

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

**Wednesday, September 18th, 2019 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Jeannie Mock, Secretary, called the September 18th, 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: Mike Powers, Al Grasser, Ken Vein (via conference call), and Jeannie Mock.

Absent were: Bob Rost, Warren Strandell, Clarence Vetter, and Marc DeMers.

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

Mock declared a quorum was not present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 21st, 2019, MINUTES OF THE MPO
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

As there was not a quorum present the minutes could not be approved.

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

Acting Chair Mock ask staff to brief those in attendance on the agenda items. Haugen reported that staff did work with the Technical Advisory Committee on changes to the Functional Class, which are noted in the last table. He stated that most of them are centered around the direction not to allow stubs any longer. Haugen commented that the only other major change is up on North 3rd and North 4th Streets, which both used to be Minor Arterials, but are now being identified as Collectors. Kouba added that Adams Drive has also been changed from a Collector to a Local Road.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 18th, 2019**

Grasser reported that we are also developing a second map and asked that Mr. Haugen explain the reason for that. Haugen explained that because of the change from having a map that showed both existing and future functional class, we are now working on a separate map that we will help identify our future roadway network. Grasser commented that the Technical Advisory Committee felt it was important to keep using this as a planning tool to show what our intent was as to where these streets were going to extend to, and when the Federal and State changes came in so that we can't show stubs, we developed that second map so it is available for people to use when they are looking long term.

Information only.

MATTER OF BRIDGE FEASIBILITY RFP

Haugen reported that at last month's meeting you asked MPO Staff to redraft the RFP that was provided to include other locations, those being Elks and 47th Avenue South, so the intent of the motion was to have an RFP drafted that looked at three potential bridge corridors. He added that also, as we discussed last month as well as prior to that, there is still some unknowns as to whether we can continue doing some of the feasibility work that we have been able to do in the past and we were informed in late August that the Water Hydraulic Analysis was not an eligible funding scope of work for our MPO Planning funds. So with that knowledge, staff met with City Representatives and the City Administrators, and sort of laid out that because it is not able to be funded through the MPO, MPO funds couldn't really start to pay for anything until 2020 so there was an opportunity for perhaps both Cities to jump in and get the water hydrology done, and that seems to be the plan of action that each side has taken back through their process to get the hydrology going and done outside of the MPO RFP

Powers asked if he had any indication as to when the City Councils will look at this. Haugen responded that the East Grand Forks City Council, last night. Powers asked if there was anything on Elks. Haugen responded that they are starting out with not offering to fund anything on Elks or 47th Avenue. Mock asked when it would be coming to the Grand Forks City Council. Haugen responded that he hasn't had any feedback from City Staff as to when they think they might be having this conversation.

Grasser said that you may have answered this question, but he wants to be sure he understands, the decision now is to do the hydraulics and then hold on everything else, or try to do everything in concurrence. Haugen responded that that is correct to do hydraulics first.

Grasser stated that he has some other questions, procedurally, he isn't sure if there was discussion about limitations on the study, are we looking at high bridges and low bridges or only low or only high. Haugen responded that the Boards action in the past has been to eliminate consideration of high bridges, and so for it to be reintroduced he thinks it would take Board action to do so. He added that the discussion that took place, and the thought process of the hydrology, was looking at a low level or floodable bridges.

Vein commented that it is his interpretation that hasn't changed. He added that it could be, based on the hydrology of the low bridges, that we might look at a higher bridge, but right now he thinks that all we

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 18th, 2019**

are asking is to go forward with the hydraulics to locate it. Grasser said that he is trying to get details on what the expectations are if we are running it through the City process and how it differs from what we normally do. Powers commented that basically anything we do is a recommendation to the City Council anyway, correct. Haugen responded that that is true on this matter. Mock added that it isn't eligible for MPO funds anyway, so even if the MPO, she thinks the intent of that meeting was to have a group that could get together quickly to move this forward, the intent was to bring it back to the MPO Board for information, comments, questions, but it does have to go back to the Cities for funding otherwise the MPO can't fund that action.

Vein summarized that for now this is just informational, we know that this will be handled between the two Cities, and between now and the Committee of the Whole, which for Grand Forks is next Monday, we can iron out the details and help Mr. Grasser with the staff report, and then Grand Forks can talk about it. Grasser added that he isn't sure he can get a staff report in that quickly, but he will try. Vein said that if he can't then it can be brought up as an added item as well. He added that he will be meeting with Mr. Feland tomorrow so they can try to work out how it can be on the agenda for Monday otherwise we have to wait another two weeks.

Information only.

**MATTER OF NORTH DAKOTA CONSOLIDATED PLANNING GRANT DISTRIBUTION
FORMULA**

Haugen reported that this is a continuation of a grant management issue that the NDDOT has been working with the three MPOs on.

Haugen referred to a graphic, included in the staff report, and commented that he thinks it best captures what the issue is. He stated that in the last decade, because of Bismarck/Mandan and Fargo/Moorheads' inability to spend all of their planning funds in a timely fashion, there were too many grants open. He said that normally, under the federal process, you usually have the year of appropriation, plus three to spend funds, however, North Dakota Federal Highway is pushing that the NDDOT not have so many grants open.

Haugen commented that the hope was that the three MPOs could reach an agreement, but the reality is that that most likely won't occur, so the NDDOT has indicated that if an agreement can't be reached they may step in and make a change based on that grant management. He said that an MPO Director's meeting is scheduled for October 7th, where we will again have a discussion on the distribution formula.

Grasser asked if these dollars are available for specific purposes; are they targeted for studies, or staff, or operations, or is a limitation on them, especially what goes into the base amount. Haugen responded that there are no limitations. He added that the formula is distributed, and then once we receive our \$500,000 our work program determines where it is spent.

Discussion ensued; consensus was to go with increase just the Grand Forks MPO base.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 18th, 2019**

Information only.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no one present for comment.

OTHER BUSINESS

- a. 2019 Annual Work Program Project Update

Information only

- b. Approval Of Bill/Check List For 8/16/19 to 9/13/19 Period

No action could be taken due to lack of quorum.

ADJOURNMENT

MOCK CLOSED THE MEETING AT 12:40 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager