staff report, included in the packets, and pointed out that both the Finance Committee, and himself, concluded that there really isn't anything that would cause us to have a different opinion as to what the pay-grade and salary should be for the Planning Technician position, so per the motion approving the creation of this contracted position through December 2011, the three-month review will show that the employee is doing the job as expected, and both the Finance Committee and staff recommend that there be no changes made to either the salary or pay-grade for the position.

MOVED BY GRASSEL, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THAT NO ADJUSTMENT BE MADE TO THE PLANNING TECHNICIAN'S SALARY OR PAY-GRADE.

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

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF HOLIDAY BONUS HOURS

Haugen reported that, as in past years, the City of Grand Forks has granted their employees a four-hour holiday bonus, and because the MPO strives to follow, as best they can, what the City of Grand Forks does for their employees, staff is requesting approval of a four-hour holiday bonus for MPO employees as well.

MOVED BY GRASSEL, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE A FOUR-HOUR HOLIDAY BONUS TO MPO STAFF.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Christensen reported present.

MATTER OF 2011-2012 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM

Haugen reported that a requirement of our federal funding is that we lay out how we are going to utilize the funds we receive. He stated that, traditionally, we have broken our activities into three categories: 1) 100 – Program Administration; 2) 200 – Program Support and Coordination; 3) 300 – Planning and Implementation.

Haugen referred to a chart listing the three categories, as well as each of their subtasks, and went over the information briefly. He pointed out that in 2011 our total budget is shown as being just under \$1,000,000. He explained that a quarter or more of that \$1,000,000 is the extra funding we received back in August, which is being carried forward to the end of 2011, thus the reason for the unusually high budget. He pointed out that the projects we are utilizing those extra funds for are highlighted in yellow, and were started in 2010, and will be completed in 2011. He added

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 15th, 2010**

that in 2012, as you will notice, those funds are no longer included, and the budget is back to what we normally have to work with.

Haugen reported that because we have not officially received what our Fiscal Year 2010 funding is, we have completed the plan with the assumption we will be maintaining Fiscal Year 2009 funding levels. He explained that we would expect that when we receive our final Fiscal Year 2010 numbers, there will be a slight increase from the Fiscal Year 2009 numbers. Strandell asked if the MPO always works one year in reverse. Haugen responded that we do not normally do that, but with the non-reauthorization of SAFETEA-LU and the continuing resolutions, etc., we just have not received from our lead agencies what our Fiscal Year 2010 numbers are. He added that typically we receive that information at the end of the Federal Fiscal Year or early into the new Fiscal Year, so this is not the norm.

Haugen commented that, as everyone is probably aware, the Senate and House are debating this week the Fiscal Year 2011 Appropriation Bills, so we aren't sure what our 2011 amounts will be, although from most reports it sounds like they are freezing it to the 2010 numbers, so again, he is just pointing out that the funding levels we are using are actually 2009 funding levels for 2011 and 2012 as we prepare our work program at this time, and once we know what our 2010 numbers are we may need to do an amendment to the work program to identify those funds. He added that we will also, at the end of 2011, re-evaluate where we are at in 2012, and may need to make some adjustments at that time.

Haugen referred to the 2011 project list, and pointed out that, again, the four studies that we already agreed we would be doing with the extra funds awarded us, are shown in yellow. He stated that we did request both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks advance to us activities they would like the MPO to undertake, and were able, in 2011, to fund both cities top two requests. He explained that for Grand Forks that involves: 1) looking at their downtown parking code requirements in terms of the number of stalls by different land use types, and also the assessment for the operation and maintenance for the provision of free parking in the downtown; and 2) looking at a possible amendment to our Transportation Plan to have the Columbia Road Reconstruction Project moved up.

Haugen stated that for East Grand Forks it means looking at a northwest traffic circulation study. He explained that for many years, in our Long Range Transportation Plan; and visited in a couple of previous studies; was the creation of a full-intersection at 5th Avenue N.W. and U.S. Highway 2. He reported that we actually had the project programmed to be done in 2010, however the East Grand Forks City Council asked that it be delayed, but are now asking us to restudy it to determine whether or not there is still full support of the project, and if not, to identify what the ramifications of not doing the project will be. He added that the second project they requested we do involves a review of their infrastructure code.

Haugen commented that, as mentioned last month, with the results of the Demand Response Service Contract, there is a significant increase in cost, so we will need to revisit the whole transit department, and re-examine their financial plan. He added that as part of that we will be

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 15th, 2010**

looking at their route structure, as well as some of their other cost components so we can show that the financial plan is sustainable in the long term.

Haugen referred to the 2012 table, and reminded the board that there will be less funds to work with. He pointed out that the work program identifies that we will be spending most of our funding resources addressing the update of our Long Range Transportation Plan, which is due for final approval in the first quarter of 2013, so we will need to look at the Street and Highway section of the plan, and will need to engage a consultant, as well as work more closely with our Demand Model Forecasting with ATAC, out of NDSU, so you will see there are funds set aside for this. He reported that the Long Range Transportation Plan is the most important document the MPO produces at least once every five years. He added that most of the resources allocated in 2012 are for that activity, thus there is little funding left for any additional activities in 2012.

Haugen stated that the Work Program was presented to the Technical Advisory Committee at their meeting last week, and there were no issues raised, however, since then we have been informed that our federal partners are instituting a 30-day review period for their review and approval of the document. He said that they did receive a draft copy of the document on November 30th, and are not prepared to say that all of these activities are eligible, so if this body is ready to approve this work program it will need to be contingent on any comments or issues our federal partners may have; or you can give approval of the draft and have it brought back for final approval once we have all the comments from our partners.

Haugen commented that most of the comments made by our federal partners have, for the most part, involved the 100 category, or general administration; so, although he doesn't want to make them sound too minor in stature, when we are talking about items that have historically been the same for the last ten or fifteen years, and are now being questioned, and that represent 8% of the budget, he isn't sure they are really much of an obstacle. He added that he did respond to the comments received, and their response to that was to institute the 30-day review period, so you have two options: 1) approve it and allow staff to work out the issues with Federal Highway; or 2) give it preliminary approval and have it come back to you for final approval in January.

Christensen asked if anything would need to be changed to allocate funds to study our bus routes. He stated that the City of Grand Forks received a request from the Park District to add a route for the Wellness Center, and Mr. Gershman asked that a route also be added to the existing Library. Haugen responded that that is already a part of the total revamp of the Transit Development Plan that he identified, the route structure is part of that study.

MOVED BY STRANDELL TO APPROVE THE 2011-2012 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM.

MOVED BY CHRISTENSEN TO AMEND THE MOTION TO AUTHORIZE THE FINANCE COMMITTEE APPROVE ANY AMENDMENTS MADE NECESSARY DUE TO COMMENTS FROM FEDERAL HIGHWAY, SECONDED BY STRANDELL.

MOTION, WITH THE AMENDMENT, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 15th, 2010**

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

Voting Nay: None.

Malm referred to the staff report, and asked what was meant by "...considers UND's Climate Action Plan's temporal closure of University Avenue." Haugen responded that as part of UND's official Climate Action Plan they labeled a project to consider temporarily closing down University Avenue to traffic from about 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., and since it is part of UND's official plan we need to evaluate it as part of our Long Range Transportation Plan for two reasons. The first is, obviously, if implemented it will have an impact to our traffic flow, and one of the reasons we have long range transportation plans is so we can assist in identifying, should they go forward with some of these things, what impact they will have and whether we should still go forward or modify their climate action plan. He said that the other reason is that we are expecting that whatever new authorization does come through it will require us to consider climate change, and so this is, again, another identified institution in our communities official climate change, or climate action plan, so we need to address it as well.

Christensen asked what is meant by climate action, why is the word "climate" in there. Haugen responded that it is a response to greenhouse gas emissions and global warming. He explained that the University of North Dakota adopted a Climate Action Plan that lays out how they are going to lower their contribution to global warming. Christensen asked if this was what they came up with. Haugen responded that it is one of their solutions. Grandstrand added that one of the reasons they specifically want to close that portion of University Avenue is because students drive from one class to another, thus creating more interaction between people and cars, so it isn't just climate. He stated that he thinks it is a good idea, and was wondering if we could look at what would happen if University Avenue were closed permanently, except for public transportation vehicles. Haugen responded that it would be easy to look into that. He stated that they have looked at the possibility of total closure of University Avenue in the past, and found that it had a pretty significant impact on the surrounding network, so we didn't pursue it, but now we could look at it, but, again, when buses aren't operating on it we would like to consider other vehicles to operate on it so what time of day would we close it down to those types of activities, buses, bike/ped, etc.. Grandstrand stated that the reason he asks is because a lot of the accidents he has heard about happening on this stretch of roadway have primarily occurred around 5:00 to 6:00 p.m., when people are getting off work, but there isn't a lot of student traffic, in terms of pedestrian traffic.

Haugen commented that there is a significant amount of traffic on University Avenue during the 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. time period that doesn't just involve students driving around campus, but also staff going from one end to the other, so we will have to see what the impact is, and that is why we are including it in our Long Range Transportation Plan scope-of-work so that we can make an informed decision on whether or not we want to go forward with the closure. Powers asked what portion of University Avenue would be closed. Haugen responded that it would generally be from Columbia Road to Stanford. Christensen pointed out that if this closure occurs, obviously your going to have people cutting over to 6th. Haugen agreed that people

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 15th, 2010**

would probably use either 6th, or Campus Road would need to be revamped to allow for better traffic flow. He added that one other option would be DeMers Avenue as a way for people to get from the east end to the west end of campus.

Grassel commented that he sees this as being real confusing. Christensen stated that he doesn't know why this was added to the program, but the long and short of it is that if we were to close University Avenue, think of the outcry we would get from citizens, as the roadway has been used since 1889. He added that this would also have a big impact on 6th, and Mr. Malm lives in that area so he could speak on how that would impact that area, but then you would channel them down to Stanford Road to the balance of University Avenue, but he guesses that's why we have the MPO, to study this. Grandstrand commented that it takes like ten to fifteen seconds to get to 6th Avenue from University, and he has lived on campus for six or seven years now. Christensen stated that he has driven through it for thirty-eight years. Grandstrand responded that he doesn't know how much you learn in thirty-years, but maybe it's a lot, but ten or fifteen seconds isn't a big deal, and you can go a lot faster on 6th, its so slow on University to he uses 6th anyway. Grassel added that it is just the nature of the beast, its hard for people to accept change.

Malm stated that it's in the study, and there are a lot of things to consider, there are two schools on 6th Avenue, as well as some other issues. He said that he has lived out there for the last twenty-five years, and he has always ignored University Avenue because the students don't know these streets are not for walking on. Haugen reported that the way it is written up in the plan, as he understands, is after the A.M. peak and before the P.M. peak, that is the time consideration that is up for review.

Discussion only.

MATTER OF 2012-2015 T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS (ND SIDE)

Haugen reported that this is that time of year, for the North Dakota side, when we look at all of the projects that have been considered to us for funding during our next T.I.P. cycle. He pointed out that the next T.I.P. cycle covers the years 2012 to 2015, and we already have a document that covers 2012 to 2014, so a lot of the focus on today's presentation is on the last year, 2015, although there are some slides that give some information as to what the current status is of various projects.

Haugen referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request), and went over it briefly.

Haugen pointed out that the eligible programs include:

- 1) Transportation Enhancements for FY2012
- 2) Safe Routes To School for FY2012 – None were submitted.
- 3) Urban Local for FY2015
- 4) Urban Regional For FY2015 – Plus one non T.I.P. year FY2016
- 5) County Roads – None were submitted.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 15th, 2010**

Haugen commented that one of the reasons he asked for the phone call he just received was because of how this was submitted to us. He stated that it created some confusion, and staff has been trying to get it cleared up since the Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

Haugen referred to the slide listing the Transportation Enhancements for FY2012, and pointed out that there are three projects listed: 1) DeMers Avenue Multi-Purpose Trail – Phase 1: 42nd Street West to 48th Street; 2) DeMers Avenue Multi-Purpose Trail – Phase 2: 48th Street West to 55th Street; and 3) Lincoln Park Connecting Trail. He stated that all the applications were filled out on FY2012 applications, however the summary sheet showed one per year for the next three years, so he needs clarification as to how many projects there really are. Rau responded that there is one project per year for the next three years. Haugen said, then, that there is only one 2012 project being submitted, so there will be only one project submitted for FY2012. Christensen asked what the third project for DeMers Avenue is. Haugen responded that sometime beyond 2014, if we are successful in getting the areas shown in solid and dashed red lines completed, the next area to be done would be 55th Street from Gateway Drive to University Avenue.

Haugen summarized that the one project that will be submitted for FY2012 funding would be the area shown with a solid red line on the map.

Haugen then went over the scoring process that the City of Grand Forks provided to them for each of the projects submitted. He explained that they try to include projects that have been awarded a score of 60 points or more, and as you can see, staff scored the DeMers Phase 1 project at 66, so it has a lot of the different components we like to see in an enhancement project, and it is consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan, so staff is recommending approval that it is consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan, and award it top priority.

Haugen referred to a map showing the Lincoln Drive trail project, and went over it briefly.

Haugen continued with the slide presentation, and explained that the next few slides discuss our current projects, as well as some adjustments that were made to those projects, including some cost increases, cost decreases, etc..

Christensen referred to Figure 6, Alt 2H, and asked about the alternate right-of-way, with the current boulevard. Haugen asked if he was talking about the DeMers/Washington intersection area. Christensen responded that he was referring to the DeMers/Underpass intersection. He said that he is trying to figure out what is shown in the blue. Haugen responded that the blue lines indicate the current right-of-way for the property. Christensen commented that his concern is with the blue shown on the Leever's Parking Lot. Haugen responded that there are some property splits occurring with that property that causes a portion of the property to be a separate legal piece of property. He added that the blue lines are defining individual parcels.

Christensen commented that if the underpass project is done, will there be any taking of that parking lot. Haugen responded that this drawing does not show that. Christensen asked if there

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 15th, 2010**

was a drawing available that does show that. Haugen responded that we are about to proceed with a study that will show that, sometime in the next year, and there will be a more refined concept of what will be happening here, but as of right now we do not show anything.

Christensen commented that, as you know, we just had a conversation concerning this, and we need to know what the intention is sooner rather than later if we are going to have the potential taking of that parking lot, and that is pretty important, so when will we know that. He added that he doesn't want to be siting a library there and then find out your taking part of that parking lot. Haugen responded that we will know that sometime in the second quarter of next year. He added that the impact, as best as he can tell right now, would be additional frontage right-of-way, most likely not more than forty or fifty feet. He stated that the only way it would be more than that would be because one of the concepts the NDDOT wants us to look at, if it is determined that a rehab is not an option, would be to replace the underpass with an overpass, which would have a possible impact on the Leever's parking lot. Christensen asked if this could be put into memo form, sooner than later, way before the 6th of January because the City Council needs to have this information. He explained that if we site a library there, there will be no way an overpass will be built. Grandstrand asked that, when you write the memo, keep in mind that it will probably be used to try to block siting the library at the Leever's site. Christensen disagreed, that it doesn't really matter, it's the truth, and Mr. Grandstrand may not be on the council, and neither might he, but it is going to affect future decision points because you will be doing certain things then that we are doing today that will affect tomorrow, its called custody. Grandstrand stated that that's the whole conversation, if the library goes anywhere its going to affect the future.

Malm stated that he understands everyone's concerns, but he has a simple solution to the problem, and that would be to remove the restaurant at the corner, close the adjacent street and use it for parking for the library.

Haugen reported that they will also be looking at all the driveways along this portion of Washington, and the adjoining streets so there may be recommendations to install right-in/right-out onlys or $\frac{3}{4}$ access points, and he is speaking only to the Leever's parking.

Discussion ensued.

Haugen stated that the actual projects we are reviewing at this time are the 2015 projects:

Local:	47 th Avenue South between Washington and Columbia
Regional:	Washington Street Underpass Reconstruction DeMers Rehabilitation from I-29 to the Fire Station

Haugen reported that on the North Dakota side they do ask us, on the Regional Highway System, to give them an extra year lead on what projects might be coming up. He stated that if we do something with the underpass on Washington, in 2016 we will address that segment from Hammerling to the underpass, then from 1st Avenue to 8th Avenue, either a mill and overlay or a complete concrete replacement project. He added that also in 2016, per an agreement with MNDOT, there is the Kennedy Bridge Repair project.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 15th, 2010**

Grassel asked about the DeMers/Washington Street Intersection project, and if he is correct that the fire station would need to be moved. Haugen responded that he is correct, that it is part of the project cost to move the fire station. Christensen asked where they would move it. Haugen responded that Chief O'Neill has identified a location in the south end. Christensen stated that there would still need to be one on the north end as well. Haugen responded that Chief O'Neill feels he has that with the one located on Columbia Road.

Haugen referred to the last three slides, and pointed out that they focus in and summarize the projects that, if they are funded through our cooperative T.I.P./S.T.I.P. decision process, these will be the projects showing up in our next T.I.P.. He went over each briefly.

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE LIST OF CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE FY2012-2015 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING.

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

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF FINAL A.T.A.C. SCHOOL SAFETY STUDY FINAL REPORT

Ellis reminded the board that she was here last month with the Draft A.T.A.C. Safety Study for Winship, Wilder, and St. Michaels elementary schools. She stated that there were just a few changes made to the draft. She referred to page 158 of the final report, and went over the changes briefly.

Grassel asked if there hasn't been some discussion on possibly closing one of the elementary schools in Grand Forks. Ellis responded that there has been some discussion about possibly closing Wilder, but we can still make recommendations since it hasn't been determined yet, and what we hope to accomplish is to provide consistent safety for walkers, bikers, bus riding, and parent drop-off/pick-up for all the schools in Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, and as long as Wilder remains open we want to make sure they have a safety plan available.

Malm asked if Ms. Ellis was seeking approval of the Final A.T.A.C. School Safety Study Report. Ellis responded she was, but with one additional item. She referred to Page 44 of the report, and pointed out that they left off a turnout lane for St. Michaels, so she will have it added before the Final Reports are published.

Grandstrand asked about the speed limit signs by Lewis and Clark that flash a vehicles speed, and whether or not they are considered in this as well. Ellis responded that when they look at each individual school, they look at all of the signing and pavement markings including crosswalks, flashing lights, no parking signs, etc., and they are recommended for some of these schools as well. Grandstrand stated that he feels they are pretty effective. Ellis commented, however, that there have been some issues with them not working in cold weather, and with the purchase of some of them. She explained, however, that they do recommend putting either those

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 15th, 2010**

signs, or something similar. She stated that the school districts and Safe Kids have been given some non-infrastructure money through Safe Routes To School for the temporary wheel out signs that any school has the ability to use. Christensen asked why we wouldn't add a recommendation so that they know that we, as a long range planning body feel they should have these kinds of signs, and then it will be the school districts issue of buying it or not. Ellis commented that it is the City's responsibility. Christensen said, just recommend it so we can have something to fall back on.

Powers asked what the status is on the quiet zone downtown. Rau responded that BNSF had some concerns that not all the safety devices were in place, mainly the medians, so it was delayed until the medians can be installed next spring. He stated that had they had that information sooner, the medians could have been installed, but now they have to wait until they can do concrete work, which will be May or June. He added that they plan on having the work done, and the quiet zone implemented by July or August.

MOVED BY CHRISTENSEN, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE FINAL A.T.A.C. SCHOOL SAFETY STUDY FOR WILDER ELEMENTARY, WINSHIP ELEMENTARY AND ST. MICHAEL'S ELEMENTARY IN GRAND FORKS SUBJECT TO THE INCLUSION OF BULLET ON PAGE 44 OF THE REPORT INDICATING THERE SHOULD BE A TURNOUT LANE FOR ST. MICHAEL'S SCHOOL AS WELL.

***Voting Aye: Powers, Adams, Strandell, Grassel, Grandstrand, and Christensen.
Voting Nay: None.***

MATTER OF AUTHORIZING FINANCE COMMITTEE TO EXECUTE CONTRACTS FOR: A) 48TH AVENUE SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY TO BONESTROO; AND B) NORTH WASHINGTON STREET AND UNDERPASS STUDY TO KLJ

Haugen reported that we have two RFPs out, the 47 Avenue Corridor Study and the North Washington Street and Underpass Study. He stated that there were Selection Committees for both studies, that met and interviewed those consultants submitting proposals.

Haugen stated that the 48th Avenue South Corridor Study committee is recommending we engage with the firm Bonestroo; and the North Washington Street and Underpass Study is recommending we engage with the firm KLJ.

Haugen reported that we would normally have contracts, and the final scope of work available for these studies, but we were not at that point for today's meeting, therefore staff is requesting this body authorize the Finance Committee to execute those contracts once they are finalized. He added that all of the scopes of work have come in, and addressed all that we asked them to in the RFP, and both budgets were under the budgeted amount we identified for each study, so there is no indication there should be any hidden surprises.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 15th, 2010**

Haugen commented that this is something that we have done in the past under similar circumstances, to authorize the Finance Committee to review the contract and approve it prior to the Chairman signing, so if the Finance Committee is willing to meet sometime soon, we can wrap this up soon.

MOVED BY CHRISTENSEN, SECONDED BY GRASSEL, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING THE FINANCE COMMITTEE EXECUTE THE CONTRACTS FOR: A) 48TH AVENUE SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY TO BONESTROO; AND B) NORTH WASHINGTON STREET AND UNDERPASS STUDY TO KLJ, OR IF NOT ABLE TO PERFORM THOSE DUTIES THAT THE CHAIRMAN OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD BE SO AUTHORIZED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. January Meeting – Election of Officers

Haugen reported that we are at the end of a two-year period of our current chair, and per our by-laws the secretary assumes the chair, and that is Mr. Strandell, so at our January meeting he will be assuming the chair, and he has elected to hold the meetings at the East Grand Forks City Hall, therefore the January 19th meeting will be held in East Grand Forks.

Haugen commented that our Finance Committee will now consist of our new chair, Mr. Strandell, our past chair, Mr. Malm, and a new secretary from the Grand Forks side, to be determined at the January meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY GRASSEL, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO ADJOURN THE DECEMBER 15TH, 2010, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:15 P.M.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager