

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, October 16th, 2019, - 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Clarence Vetter, Chairman, called the October 16th, 2019, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:03 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Clarence Vetter, Mike Powers, Don Diedrich (Proxy For Warren Strandell), Marc DeMers, Bob Rost, Al Grasser, Ken Vein (Via Conference Phone), and Jeannie Mock.

Guests(s) present were: Trent Berg, Houston Engineering.

Staff present were: 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 AUGUST 21ST, 2019 MINUES AND THE
SEPTEMBER 11TH, 2019 MEETING SUMMARY OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY
BOARD**

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY ROST, TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 21ST, 2019
MINUTES AND THE SEPTEMBER 18TH, 2019 MEETING SUMMARY OF THE MPO
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2019 NORTH DAKOTA SIDE FUNCTIONAL
CLASSIFICATION MAP**

Kouba reported that as staff was going through the process of identifying the functionally classified roadways, NDDOT pointed out some inconsistencies and we also received some additional road mileage, so we went through the process of updating our functional class with our Technical Advisory Committee.

Kouba referred to the Functional Classification Map and stated that this is the map that the Technical Advisory Committee is recommending be approved. She commented that there weren't very many changes made to the map, but we wanted to make sure that everything that is in our urban area is functionally classified. She pointed out that most of the changes pertained to the added roadways to Cherry Street and to 55th Street. She added that it was also determined that Adams Drive shouldn't be classified, that it should be a local road, so that change was made as well.

Kouba commented that some of the future roadways we had on the map previously have been removed because the State no longer wants them on the Functional Classification Map, but they can be shown on a future map if the City wants it.

MOVED BY ROST, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE 2019 NORTH DAKOTA SIDE FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION MAP, AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Vetter, Powers, Diedrich (Proxy For Strandell), Mock, Grasser, DeMers, Rost, Vein (Via Conference Phone), and Mock.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF PLANNED FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION MAP

Kouba reported that these are the existing and future classification maps for both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks. She reiterated that this is being done at the request of the Technical Advisory Committee so that as they are planning into the future they know where proposed roads are located, particularly for areas that will be growing around the Cities.

Kouba stated that these maps are not required by State and Federal Standards, but they are a good foundation for planning.

Powers asked what the street is that is shown as being the furthest most south, is it 62nd. Grasser responded that the planned one is 69th and the actual one is 62nd.

MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE PLANNED FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATIONS MAPS, AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Vetter, Powers, Diedrich (Proxy For Strandell), Mock, Grasser, DeMers, Rost, Vein (Via Conference Phone), and Mock.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE FY2020 SAFETY TARGETS

Haugen reported that of all of the Performance Measures we are required to do by the Federal Government, this is the only one that is on the highway side that is annual, and it is the Safety Targets. He referred to the packet and added that there is a methodology that they recommend, or prefer, that we use to set these targets at both the State level and the Local level; that methodology is explained here, and graphically shown; then we take five sets of five-year rolling averages to create an average of those five sets to establish what our targets are. He said that based on the most recent data that we have those calculations are shown in the table in the packet and then are rolled over into our Proposed 2020 Targets.

Haugen referred to the table and commented that they are also showing State actions for the last three target settings, and then we show our previous two targets, and what was set then.

Haugen said that, other than going over the methodology the only other discussion issue was whether we would have decimal points, indicating 9/10ths of a person, or not; again the methodology is such that that is what the feds are indicating as their methodology, and you can see how both States, in their most recent targets, are going with decimal points as well, so these are the values we are asking you to set as our Safety Targets. He added that in the past we have waited until February to set these targets, but having done this twice now we are a little more in-tune with the process and one of the main reasons we are setting targets is to help us program safety projects, and so we are now soliciting for those programs, as it seemed to be a better timeline to do this now rather than waiting until February.

Haugen commented that the last table shown is; two year ago we set 2018 targets, and we now have the data from the last five years to show how we performed based on those targets , and so all five show that the performance was better than what the target was, so from now on when you see us identify potential new yearly safety targets we will always now have a performance to show how we have done compared to the targets we have set for that year.

Haugen stated that the action needed today is to adopt what is shown in the red blocks as your five safety targets for 2020.

Mock asked what happens if we don't meet our targets. Haugen responded that at the MPO level there are no identified penalties. He explained that every five years, as we go through our planning process, we have to show some progress, or we have to do an assessment of how we are progressing, and if we aren't showing great progress on safety then that would be something they would ask us to emphasize in our next plan. He added that at the State level there are penalties.

Grasser asked if the Technical Advisory Committee made these recommendations as well. Haugen responded that they did.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE FY2020 SAFETY TARGETS, AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Vetter, Powers, Diedrich (Proxy For Strandell), Mock, Grasser, DeMers, Rost, Vein (Via Conference Phone), and Mock.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2020 MNDOT STATE PLANNING GRANT CONTRACT

Haugen reported that every year re receive funds from the State of Minnesota; for the past ten plus years they have allowed those funds to be used to match our federal funds, so this is our annual contract that we enter into with Minnesota to access their State money. He added that as the staff report indicates, we have to identify, as part of our total funding package, that East Grand Forks is providing 20% match to these State dollars, so, again, in our total financial package we set aside the 20% from East Grand Forks to show they are matching this roughly \$11,000 we get from Minnesota.

Haugen reiterated that this is an annual contact that we have, and it is that time of year when they are asking us to execute our agreement.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY ROST, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING THE CHAIRMAN AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR EXECUTE THE ANNUAL MNDOT STATE PLANNING AGREEMENTS FO RFISCAL YEAR 2020.

Powers asked if this will go before the City Council. Haugen responded that it won't, that this is part of the MPO's overall budget.

Voting Aye: Vetter, Powers, Diedrich (Proxy For Strandell), Mock, Grasser, DeMers, Rost, Vein (Via Conference Phone), and Mock.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN UPATE

a. Matter Of Approval Of Environmental Justice Manual

Kouba reported that the Public Participation Plan is made up of several documents; the Participation Plan itself, the Environmental Justice Manual, the Limited English Proficiency Manual, Civil Rights, and the Americans With Disability Act. She stated that we are just presenting the Environmental Justice Manual update at this time because it is easier to take things in small bites.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 16th, 2019

Kouba said that with the Environmental Justice Manual, as they went through it, especially the data we were getting for our MPO area, we looked at it on a census block level, so when we looked at that data and how many people are within a minority or low income group, we saw that it is pretty diverse throughout the whole block group, and when we saw that it made it harder to determine if this is truly an area based on the methodology we were using previously, so this time around we changed that methodology so that the population is of a meaningful greater, and is going to be two times the population within the metro area, or if that unit exceeds 50%, depending on which group we are looking at.

Kouba stated that they went through the manual and updated that batch of information throughout it, making that statement that it is two times the total percent of the MPO boundary area, or 50%; and updated all of the maps and came up with some new areas, some areas that we generally have seen before, and we also separated out each side of the river so that we are also definitely including populations on the East Grand Forks side. She explained that sometimes Grand Forks tends to overshadow East Grand Forks so we want to make sure we are looking at populations in East Grand Forks as well, so that is why we separated out each side of the river.

Grasser asked if this is where people are residing. Kouba responded it is, adding that it is based on residents. Grasser referred to the map and pointed out that it shows that there is an area of population west of the Interstate between 17th Avenue South and 32nd Avenue South, that he isn't aware of. Kouba responded that the way the census block groups are set up it shows that that block group crosses the interstate, unfortunately, but in the area east of the interstate there is an area of apartments, which is generally a very high draw for certain groups. Grasser said, then, that it only shows up because of how the census blocks are set up.

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE UPDATE TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MANUAL, AS PRESENTED.

Mock asked about the area around Washington, from 17th to 20th, that gateway mall area where there are a lot of apartments and commented that this area was on previous Environmental Justice maps, but it isn't on this time. Kouba responded that it depends on how the math came out. She added that the area was probably close, like a border, but they kind of vacillate between being included and not being included, it just depends upon the various years.

Grasser stated that this is obviously just the Environmental Justice component, but do we have an idea when we are going to come back and talk about the Public Participation Plan in general, because he is wrapping this back up into some of the criticism we are getting on the bridges and stuff, that we didn't communicate it effectively, and we should look at that component. Haugen responded that we should be talking about it in November.

Mock asked, with the distinction of the Environmental Justice areas, how does that impact future areas that she imagines will take place, or carry over future impacts for different projects, do we do a special emphasis of those areas, or do we just make sure the impacts don't place a burden on those areas. Kouba responded that we are looking more at trying to overcome that connection, letting people know that we know that in these areas we need to try a little bit harder,

but we also, in other projects, especially construction, need to be able to mitigate any adverse impacts to the area.

Voting Aye: *Vetter, Powers, Diedrich (Proxy For Strandell), Mock, Grasser, DeMers, Rost, Vein (Via Conference Phone), and Mock.*

Voting Nay: *None.*

Abstain: *None.*

Absent: *None.*

b. Matter Of Approval Of Awarding Agreement With CivicLive For ADA Website

McNelis reported that as everyone is aware the MPO's website is not currently ADA compliant, and that is something that we need to address as soon as we can; so she contacted three different companies; CivicPlus, who developed the City of East Grand Forks' website; Granicus, who developed the City of Grand Forks' website; and CivicLive.

McNelis stated that after proposals were received from all three companies, and all three gave demonstrations of their work; CivicLive stood out as being the best fit for our needs at this time.

McNelis commented that she did send links of examples of some of CivicLive Websites, but Mr. Haugen has one pulled up for you to view today.

McNelis pointed out that the initial setup cost for the Website will be about \$4,700, and that there will be an annual update/maintenance cost of \$4,260.00.

Grasser asked who is paying for the initial setup of the website. Haugen responded that the cost share would be the typical 80/10/10. Grasser asked if the maintenance costs will be shared the same. Haugen responded that they would.

Haugen stated that one thing to note is that CivicLive will be monitoring our site for ADA compliance, so they will run checks on the website and flag us before somebody else flags us and causes a bigger problem.

MOVED BY ROST, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE AWARDING THE AGREEMENT WITH CIVICLIVE FOR THE ADA WEBSITE.

Voting Aye: *Vetter, Powers, Diedrich (Proxy For Strandell), Mock, Grasser, DeMers, Rost, Vein (Via Conference Phone), and Mock.*

Voting Nay: *None.*

Abstain: *None.*

Absent: *None.*

MATTER OF BRIDGE FEASIBILITY RFP

Haugen reported that this is a carry over from last months non-meeting. He said that at that time it was being announced that the hydraulic analysis is not eligible for MPO funding, and that each

City was going to consider joining together on an RFQ for the water hydraulics. He stated that since then both City Councils have authorized the release of an RFQ, however there is still a little potential funding that has to be worked out.

Haugen stated that where this came from was a month ago, announcing that we really can't do the water hydraulics, so a meeting with the City Council representatives and the City Administrators to ask how we should move forward from here, and an agreement was made to separate out the water hydraulics from the traffic analysis and move forward with the answer on water hydraulics as fast as we can and that will help us identify where we should focus traffic operations as a follow-up, so that is the update that we have at this time.

Powers asked if East Grand Forks is doing Elks and 32nd. Vetter responded that East Grand Forks is only doing 32nd, but Grand Forks approved doing Elks, 32nd and 47th. Grasser commented that Grand Forks approved to get the RFPs for the three bridges, but he thinks there was going to be additional discussion about the funding when that comes back.

Grasser stated that, putting on his other hat here, he thinks that when they get into the RFQ at the selection committee, although he normally doesn't like having a politician on the selecting board, but because of the nature of this he is just thinking that we should look at having somebody from Grand Forks City Council and East Grand Forks City Council. Consensus was that this would be a good idea.

Vein said that he thinks Grand Forks is on board to proceed with getting the qualifications. He added that he does think that do have some more discussions that need to take place on the Grand Forks side to talk about what that cost share might look like, but he thinks we are moving forward appropriately with getting qualifications.

Powers asked what the cost is, is it \$12,000.00. Vetter responded that it is estimated at \$30,000 per crossing, that is what the RFQ comes in at and then we can decide how to break it all out. Powers said, then, that there is still a possibility that East Grand Forks might consider Elks. Vetter responded that it is possible, adding that the Mayor still threw it out there that we shouldn't shut it off completely, especially if that is what it takes to move the project forward. Powers asked if there was any idea when it might happen. Grasser responded that their staff keeps getting tied up with emergencies with all the moisture we've been getting these past weeks, but it should happen soon.

Information only.

MATTER OF NORTH DAKTOA CONSOLIDATED PLANNING GRAND DISTRIBUTION FORMULA

Haugen reported that this is a follow-up from the September meeting. He stated that back on October 7th the MPO Directors met with the NDDOT; we did not have Federal Highway present. He said that there was a discussion that has been ongoing about the North Dakota distribution formula for most if not all of the 2010s.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 16th, 2019

Haugen stated that the basic issue is that Fargo/Moorhead has several years of grants open that they are accessing to pay for things, while Grand Forks/East Grand Forks is down to operating on our current fiscal year, and have been for the last couple of years, so when it came time to open the 2020 Grant, from North Dakota's perspective they said that there is a constraint that they cannot have too many prior year grants open, so the formula distribution got pushed back to the forefront.

Haugen referred to a table and explained that it shows the five scenarios that were eventually laid out on the table for consideration. He stated that the three MPOs met with NDDOT and the first three scenarios were developed at that meeting, and then after the meeting Bismarck/Mandan submitted Scenario D, and then Fargo/Moorhead said that they prefer Scenario E, which eliminated the base, Scenario D increased the base for all three MPOs but then Bismarck/Mandan would gift Grand Forks/East Grand Forks their \$6,000 increase. He said that when we discussed with the board members present at the September meeting, we decided that we would go with what North Dakota provided which was to increase the base to Grand Forks only, and that would result in a larger impact to our budget, so on October 7th we met to discuss this. He stated that there are two things to be aware of; the first is that the NDDOT softened their stance about having too many open grants, and the second is that Fargo/Moorhead is about to exhaust their 2018 funds, so that meant that moving forward the NDDOT could open up the 2020 dollars, and they would obviously be opened for us first since we are the ones that need to access them first, so that solved some of the crisis, if you will, by having them say that they could open these 2020 dollars sooner.

Haugen stated that the other item was that there wasn't an agreement among the three MPOs as to a plan of action forward without the changes, so, as you are all aware, in these types of settings someone chairs the meeting and can't make motions, so the only two people that could make motions was himself and the Fargo/Moorhead person, so before the Fargo/Moorhead person could make a motion to do away with the base he made a motion to maintain the formula as it is, and that is what was adopted, so there is no change in the formula, so proceeding from the MPO perspective under this scenario, now North Dakota has to reflect on that is there is still an identified need to change the formula, the MPOs couldn't reach an agreement as to what that change should be so we could only agree to not make a change, so there is still a decision that North Dakota has to make as to whether they are going to accept that motion from the MPO Directors or if they are going to say there is still a need to change the formula, so there is still a possibility that the formula could be changed.

Haugen reported that as we are coming to the end of this year, and will be starting next year, so the issue with the 2020 funds is that Congress did not appropriate a full year of money yet, so North Dakota could go in and write a grant for around 1/12th of North Dakota Highway dollars, so we wouldn't be able to access those; instead we have a continuing resolution that's rolling on an intermittent period of time, so right now they can only access 1.5% of the 2019 Appropriation, and that, on a month to month basis, sort of puts us in sort of a bind, so talking it over with the Chairman, and looking at our budget, we decided that we would lay off one of our salaried positions to better manage that month to month output, and then also as we move into 2020 to focus on getting the consulting expertise that we need for activities in 2020 and then we

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 16th, 2019

can manage when we contract those consultants as to when we start paying out those consultant costs at a later time of the year than having to maintain the salaried position through that adjustment period.

Haugen reiterated that that is the status of where we are at, there is no change from the MPOs perspective, but North Dakota still has an issue because internally they have identified that from the Federal North Dakota side and the Federal Minnesota side there is a distribution issue, so they may or may not take action.

Grasser said that he is assuming, and is asking for verification, that our MPO, relative to the other MPOs on a population basis would probably see a shrinking percentage based on when the census comes out, so our best strategy is to avoid things that put undo emphasis on per capita. Haugen responded that that is correct.

Powers said, then, that you are saying that everything is staying the same for now. Haugen responded that it is, with the exception that instead of us having a large bank account, if you will, in Bismarck, we are only getting bits and pieces of it as congress passes continuing resolution of appropriations. Powers said that the \$200,000 that was proposed to Grand Forks for our MPO didn't fly. Haugen said that is correct. Powers commented, though that the other two MPOs don't seem to utilize their full allotment in a fiscal year. Haugen agreed that that has been an issue in the past; they both are now indicating that this is no longer an issue in the future, they have taken steps to correct that. Powers said that that is nice to hear, they can't spend it, we sure can. Haugen responded that they have some pretty healthy budgets on some of their studies, and that is part of the issue with us, our budget, we squeeze \$150,000 of work into \$100,000, and we get one or two or three people to propose on it, they flush \$200,000 into \$150,000 scope and get seven, eight, nine proposals. He stated that that is why there is still an issue that North Dakota and Federal Highway are aware of.

Information only.

MATTER OF ANNOUNCEMENT OF SOLICITATION OF CANDIDATE T.I.P. PROJECTS

Haugen reported that this is our annual cycle, were in the fall season and on the Minnesota side what happens now is just the announcement of the Transportation Alternatives Program, which on the Minnesota side is comprised of two components in a two step process. He added that Minnesota also encourages and sets aside portions for Safe Routes To School, plus there is a Minnesota State funded States Routes To School that is part of this solicitation with their Transportation Alternatives Program, and the two steps is that an entity has to express interest, saying this is a project we would like, they meet with us and go over whether it is eligible or not and help them understand the process, so after a letter of intent there is a notification that the project is valid and they can then prepare the complete package for our consideration. He said that the rest of the programs in Minnesota will be solicited a little later this year, as is usually the case.

Haugen stated that on the North Dakota side, this is typically the time when they open up all of their solicitations; right now we have three open. He said that the unusual thing is that they have not solicited for the Urban Program, the Urban Roads for the Regional Roads Program, those are the major funding programs that North Dakota has for highways and streets. He added that there are probably two reasons for this, one is that they are preparing a more comprehensive paperwork process so instead of maybe two or three sheets of questions and answers there will be more pages that they will be releasing out to people to submit projects. He explained that the reason they are doing that is because they are getting caught up with project creep, particularly on the Regional System, where at this time a project is identified and estimates of \$2 million dollars in the T.I.P. so they program other projects across the state because there is money left to do it and as a project develops and creeps up, that \$2 million dollar project ends up being bid at \$10 million dollars, well there is \$8 million dollars that has to come from somewhere and sometimes there is enough movement in project that the \$8 million is easily identified, other times it is too significant. So they end up trying to develop paperwork on the front end to make sure that less projects scope creep occurs afterwards and more projects scope can be identified at that time, and we will wait for that paperwork before we can announce the solicitation, so if you have projects in mind now would be the time to look at your staff to begin the process.

Information only.

MATTER OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN NORTH DAKOTA S.T.I.P./T.I.P.

Haugen reported that in theory there would be no differences, in reality there typically are differences as North Dakota makes changes at the last minute when they finalize their S.T.I.P. document.

Haugen commented that there are five projects on the North Dakota side that are different in the S.T.I.P. He said that they have communicated with North Dakota staff as to how to perhaps better mitigate this issue in the future, we think we have a plan of action. He stated that staff will be asking the Board to amend these five projects next month, and there may be a couple other amendments that are needed in our T.I.P. document for other reasons as well.

Haugen state that the last point is we are just asking our local partners when they ask for these projects to move and other things, they try to get us to ??? so we know how we have to proceed with those request before they are considered final.

Haugen said that from a Federal Highway perspective our T.I.P. document is still the controlling document so when they went to look at some of these projects they were saying why they are different, so we are trying to rectify that problem going into the future, and next month you will see a lot of T.I.P. amendments going through.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2019 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that this is our monthly progress report of all our pertinent studies and documents that we are preparing and their progress this past month.

b. Approval Of Bill/Check List For 8/17/19 To 10/11/19 Period

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO APPROVE THE BILL/CHECK LIST FOR THE 8/17/19 TO 10/11/19 PERIOD.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

c. New NDDOT Director Named

Haugen reported that there is a new North Dakota DOT Director who has promised that he will be making his rounds so at some point we will have him appear before the MPO Board. He added that North Dakota is also going to do a significant revision, update to their Statewide Transportation Plan, so for the next twelve months or so periodically you will be invited to participate in that update.

d. Minnesota Freight Plan

Haugen reported that on the Minnesota side the District will be preparing a Freight Plan, and so soon you will see some information about some public input for the Freight Plan, a survey, etc., on the Minnesota side.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY ROST, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO ADJOURN THE OCTOBER 16TH, 2019, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:45 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully Submitted,
Peggy McNelis, Office Manager

Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO
Transaction List by Vendor
 August 17 through October 11, 2019

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
AFLAC.							
Liability Check	08/23/2019	AFLAC	501	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-585.22
Liability Check	09/20/2019	AFLAC	501	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-585.22
Alerus Financial							
Liability Check	08/23/2019	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-3,377.54
Liability Check	09/06/2019	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-3,367.22
Liability Check	09/20/2019	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-3,348.88
Liability Check	10/04/2019	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-3,326.88
Alliant Engineering							
Bill	10/09/2019	Inv. #...	Retainage Du...	206 · Accounts Pay...		220 · Retainag...	-6,999.69
Bill Pmt -Check	10/09/2019	6817	Retainage Du...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-6,999.69
Business Essentials							
Bill	08/22/2019	Inv. #...	Office Supplie...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-51.98
Bill Pmt -Check	08/22/2019	6796	Office Supplie...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-51.98
CitiBusiness Card							
Bill	08/23/2019	Acct. ...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		-SPLIT-	-399.99
Bill Pmt -Check	08/23/2019	6797	Charges For ...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-399.99
Bill	09/27/2019	Acct. ...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		-SPLIT-	-957.04
Bill Pmt -Check	09/27/2019	6813	Charges For ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-957.04
City of East Grand Forks							
Bill	10/09/2019	Inv. #...	2019 4th Qua...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-3,031.58
Bill Pmt -Check	10/09/2019	6818	2019 4th Qua...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-3,031.58
Earl Haugen							
Bill	08/30/2019		Reimburse Tr...	206 · Accounts Pay...		530 · Educatio...	-112.00
Bill Pmt -Check	08/30/2019	6799	Reimburse Tr...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-112.00
Bill	10/08/2019		Reimburseme...	206 · Accounts Pay...		530 · Educatio...	-42.00
Bill Pmt -Check	10/08/2019	6815	Reimburseme...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-42.00
Fidelity Security Life.							
Liability Check	08/23/2019	6791	50790-1043	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-16.84
Liability Check	09/20/2019	6806	50790-1043	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-16.88
Forum Communications Company							
Bill	09/13/2019	Inv. #...	Public Hearin...	206 · Accounts Pay...		-SPLIT-	-414.38
Bill Pmt -Check	09/13/2019	6805	Public Hearin...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-414.38
Jairo Viafara.							
Bill	09/03/2019		Travel Expen...	206 · Accounts Pay...		530 · Educatio...	-205.96
Bill Pmt -Check	09/03/2019	6801	Travel Expen...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-205.96
Bill	09/05/2019		Travel Expen...	206 · Accounts Pay...		530 · Educatio...	-57.00
Bill Pmt -Check	09/05/2019	6802	Travel Expen...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-57.00
Kadmas, Lee & Jackson, Inc.							
Bill	09/10/2019	Inv. #...	Work Done O...	206 · Accounts Pay...		550 · Corridor ...	-2,196.58
Bill Pmt -Check	09/10/2019	6803	Work Done O...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-2,196.58
Bill	09/10/2019	Inv. #...	Work Done O...	206 · Accounts Pay...		550 · Corridor ...	-7,595.85
Bill Pmt -Check	09/10/2019	6804	Work Done O...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-7,595.85
Bill	10/10/2019	Inv. #...	Work Done O...	206 · Accounts Pay...		550 · Corridor ...	-11,378.38
Bill Pmt -Check	10/10/2019	6819	Work Done O...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-11,378.38
Liberty Business Systems, Inc.							
Bill	09/18/2019	Inv #3...	Contract Bas...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-147.87
Bill Pmt -Check	09/18/2019	6810	Contract Bas...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-147.87
LSNB as Trustee for PEHP							
Liability Check	08/23/2019	NWR...		104 · Checking	X	216 · Post-Hea...	-165.00
Liability Check	09/20/2019	NWR...		104 · Checking		216 · Post-Hea...	-165.00
Madison Nat'I Life							
Liability Check	08/23/2019	6792		104 · Checking	X	215 · Disability...	-90.29
Liability Check	09/20/2019	6807		104 · Checking		215 · Disability...	-90.28
Mike's							
Bill	08/21/2019		MPO Lunche...	206 · Accounts Pay...		711 · Miscellan...	-125.00
Bill Pmt -Check	08/21/2019	6795	MPO Lunche...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-125.00
Bill	09/18/2019		MPO Lunche...	206 · Accounts Pay...		711 · Miscellan...	-51.00
Bill Pmt -Check	09/18/2019	6811	MPO Lunche...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-51.00
Minnesota Department of Revenue							
Liability Check	08/23/2019	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-207.00
Liability Check	09/06/2019	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-207.00
Liability Check	09/20/2019	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-207.00
Liability Check	10/04/2019	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-192.00
Minnesota Life Insurance Company							
Liability Check	08/23/2019	6793		104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-117.78
Liability Check	09/20/2019	6808		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-117.78

Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO
Transaction List by Vendor
 August 17 through October 11, 2019

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
Nationwide Retirement Solutions							
Liability Check	08/23/2019	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-640.92
Liability Check	09/06/2019	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-640.92
Liability Check	09/20/2019	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-640.92
Liability Check	10/04/2019	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-640.92
NDPERS							
Liability Check	08/23/2019	NDPE...	D88	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-3,853.50
Liability Check	08/23/2019	NDPE...		104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-3,273.38
Liability Check	09/20/2019	NDPE...	D88	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-3,853.50
Liability Check	09/20/2019	NDPE...		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-3,273.38
QuickBooks Payroll Service							
Liability Check	08/21/2019		Created by P...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-8,384.43
Liability Check	09/04/2019		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-8,343.59
Liability Check	09/17/2019		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-8,232.76
Liability Check	10/02/2019		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-8,114.76
SRF Consulting Group, Inc.							
Bill	08/27/2019	Inv. #...	Work Done O...	206 · Accounts Pay...		565 · Special ...	-2,752.57
Bill Pmt -Check	08/27/2019	6798	Work Done O...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-2,752.57
Bill	09/25/2019	Inv. #...	Work Done O...	206 · Accounts Pay...		565 · Special ...	-4,077.69
Bill Pmt -Check	09/25/2019	6812	Work Done O...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-4,077.69
Standard Insurance Company							
Liability Check	08/23/2019	6794		104 · Checking	X	217 · Dental P...	-158.60
Liability Check	09/20/2019	6809		104 · Checking		217 · Dental P...	-158.60
State Tax Commissioner							
Liability Check	10/02/2019	NDST...	45038827301	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-510.00
Teri Kouba							
Bill	08/30/2019		Travel Reimb...	206 · Accounts Pay...		530 · Educatio...	-112.00
Bill Pmt -Check	08/30/2019	6800	Travel Reimb...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-112.00