

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

**Wednesday, August 21st, 2019 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Clarence Vetter, Chairman, called the August 21st, 2019, 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: Clarence Vetter, Mike Powers, Warren Strandell, Marc DeMers, Bob Rost, Al Grasser, Ken Vein, and Jeannie Mock.

Guest(s) were: Tom Ford, Grand Forks County; Sandi Marshall, Grand Forks City Council; Brad Gengler, Grand Forks City Planning; Corey Mock, North Dakota State Representative District 18; Todd Feland, Grand Forks City; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; and Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks City Planning.

Staff: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Jairo Viafara, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; and Peggy McNelis GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Vetter declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JULY 17th, 2019, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY ROST, TO APPROVE THE JULY 17th, 2019 MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FY2020-2023 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that at our Technical Advisory Committee meeting last Wednesday we did have a formal public hearing on this item. He said that there were no written comments received and there was no one present for oral comments either.

Haugen stated that this is the time of year that we need to annually adopt a new T.I.P. document, and we are covering Fiscal Years 2020-2023.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 21st, 2019**

Haugen said that he would like to just highlight a few things. He referred to the packet and pointed out that it includes some key pages from the full T.I.P. document and said that it also mentions that the full document is available on the MPO website for review.

Haugen referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and gave a brief overview of the T.I.P. and the T.I.P. process.

Haugen commented that just as everything else we have responsibilities when we do our T.I.P.; we have to make sure it is consistent with our planning documents and then also we have to prioritize projects within the programs.

Haugen stated that our study area is not just the Cities of Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, but we also have to remind ourselves that we do go out into rural areas and the projects that are in those rural areas also need to be showing up in this document.

Haugen reported that this is a twelve-month process, adding that way back when it might have been a six-month process, but it has evolved with the requirements that we must meet into a twelve-month process. He stated that in order to make some distinction between the T.I.P. and the S.T.I.P.; the S.T.I.P. document is a document that the State adopts, but they also adopt our T.I.P. by reference, which means that our T.I.P. document is really the governing document for our study area, so complying to the T.I.P. is more important because the S.T.I.P. is just referencing our T.I.P. document.

Haugen commented that if we adopt this document today we are actually going beyond 2020, however the authorization for transportation expires in September of 2020 so we have some unknowns, thus we may have to make some changes to what we approve today since we don't know yet what Congress might do in the future with a new appropriation act.

Haugen pointed out that the total dollar amount in this T.I.P. is just over \$100 million dollars, that is a pretty hefty T.I.P.; normally we would be down in the \$60 to \$70 million dollar range, so this is a substantial T.I.P. document.

Haugen referred to a slide and explained that it shows all of the funding programs. He said that some of them are eligible, we did not have any projects from them, but he will skip to the three years that are in our current T.I.P. and what changes are being done into the new T.I.P. year.

Haugen said that we do have projects that are moving; we do have a Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) project that was originally programmed to be in 2019 but is now in 2020. He added that we also know that on the Urban side, which is North Dakota's local program, that we will have to do a T.I.P. amendment to what we are approving today because there have been some changes in the scope of work and the federal dollar amounts for the University Avenue Project; some of it is being shifted over to the North 5th Street Project.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 21st, 2019**

Haugen stated that on the Regional side the big thing was on the western limits of our study area, from 69th Street westward, the State has basically doubled the cost of their projects on US2 going out to the Airforce Base and back. He explained that they changed the scope from an asphalt mill and overlay to a concrete overlay. He added that they are also delaying a project a couple of years because of the substantial scope and cost increase on that stretch of US2, that mile stretch between 55th and 69th, it is now being delayed to 2023. Vein commented that he isn't really experienced with a concrete overlay over the asphalt, is that what is going to happen. Haugen responded that that was correct. Vein asked what thickness of concrete are they going to be using. Haugen responded that he believes it is an inch and a half, but he would follow up and make sure that is correct. Haugen added that that scope has been vacillating within the NDDOT on what to do and what type of projects and they spent a lot of time on analysis and thought and they are now going with this concrete overlay as the solution.

Haugen commented that even though the Interstate Program is not a new program the process of how they select interstate projects is new. He explained that out of their process we did get some funding to help flesh out the northbound off ramp of I-29 and Gateway Drive. He added that there was also a request to do some NEPA documents for 32nd Avenue that was not funded.

Haugen stated that on the Minnesota side we added in a project is FY2022. He explained that as a result of our Mn220No study they are implementing some of the short-term low-hanging improvements to a couple of intersections along there, so it is nice to see that we do a study and there is immediate funding to do an alternative.

Haugen reported that 2023 is our new year. He pointed out that on the North Dakota local side, the Urban Program, we submitted a request to rehab Columbia Road Overpass; that was not programmed, and, as we discussed, when it was submitted the cost estimate was quite a bit higher than what was in our financial plan so if we are going to be pursuing that high of a value project we will have to do some adjustments to our transportation plan. Vein asked what they are doing for the rehab, is it the deck, or what? Grasser responded that he thinks they are doing the deck, the step one pads. Kuharenko added that they are doing both the bearings and the abutment bearings, as well as sandblasting and painting the structure underneath. He explained that the main reason why they are putting all of that together was because that way they have only one project, which, because it goes over the railroad, they only have to deal with the railroad once. Grasser stated that originally they were looking at phasing that but because of the effort of having to deal with the railroad they are looking at doing some combinations.

Haugen commented that on the Regional side there were no projects submitted for 2023. He said that on the Minnesota side in 2023 initially there was talk of replacing the downtown traffic signals; they are now pushing that out to a later year. He said that one of their reasons for that is that as they got into the projects a little further they began seeing that potential right-of-way purchases might have to be done so they are delaying the implementation to get a better scope of work on it, plus our Downtown Traffic Study might identify some other added features of the traffic signal equipment need to be installed.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 21st, 2019**

Haugen stated that we are carrying illustrative projects; they are all on the North Dakota side. He said that he will point out that North Dakota, for whatever reason, in their S.T.I.P. uses the term “pending”, but it means the same as illustrative, and those are projects that we would like to do but we don’t have the fiscal ability to do them, but when we do get the fiscal ability these are the projects that we would probably put those monies towards, and we would have to come through a T.I.P. amendment process. He said that in order to do that, and just to note, fiscal constraint is causing even a very low valued project to be shown as illustrative. He stated that you would think that within the means of the NDDOT a \$100,000 chip seal project could be financed, but they are identifying that they could not find ways to finance even that small amount of money in the T.I.P.

Haugen referred to a map and explained that it shows all of those projects, particularly in relationship to our environmental justice populations, which are low income and/or minority populations.

Haugen reported that also in the T.I.P. document is a year-by-year by type of project breakdown, and again it is just over \$100 million dollars that the Technical Advisory Committee and staff are asking this board to approve today. He stated that that is all we have for a presentation; included in your packet is more information so if anyone has any questions on anything.

Grasser asked, and it kind of relates to this; maybe why we are seeing some funny things in these outyears, but has there been any further discussion at the DOT as to whether they are going to do this or reset relative to especially the urban funding. He added that he thinks it has been eight or ten years ago now that they reset our balances so-to-speak. Haugen responded that he guesses the Senate Bill that has gone through the Senate Committee as resetting the rescission, or is taking that out, so he assumes that they are hoping that that passes congress and they don’t have to address the issue. Grasser said, though, that passing rescission doesn’t solve the problem if you’re leaving money there. Haugen stated that it doesn’t change today’s condition with the program. Grasser said that we aren’t planning on doing that in there officially. Haugen commented that the bigger thing that they are working towards is, if Fargo/Moorhead becomes a TMA and they get an automatic \$X dollar amount out of that program, then they would readjust the rest of the permanent program. Grasser asked if that would affect the Urban program as well. Haugen responded that would.

MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE FY2020-2023 T.I.P., AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Vetter, Powers, Strandell, Mock, Grasser, DeMers, Rost, and Vein

Voting Nay: None

Abstain: None

Absent: None

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF A.T.A.C TRAFFIC COUNT ADDENDUM

Haugen reported that as traffic signals come online, or get replaced with newer video capturing equipment, we engage or contract with A.T.A.C. to bring those online with our counting program. He

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 21st, 2019**

said that there are six signals that are part of this scope of work, and the total cost is just shy of \$9,000.00 and this is in our work program, so both the Technical Advisory Committee and staff are recommending you approve this contract addendum.

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY VEIN, TO APPROVE THE A.T.A.C. TRAFFIC COUNT ADDENDUM, AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Vetter, Powers, Strandell, Mock, Grasser, DeMers, Rost, and Vein

Voting Nay: None

Abstain: None

Absent: None

MATTER OF DRAFT 32ND AVENUE BRIDGE FEASIBILITY STUDY RFP

Haugen reported that at the June MPO Executive Policy Board meeting you asked staff to put together a scope of work specific to the 32nd Avenue Bridge Feasibility. He said that included in the packet is a draft of that scope of work.

Haugen commented that before getting into the scope of work he forgot to identify that there was that Joint County Commission meeting that was held earlier this month. He asked if either of the County Commissioners would like to give a report on that meeting.

Rost stated that the minutes are not done from that meeting yet but the Commissioners from Polk County and Grand Forks County met and talked about the Merrifield Bridge location. He said that they talked about if that bridge is built that the NDDOT would put in an interchange out at I-29 as well.

Rost said that they all felt that they needed to look at more things pertaining to that bridge and that is pretty much where it was left at this time.

Strandell agreed, adding that he knows that on the Minnesota side they pretty much put in place some action that would prevent people from building in a proposed roadway area, and that was done years ago, but as far as anything beyond that they have some support for that site location. Rost added that he definitely thinks that there would be a lot of support on the North Dakota side as well.

Haugen commented that in the scope of work that we drafted there are a few things that they really wanted to emphasize, and they tried to do that; one is to make sure that we get the traffic correct and identify all the needs along that corridor. He said that that corridor has been defined as South Washington Street at the west end and Rhinehart Drive on the east end. He added that the second thing they wanted to focus on was the school safety component on the North Dakota side, and they tried to address that with some language and other items in the scope; and the third thing was the impact to the flood protection system, particularly the hydraulic impact, and so they tried to identify and place a little emphasis in some of these areas.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 21st, 2019**

Haugen said that they are also approaching this like they have many of our recent studies, as what is termed “planning and environmental linkage” or PEL for short. He explained that that allows us to maybe go; normally in planning we really don’t go too far into the environmental or the NEPA process, but this is something that allows us to go into that a little bit further and answer some really up front questions as to whether or not there are some show-stoppers here from an environmental perspective but it does not get us to a NEPA document, but it does help inform, considerably a follow-up NEPA document that would be done.

Haugen stated that because this is framed around the PEL language there are a lot of these same 18 different factors that we need to address, but the key to this is that, again, we are focusing on all of the transportation needs of all modes; the school safety component, particularly on the North Dakota side of the corridor; and lastly working with the flood protection system, particularly the hydraulic analysis.

Haugen commented that, as you can tell, the front of the document is based on Section 7 of our normal RFP, so the other six sections in the front are required verbiage that we need from a federal point of view, and at the tail end we did not put much down on the public involvement process as far as separating out the consultants responsibilities versus our responsibilities, nor did we put together an actual map of the corridor study, but this is the draft that we have for you to consider. He added that, again, we are budgeting around \$110,000 for the consultant costs.

Strandell asked how this study differs from previous studies, what new information did it obtain. Haugen responded that right now the 32nd Avenue Corridor, from the Long Range Transportation Plan, we’ve identified it, from a Metropolitan point of view, beneficial from a traffic operation standpoint. He added that it will take, and they looked at three key intersections; Rhinehart and the new bridge, Belmont and the new bridge, 32nd and Washington, but those are still that very high level of what they would do to make sure that there is a solution to the level of service issues. He stated that this will take us down to that traffic operations level, and we will be looking at those intersections in a more refined manner, but then we are also including intersections such as Cherry and Belmont, etc. and we are including now a component of how it relates to school safety on the corridor, and then lately we are taking a look at how it really works with the flood protection system. He said that, again, at the planning level we aren’t getting into a level of detail that this study would be giving us as far as how it works with the flood protections system, so in a nutshell that kind of takes it from that planning level, which is a high elevation and brings it down to a much more refined elevation but not to a project development level yet, there is still another level of analysis that will take place if anything in this corridor goes to a project development level, so it gives us a more refined answer of what the questions are and what the issues are, what possible solutions are out there, but it can’t get to the planning level of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, and, again, it still can’t get us to any project level specifics of this is the recommended solution to this issue at this spot.

Strandell commented that he is getting the feeling that 32nd Avenue has been chosen as the bridge site. Haugen responded that that is the site that is identified in our transportation plan for one of two additional river crossings, Merrifield being the second.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 21st, 2019**

Rost stated that he just doesn't feel that 32nd Avenue is going to be viable; 2045, he thinks that all of those driveways all dump into 32nd Avenue, the schools, that is going to be a huge safety issue. He said that he just doesn't think that that is a good site to put a bridge, he doesn't think that it is going to work, and he thinks that \$110,000 is a lot of money to spend on something that he doesn't think; you can do all the study you want, he just doesn't think it is going to be a popular place to put a bridge, it's just not going to do it, but no matter what you do, whatever study you do.

DeMers asked when will we know, if there are exemptions from that \$110,000 that aren't going to work. Haugen responded that one of the hang ups we are having is; North Dakota is our lead State and our lead Federal Agency, and they have some staff vacancies so we are working through their vacancies to get a federal thumbs up or thumbs down on it so they are aware of the timing and we are still pushing and will be meeting with them at a workshop in Fargo next week.

DeMers said, secondly, when we talk about the part that brings particular attention to the school areas, would that include some illustrative projects or things that could be implemented with costs, or is that the next level. Haugen responded that this will come up with alternatives that address all the various issues, there will be more than one alternative that could give us the solution, it will have a cost estimate for that. He added that what this study could do is eliminate some of those that aren't technically feasible so if somebody throws out an idea that maybe we could do this, this will do the technical review of that and determine whether it is technically feasible to do or even if it is technical feasible but the cost is such that it is more than we can bear with our fiscal constraint, we can eliminate some alternatives but we will always end up with a list of alternatives that are still technically feasible and are within our fiscal constraint capabilities.

DeMers asked if there will be a Steering Committee involved in this project. Haugen responded that normally with our corridor studies, and this is kind of a corridor study, that would be fleshed out in the public involvement process, so that is something that is still up for discussion. DeMers stated that he thinks that would be important for this, and as always, usually when we do these corridors it seems like if you include people, the stakeholders, he thinks that steering process really helps to illustrate the dilemmas and obviously bring issues and concerns to light, and again focuses those concerns and goals in areas that are important.

Vein commented that this has obviously been a very complex and difficult process that we have gone through, and there are many sides to the whole story, but the issue is we have a transportation system that is not working real well and it is only projected to get worse. He said that the biggest issue is Minnesota and 4th and the amount of traffic that is going there and there is probably no such thing as "do nothing" because doing nothing is only going to make that situation worse so we would be making that decision, if we don't look at another option, then we choose to make the Minnesota/4th Corridor continue to be less efficient and dangerous, because much of this is about public safety.

Vein stated that every place that we look at for a location of for a bridge has implications. He said that every single one of these locations has pros and cons and negatives so if we go back to the process we

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 21st, 2019**

have the traffic consultant who did go through the study and made recommendations; and the City's and the County's and the MPO have all agreed to that, and that decision was 32nd Avenue South, and there is a point ranking system in here for why that one was determined to be the best location, but it does have the implication that you talked about, it adds a lot of traffic to 32nd Avenue South; on the same token it decreases traffic in almost all other areas, and that is kind of the balances that he looked at when we did this.

Vein said that if we don't do 32nd Avenue South, what would be the other alternative, that is the question he asks, what could we do differently that would solve the problem because he thinks the study we are seeing today do say that this is the best location, but to be honest he looked at Elks Drive and what the implications are for that; or we looked at 47th, but unless you did something in there it seems like 32nd from a purely safety perspective, and north of there are the only ones that give us good value, 47th does not solve the internal city traffic although it does take a lot of the external traffic that goes around the city.

Vein stated that we will always have neighborhood impacts, and he doesn't know if there will ever be a perfect solution, but we have to try and he thought at least this study would help us determine; first of all he isn't sure if hydraulically we can do this and make it work so we've got to do that hydraulic study, and he thinks we have to do a school safety study, if we can't keep people and students and drivers safe than that is an issue too, so at least this study takes it to that next level, can we build a bridge at this location hydraulically, if we can't it's gone, or he guesses the choice would be to go to a elevation that would be above the lower elevation that we talked about, and if we can't keep the schools safe then that would eliminate for him too, but we won't know that until we do the study. He added, again, if we let it continue to hang out there, then these people on 32nd will all be left in limbo because we won't know anything until we do the study, so that is why he actually thinks it is advantageous for everyone even on 32nd to do the study because at least we will have more details than we have today because we don't have all the data that we need, so that is why he is in support of trying to move this forward to at least this level. He said that he knows we have had some discussions about whether or not we can do a feasibility study at other locations besides just this one, and then we could maybe compare some of them, and he isn't necessarily against that so one question he would ask is if we were to add another location to this how much additional cost would that add to the study, he doesn't think it would double. Haugen responded that he did answer that question at a ward meeting and he did suggest that it probably would double the cost. He explained that you will have some commonalities that would reduce the cost but then each of these corridors have unique aspects to them that would require us to invest considerable energy into that uniqueness so your commonalities kind of get lost in the uniqueness of each of the additional sites that have to be evaluated.

Grasser asked if when you do a project concept report or a final report would we normally have to look at alternatives. Haugen responded that we would. Grasser asked if those alternatives probably go back and consider other bridge locations. Haugen responded that they could, it depends on how you scope your project concept report. Grasser said, then, that he is going to go back; some of the things that he is

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 21st, 2019**

struggling with is, yes we have a 32nd Avenue South location in the Long Range Transportation Plan, but it is probably there not so much as recognizing that is a good location other than it was a requirement to get the Long Range Transportation Plan done so we kind of picked one, knowing it had challenges; but he agrees that in his mind he just doesn't see 32nd ever being viable from a political/financial standpoint, and he is struggling that that that would be the choice. He then said he would switch to another philosophical idea; at this point in the Long Range Transportation Plan we studied five or six bridge locations, so we studied a universe of bridge locations like this, now we are looking at a study that funnels that down to exactly one location, but then when we get to the final project concept development we are probably going to expand the universe back out again, so he is struggling with that idea of going from universe to single back to a larger universe, and it feels like we are going too far too fast at this point and maybe we should think about carrying a couple of other locations to this next level, for instance the environmental review, if we do an environmental review at this location we are going to get some data, but we don't know if that environmental review is better or worse than what might otherwise have been at a different location, we have nothing to compare it to because we are only going to be studying one. He said that he is trying to combine and compromise a number of things, he has looked at some of the same things that Mr. Vein has looked at too so he is going to throw out the idea that a better approach to this thing would be to carry, probably in his mind, three levels of options that we do the next level of investigation; he thinks that Elks should probably stay on the list, 32nd is already there, and he thinks 47th is identified by the Mayor; so he thinks it would be worthwhile, it may cost us money, it may cost us local money, but man this is a big big decision and a big project and he thinks it would be a worthwhile investment to try to refine that. He added that on a political platform we found that there is some decisions, certainly on the Grand Forks side, about council people wondering if 32nd is best, think we need to go back and validate what passes, you know maybe the local funding availability or support. He said that his thought is that maybe we look at expanding this scope to, he is going to suggest three locations, and he is going to through that out there for discussion.

Rost suggested we add Merrifield as well. He stated that there is going to be support on the Minnesota side and there is going to be support on the North Dakota side; we are looking at 2045, and the way Grand Forks is growing it is going to be past 62nd Avenue, or past the Merrifield Road by the time 2045 rolls around, that way development can go in and around whatever that corridor is going to be. Grasser commented that in his mind that isn't a bad idea, it would help us actually go back and prioritize as there was some confusion about, okay, what is the priority ranking, we didn't actually rank them in the Long Range Transportation Plan, he thought we kind of had but found out later we really didn't, so that, again, all makes sense to him to kind of go to the next level of study in more detail. Vein asked if we didn't already to the Merrifield Road location but we haven't done the other three. Haugen responded that we have. Vein said, then, that we wouldn't need to redo the Merrifield location again, we can still stay focused on the three. Grasser said that it may be a bit dated though. Rost said that he is just surprised that Grand Forks is growing as fast as it has, if you look how far out we are already.

Vetter commented, in part to answer Mr. Rost's question about including Merrifield, or in the ranking, he thinks the Long Range Transportation Plan, if he remembers correctly, says we need both bridges now, we can't do one and then wait fifteen years and do the other, that isn't going to work, each bridge

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 21st, 2019**

serves its own purpose. He said that it is kind of remiss that the Counties weren't actually going after that Merrifield Bridge; he got the feeling that they feel that "it will come twenty or thirty years from now", but we need that bridge now also, as much as we need the 32nd Avenue Bridge we need the Merrifield Bridge also, and they both serve two different purposes so if you build a Merrifield it isn't going to help with the Belmont/Minnesota Avenue issue that we have. He added that as far as expanding the study out to include three locations, where are you going to find the money; he thinks we do the one and we can kind of extrapolate the results of that to Elks and 17th to some degree, but at least it gives us a "yes this is a viable option" or "no you need to look somewhere else". Grasser responded that if we don't push that back to the local governments we won't know if there might be an appetite to fund the additional locations, he wouldn't want to assume that at this point, but he knows that we as an MPO don't have the money and it probably isn't available to change the work plan to accommodate it either. Haugen commented that we would be talking about not doing the Land Use Plan updates if we were to fund the additional work.

Vein asked if we are able to get this through the MPO are there local monies that we could use toward getting this done, and spending more even if it doesn't match federal aid, at least on the North Dakota side, between you and Todd if there would be some way you could come up with some of those funds. Todd Feland responded that he thinks if there is a will they can prioritize and can make it happen and he thinks it would probably satisfy people.

Mock stated that she thinks that that is probably the question, what we would need to do to come up with the additional funds to help support that. She asked if we move forward with this feasibility study would we get to the point where we would know, we would study those traffic impacts along the corridor, so if we did 32nd it would extend 32nd to both schools, and if we did expand to another location, Elks Drive, it would look at the impacts to 24th because there is a school on there as well, so we would capture that as well. Haugen responded that if we did Elks Drive we would have to expand the study to include the 32nd Avenue Corridor, 24th Avenue Corridor, 17th Avenue Corridor, to Washington just because the model shows that Elks obviously enters a "T" which would split traffic so it sends it down different corridors, so each of those corridors should have a level of analysis of all the key intersections as to what Elks' impact is and how it should be addressed. Mock said though that that would give us comparables on the impact there versus the impact at a different location so you can compare them.

Mock asked if we would get to a point of understanding if buyouts are necessary or which residents would be most impacted and what that impact would be or would not be? Haugen responded that the actual identification of buyouts would come at a later design level, but we would be able to identify potential impacts. Mock said then that this would just be a rough frame and just kind of sketch out the impacts, but we would at least have an idea of what that impact would look like. Haugen agreed we would have a better idea.

MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY ROST, TO APPROVE A REQUEST FOR MPO STAFF TO DRAFT AN RFP, SCOPE OF WORK, AND COST ESTIMATES TO PERFORM FEASIBILITY STUDIES FOR THREE LOCATIONS; ELKS DRIVE, 32ND AVENUE SOUTH, AND 47TH

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 21st, 2019**

AVENUE SOUTH, AND TO BRING THAT INFORMATION TO A FUTURE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD MEETING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION.

Vein stated that he supports the motion; and he looked a little more at the traffic impacts at Elks Drive, outside of the current areas, and it is probably one of the better of the projects. He said that it isn't an issue if we, as the locals, come up with the money to do the study, correct, utilize the same funding mechanism as what currently out there for 32nd Avenue. Haugen responded that we would be including in some local dollars which would essentially be considered an over-match of the federal funds, so there isn't an issue from the MPO's point of view. Vein commented that on the East Grand Forks side it would impact differently at each location, the 47th location is outside of their City Limits, the other two are within their City Limits. He asked if East Grand Forks representatives are comfortable with this additional study. Vetter responded that the motion was to do just the three locations, Elks, 17th and 32nd. Grasser responded that it is to basically just develop that information and come back for further discussion as to whether we continue with three, with two, or just the one; he would just like to have that information to look at. Mock commented that the motion was to look at Elks, 32nd and 47th, not 17th. Grasser agreed that she is correct. Vetter stated that the problem he has with 47th is that it is so far out that it doesn't help East Grand Forks at all, and we have the cost/benefit ratio that shows it isn't a good location, so even if we choose that are we going to get any federal funds because the cost/benefit ratio isn't there, so for him personally, 47th Avenue is off the table, it just doesn't do anything for East Grand Forks.

Strandell said that from a reality standpoint trying to get two bridges, that just isn't going to happen in our lifetime. He stated that he supports Merrifield, but 47th looks like some kind of an option, something that might work, and by the time it is built the community will have grown out to that point, and it will be right there.

Sandy Marshall, Grand Forks City Council, and she really likes the notion of looking at the three sites, she thinks that is a very mindful motion to make and would personally support that from a funding standpoint.

Cory Mock, North Dakota State Representative, said that he has a couple of notes or comments just from the discussion; he is not opposed to the three locations, and he thinks Mr. DeMers said it most recently that as far as East Grand Forks is concerned, pick a location and lets go forward, but just settle on something so we can move forward and he shares that sentiment. He added that, full-disclosure, he lives right off the Point Bridge

C. Mock commented that he doesn't know who said it but they said that we might be moving too far too fast, with all due respect he knows that we have been talking about a fourth crossing in the Grand Forks area since 1967, so he doesn't know if we are moving too far too fast, and in fact, honestly, this is a conversation that is long overdue. He added that the best time to have built a bridge between Grand Forks and East Grand Forks was likely 34 years ago, and the second best time might have to be today, so he hopes that we are starting to move on action because as the numbers show we are going to need it, we need it but we are going to need it more.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 21st, 2019**

C. Mock stated that as far as extending the study to three bridges, he personally would not be opposed to doing a feasibility study as a resident of three locations, his concern is with 47th, because are we treating that as an in-city crossing or would it be treated as an alternative to Merrifield as a by-pass, knowing that the whole idea that Merrifield would function as a by-pass to alleviate truck traffic and there would be a in-city crossing to alleviate just general congestion and traffic flow for the communities. He said that just having 47th as an in-city traffic relief would not do nearly enough for the other crossings, so if you are going to do that he would strongly support or suggest that you consider 47th as a by-pass and not as an in-city crossing just knowing that the numbers just don't work out to be an in-city relief option.

C. Mock said that the last thing he would point out is that safety is a concern for everybody; everyone who has mentioned it he would not agree more, Mr. Vein mentioned that even with 32nd Avenue that knowing the safety and potential affects, or the students at Schroeder and Kelly, if that safety cannot be preserved it is likely a non-starter no matter how good the numbers work out, and he would agree. He explained that they live just a couple of blocks from the Point Bridge, so they know exactly how important safety is with having almost 8,000 cars go within 15-feet of Phoenix Elementary each and every day, and that is where he would just point out that the cost of doing nothing, from a safety perspective, if we do nothing by 2045 the estimates show that we are going to have 30,000 cars going by Wilder Elementary off of the Kennedy Bridge every day, that is a car every 2 seconds; and you are going to have about 13,000 cars going by Phoenix Elementary at the corner of Belmont and 4th; so if we do this right, as he knows this body has been advocates for, if we do it right the traffic count for any south crossing, regardless of where it is at, if it is at 32nd or Elks, it would be about the same as what we have at the Point Bridge today, and if that is too much, if it is unsafe for students at Schroeder, then what are we going to do to address safety at Wilder and Phoenix, because they are already seeing that traffic today, and they will see more of it tomorrow, so just as a local resident he wants to push that safety is important for everybody, we want to do it right, but if we do nothing it is going to make it more dangerous for a lot of other neighborhoods, we don't want any one neighborhood to do everything, we want to spread it out and make it easier for everybody.

Mock asked, if we move forward with the feasibility at all three locations, the concept that 47th would probably not involve East Grand Forks, would it involve the county, and it likely wouldn't be eligible for federal funding, would that be captured as part of that as well. Haugen responded that it has already been captured so it would just be advanced, and there probably would need to be more discussion within Polk County on the Minnesota side as to would 47th be something as take over a county road or section. Mock asked where would that take place? After a detailed information on cost estimates at these locations? Haugen responded that it would be a refined cost estimate, and it would also include then, at these key intersections, and in the case of 47th Avenue where you have township roads at best, there would be a cost estimate to bring them up to a bridge crossing standard. Mock said, then, that those types of costs would be captured.

Vein stated that one thing he would like to make sure that we do, he knows there was some question, is not necessarily public involvement, but public awareness he thinks is really big, when these things come forward and there are presentations to be made, he thinks that we probably need to step outside of our norm and figure out how to make sure people hear the data at the same time, so somehow that process

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 21st, 2019**

would need to be enhanced a little bit. He said that he doesn't know if the consultant does that or how we would do that but that is inclusive in the proposal that we do it.

Grasser reiterated the motion on the table isn't to proceed with the detailed study at this point but just to have the MPO bring us the information after which we would have further discussion he thinks at that point then there could be a decision as to how many of and which ones we would study, so again, this motion is pretty limited in scope, it is just to get the information so he thinks we can make an informed decision. Mock asked if we move forward with that motion can we also understand where the funding will come from, is that part of it. Grasser responded that in his mind we would definitely again, we could have internal discussion but right now we don't know how many dollars we might be talking about, so he thinks that that would be one of those follow-ons to that.

DeMers commented that even if it is \$150,000 extra, he doesn't know if East Grand Forks is going to have the funds to cover 50% of that to study two additional crossings, that will be a tough discussion if you want to figure out how it is going to be paid for by extra local dollars. He said that he is having a hard time figuring out if they are going to have to come up with money for this study, but if it is going to be even harder to figure out an additional 200% on top of that, that is going to be hard to sell.

Grasser stated, again, try not to go too far on the motion, but he thinks part of it would help figure that discussion. He said that when it comes back he can see a whole number of different pathways that the discussion can go down; once we start having information, potentially one of them could be if the hydraulic analysis is very expensive maybe we don't do a hydraulic analysis on all three, maybe we limit some of the scopes on some of the others, he isn't saying what the answer is, he just thinks it is worthy of further discussion. He added that he thinks there are ways we can help control the budget.

DeMers said that, going back to a couple of months ago, it seems like we have had these discussions over and over and he wonders if it would be just more cost effective to go ahead with one, knowing that you would look at the corridor for each of those; yes they do have their own geometries, they have all those things that are included, but in essence all of them along there are going to have a similar go/no go reaction to them throughout that whole corridor, you are going to be able to very clearly see this is a thumbs up or a thumbs down or it is possible or it isn't, but he doesn't think you are going to get diverging go or no go's for any of those corridors, he thinks we are going to get a yes they are all good or no they aren't, and he just thinks if you want to have a political fight about where it should go, have that later, but get something down and start working on it.

Vein stated that one exception that he would have to that is the hydraulics. He said that he thinks that if we get into a position where hydraulics don't work, we don't need to do the rest of the study, that is kind of where he is leaning, that is one of the very first things we need to address is hydraulics, it is one of his biggest concerns, especially with the lower bridge. DeMers stated that that is what he is saying, why would three studies all include hydraulics when we know that, yes there are different river bends and lengths and such, but for the most part you are going to know real quick if that hydraulic works on one,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 21st, 2019**

it will work on all. Vein responded that he doesn't think that is the case. He said that 47th has definitely got different hydraulics than Elks would, and he thinks 32nd is probably somewhere in-between, but he thinks we have some real differences hydraulically between these three, because if hydraulics, again, won't work there isn't any reason to do the rest of the study. Grasser suggested that that should be the first phase of the study.

Powers said that in the interest of moving forward, and getting something done, he is going to call the question.

Mock commented that she just wants to make sure, because she hates this idea that we are always saying "well we will talk about it at the next meeting, or we'll make a decision in the future", so we already have a scope and estimated cost, so we are asking MPO staff to do this, it would be the same scope at each location wouldn't it, so it is just an updated cost and where the money would come from. Haugen responded that what isn't shown here is the study map, and so we wouldn't be looking at just a corridor, we would be looking at a mile stretch of Grand Forks' network instead of a street network, so there will be an essentially different scope for each location, and that is just on the traffic side. Mock said, though that the core would be essentially the same, and you would get where the funding would come from as well so that we could proceed with a decision. Haugen responded that by next month not only have the scope but you are also asking me to work with the two City Administrators, possibly Polk County and Grand Forks County Administrators to see if there are dollars to fill in the gap of what we currently have identified from the MPO resources.

Vetter said that the question has been called.

Voting Aye: Strandell, Mock, Grasser, Rost, and Vein

Voting Nay: Vetter, Powers and DeMers

Abstain: None

Absent: None

MATTER OF UPDATE ON DOWNTOWN PARKING STUDY

Haugen reported that included in the packet is the power point that highlights the implementation section of the plan. He stated that the Steering Committee has met and approved these implementation strategies.

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

Haugen summarized that they feel there is enough existing parking for now and for the next ten years, it is just a matter of managing it differently and there are suggestions on how to do that included as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 21st, 2019**

Haugen commented that from a Steering Committee's point of view they have done their work and they are recommending that the report and the implementation strategy in the report be approved. He stated that they will be processing it through the local entities and will come back for final approval.

Information only.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no further public comment.

OTHER BUSINESS

- a. 2019 Annual Work Program Project Update

Vetter that our 2019 Annual Work Program Project Update is included. There were no questions or comments on the update.

- b. Approval Of Bill/Check List For 7/13/19 to 8/16/19 Period

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY STRANDELL TO APPROVE THE ATTACHED BILL/CHECK LIST FOR THE 7/13/19 TO 8/16/19 PERIOD, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY ROST, TO ADJOURN THE AUGUST 21ST, 2019, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:03 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,
Peggy McNelis, Office Manager

Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO
Transaction List by Vendor
 July 13 through August 16, 2019

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
AFLAC.							
Liability Check	07/26/2019	AFLAC	501	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-585.22
Alerus Financial							
Liability Check	07/26/2019	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-3,186.12
Liability Check	08/09/2019	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-3,367.32
Alliant Engineering							
Bill	07/15/2019	Inv. #...	Work Done O...	206 · Accounts Pay...		566 · MN220 N...	-1,800.02
Bill Pmt -Check	07/15/2019	6765	Work Done O...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-1,800.02
Bill	08/01/2019	Inv. #...	Work Done O...	206 · Accounts Pay...		566 · MN220 N...	-697.35
Bill Pmt -Check	08/01/2019	6782	Work Done O...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-697.35
CitiBusiness Card							
Bill	07/25/2019	Inv. #...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		-SPLIT-	-149.35
Bill Pmt -Check	07/25/2019	6781	Charges For ...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-149.35
City of East Grand Forks							
Bill	07/15/2019	Inv. #...	2019 3rd Qua...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-3,031.58
Bill Pmt -Check	07/15/2019	6766	2019 3rd Qua...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-3,031.58
City of Grand Forks IT Department							
Bill	07/15/2019	Inv. #...	EVGA Graphi...	206 · Accounts Pay...		535 · Equipment	-951.10
Bill Pmt -Check	07/15/2019	6767	EVGA Graphi...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-951.10
East Grand Forks Water and Light							
Bill	07/19/2019	Inv. #...	2nd Quarter 2...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-599.75
Bill Pmt -Check	07/19/2019	6776	2nd Quarter 2...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-599.75
Fidelity Security Life.							
Liability Check	07/26/2019	6777	50790-1043	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-16.88
FM Metro COG							
Bill	08/07/2019		Registration F...	206 · Accounts Pay...		530 · Educatio...	-390.00
Bill Pmt -Check	08/07/2019	6786	Registration F...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-390.00
Forum Communications Company							
Bill	08/09/2019	Inv. #...	Public Notice ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		555 · TIP	-186.35
Bill Pmt -Check	08/09/2019	6787	Public Notice ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-186.35
Kadmas, Lee & Jackson, Inc.							
Bill	07/15/2019	Inv. #...	For Work On ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		550 · Corridor ...	-2,448.14
Bill Pmt -Check	07/15/2019	6768	For Work On ...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-2,448.14
Bill	07/15/2019	Inv. #...	For Work On ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		550 · Corridor ...	-761.88
Bill Pmt -Check	07/15/2019	6784	For Work On ...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-761.88
Bill	07/15/2019	Inv. #...	For Work On ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		550 · Corridor ...	-3,609.63
Bill Pmt -Check	07/15/2019	6785	For Work On ...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-3,609.63
Kimley-Horn And Associates, Inc.							
Bill	07/15/2019	Inv. #...	Retainage Du...	206 · Accounts Pay...		220 · Retainag...	-36,730.15
Bill Pmt -Check	07/15/2019	6770	Retainage Du...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-36,730.15
Liberty Business Systems, Inc.							
Bill	07/19/2019	Inv. #...	Contract Bas...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-147.87
Bill Pmt -Check	07/19/2019	6774	Contract Bas...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-147.87
LSNB as Trustee for PEHP							
Liability Check	07/26/2019	PEHP		104 · Checking	X	216 · Post-Hea...	-165.00
Madison Nat'l Life							
Liability Check	07/26/2019	6778		104 · Checking	X	215 · Disability...	-90.30
Mike's							
Bill	07/17/2019		MPO Lunche...	206 · Accounts Pay...		711 · Miscellan...	-130.28
Bill Pmt -Check	07/17/2019	6773	MPO Lunche...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-130.28
Minnesota Department of Revenue							
Liability Check	07/26/2019	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-208.00
Liability Check	08/09/2019	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-207.00
Minnesota Life Insurance Company							
Liability Check	07/26/2019	6779		104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-117.78
Nationwide Retirement Solutions							
Liability Check	07/26/2019	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-640.92
Liability Check	08/09/2019	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-640.92
NDPERS							
Liability Check	07/26/2019	NDPE...	D88	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-3,853.50
Liability Check	07/26/2019	NDPE...		104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-3,273.38
QuickBooks Payroll Service							
Liability Check	07/24/2019		Created by P...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-8,403.60
Liability Check	08/07/2019		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-8,344.10

Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO
Transaction List by Vendor
 July 13 through August 16, 2019

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
SRF Consulting Group, Inc.							
Bill	07/15/2019	Inv. #...	For Work On ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		565 · Special ...	-5,720.76
Bill Pmt -Check	07/15/2019	6769	For Work On ...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-5,720.76
Bill	07/15/2019	Inv. #...	For Work On ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		565 · Special ...	-501.20
Bill Pmt -Check	07/15/2019	6771	For Work On ...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-501.20
Bill	07/15/2019	Inv. #...	Retainage Du...	206 · Accounts Pay...		220 · Retainag...	-3,499.78
Bill Pmt -Check	07/15/2019	6772	Retainage Du...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-3,499.78
Bill	08/07/2019	Inv. #...	Work Done O...	206 · Accounts Pay...		565 · Special ...	-3,568.95
Bill Pmt -Check	08/07/2019	6783	Work Done O...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-3,568.95
Standard Insurance Company							
Liability Check	07/26/2019	6780		104 · Checking		217 · Dental P...	-158.60
Systems & Services, Inc.							
Bill	07/19/2019	Inv. #...	Filing Letters ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-66.69
Bill Pmt -Check	07/19/2019	6775	Filing Letters ...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-66.69