

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, November 20th, 2019, - 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Clarence Vetter, Chairman, called the November 20th, 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, Marc DeMers, Bob Rost, Al Grasser, Ken Vein, and Jeannie Mock.

Absent was: Warren Strandell.

Guests(s) present were: Trent Berg, Houston Engineering and Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Vetter declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 16TH, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 16TH, 2019 MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

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

Haugen reported that last month we did discuss this briefly, and staff is now asking for formal approval of the amendment to our most recently adopted T.I.P. He stated that a public hearing notice was published for last Wednesday. He said that they received no written comments prior to the Wednesday meeting, nor did anyone present oral comments at the meeting either.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 20th, 2019

Haugen commented that since our last meeting there have been some new things identified, so he would like to spend a little time going over each of them.

Haugen stated that the majority of the amendments occur on the North Dakota side. He pointed out that the first two projects are listed because of some funding trading between the two. He explained that originally the North 5th Street Project was to be a complete mill and overlay the entire length, but the State and City decided to reconstruct the first block of North 5th Street, from DeMers to 1st Avenue, with a concrete surface so instead of a mill and overlay they are going to convert that section to concrete which is what the current surface is most of the way up to University Avenue. He stated that in order to get more funding into this project the City offered to swap some of their federal funds for University Avenue mill and overlay project. He said that the reason there is some monies left is because UND took over some segments of that corridor and are putting in the pavement surface, so again, the first project will have more work done on the first block of DeMers, and there is more funding to do so; and the other will have less federal dollars involved in the project.

Haugen commented that the next three projects are projects that were already programmed but are not moving. He stated that the first two were programmed last year, but there ended up not being any federal funds available for them so the State is now reprogramming them into the next current federal year so our T.I.P. needed to be amended to reflect that. He said that the first project was ADA Curb Ramp along South Washington. He explained that this project not only got delayed a year, but they ran into some conditions on the corridor that caused the cost estimate to almost double in cost, so it is a more robust project than what it was originally.

Haugen stated that he noticed that the next project, the 32nd Avenue Project, shows the Urban Roads Program for funding but it should be Highway Safety Improvement Program instead. He pointed out that this project is addressing the turn lane improvements that were going to be done. He said that they were originally going to be bid in 2019, using 2019 dollars, but they are now using 2020 dollars.

Haugen reported that the last of these three projects was originally programmed in 2023, but the State has now moved it up into the 2020 year; and that is for a chip seal and overlay of US2 between North 69th and North 55th Streets.

Haugen stated that the next project, again, was originally awarded 2019 funds, but it didn't occur in 2019 so is now being given 2020 funds. He explained that it is a multi-use trail on 17th Avenue South, so, again, it is being brought into our 2020 Annual Element.

Haugen referred to the tables and pointed out that the projects with green highlights are what we would describe as modifications, minor editorial things that address and identify the proper program, or a specific exact dollar amount to match the S.T.I.P.

Haugen commented that the next two projects require a little bit of discussion because the NDDOT is changing, in a positive way, how they are identifying these projects. He explained that previously we had them identified as illustrative projects in our document, meaning there

weren't any federal funds or no funding source identified for them; and the State would have them shown as pending in their S.T.I.P. He stated that in the past that meant that year that they happened, if no funding would become available those projects would have to re-compete against all the other projects in the State, but for the first time the State is saying that they hope these projects will get done in the year that they are identified; in this case they are traffic signal rehabs, one in 2022 and one in 2023, but if the funding doesn't materialize those years they will be the first projects programmed in 2023, or will be given federal funds the following year; so the difference is that these are actually now going to be delivered, the question is will it be in 2022 or 2023 for one of them or 2023 or 2024 for the other project, so there is no longer a question of if there will be funding programmed for these it is just a matter of which year of funding they will occur. He stated that in the past that if we had an illustrative or pending project, there wasn't a lot of project development taking place because there wasn't a surety that there would be a project in the end, but now with what the State is doing here these projects are assured to be programmed and funded, it is just a question of which year. He added that this is the case with the small chip seal project on North 5th Street as well.

Haugen reported that on the Minnesota side there is a difference in how FTA is asking grantees to show that they have covered all the rules and regulations and dotted all the I's and crossed all the T's. He stated that East Grand Forks didn't quite get that documentation done in the last program year so now they are being advised by FTA that we need to amend our T.I.P. to show the federal money now coming in our 2020 year that they normally would have accessed last year but because of those reasons we now have to amend our T.I.P. to show them in 2020.

Haugen referred to the list of projects that were shown as illustrative before but now our T.I.P. is showing that they are now on the programmed list.

Haugen stated that those are the amendments that staff is asking the Board to formally adopt in our current T.I.P.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY ROST, TO APPROVE THE FY2020-2023 T.I.P. AMENDMENTS, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Strandell.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF CAT/UND MERGER STUDY

Haugen reported that we have been discussing this merger for most of the year, and we have been working with Cities Area Transit and UND to see whether it is plausible for the UND Shuttles to be operated by Cities Area Transit. He stated that we now have an agreement between the two parties; with the assistance of the study, to help them get to that point.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 20th, 2019

Haugen commented that the main concessions, or the main agreements are that UND will help the City purchase three new coaches; federal funding will primarily be the funding source but UND will cover the match for the federal funding over a five year period, at an annual cost. He stated that the actual operation of the service will be the same shuttle service that UND currently provides, but now City staff will be providing the service and will provide the vehicles, so everything will flow through the normal Cities Area Transit integration with the public riders as to what services, how to get the services, everything will flow through Cities Area Transit.

Haugen said that in the agreement between Grand Forks and East Grand Forks all of the costs are fully allocated out on three basis:

- 1) Miles that the vehicles will operate
- 2) Hours that the drivers are out
- 3) Administration, which is based off peak vehicles.

Haugen commented that for the most part the administrative costs weren't going to change for CAT whether they absorbed or not, so those are kind of fixed costs between the two cities, but when UND came on board there was more vehicle miles traveled, and more hours, but if we went to the full allocated model there would be significantly additional costs to UND based on the Peak Vehicle, so an agreement between Grand Forks and UND was that there will be some incremental administrative costs that could be documented as to what UND added service to CAT would be; those are being covered by UND but the rest of the administrative costs are being maintained by the City of Grand Forks. He added that without that agreement, in order for CAT to take over the services, based on the wholly allocated cost, it would have cost UND about \$150,000 more a year than keeping it in-house, so that was what made this deal come together, that agreement on not fully allocating out the peak vehicle costs.

Haugen said that in the packet is the final document that has been reviewed and recommended for approval by staff and the steering committee that was held, and just to capture what is happening next fall, instead of UND shuttle buses, which the cover shows are these Bluebird type of school buses, it will be now operated by Cities Area Transit fixed route vehicles, and will include three routes. He referred to photos of the three routes and went over them briefly. He said that this should all be in place by fall semester of 2020.

Haugen stated that the plan is that we will operate the routes shown for two semesters to get a feel for how this merger is working and what duplications might be out there, and when we do our Transit Development Plan update we will look at ways of working with, or tweaking the routes to have a more integrated City Shuttle System.

Vein asked if these buses will be identical to the other City buses so we wouldn't know it was a University route and ridership would correspond, and you wouldn't have to be a UND student to use it. Haugen responded that the vehicles themselves will be identical, although they might be wrapped with the advertising that the buses are wrapped in, something that might give you a better idea that it is a UND Campus Shuttle bus. He added that the actual campus area will be fare free, meaning most anyone riding that shuttle system will not have to pay a fare, and that is unique to the system. He said that currently those shuttles are fare free being, just in the campus

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 20th, 2019

area the shuttles will be fare free as well, and then there is an agree with the City and UND, they have had a long standing one with student government for students to ride fare free but they are now expanding that to cover faculty, staff, and others as well so that there is some compensation back to the City for that fare-free zone operations.

Vein asked what the timing is for this. Haugen responded that they are twenty-minute routes. He referred to the drawings of the routes and explained how they will operate, and how long each route might take. Vein asked if this will go back to the City Council. Haugen responded that it is his understanding that the City Council has already agreed to this and UND has already agreed to it so the action that we are taking today is just to approve that the study document is what the study document is. Vein asked then if they should just receive and file the report. Haugen responded that all of the action that could be taken has already been taken so our recommendation is to approve the report, not just to receive and file, but to actually approve it.

Grasser commented that it just occurred to him, as we are looking at some of this, there have been discussions, particularly at Grand Forks City Council, sometimes references to a bus rapid transit between UND and the Downtown, and now with the Herald Building we will see more integrating of UND with the Downtown; and this seems like a transit operation that would almost fit within that concept, it wasn't captured here, and he isn't criticizing that, but he wonders if there could be any interest in maybe looking at an additional study in the future to, again, connecting that downtown to UND in more of a shuttle manner instead of the normal bus manner because he thinks you would have shorter headways between the two, so that is kind of an aside to this but he also thinks it is too late in the process to suggest integrating here but he would just like to plant a seed to the City Council and MPO. Haugen responded that they have looked at that concept each time they do the five-year review, but it never comes to fruition primarily because the City is trying to cover more territory west to allow that quick back and forth between campus core and the downtown. He added that it is about a fifteen-minute trip to get from the downtown to campus, and vice-versa.

DeMers stated that overall he likes the concept of bringing things that are, if anything it gives the system more visibility, which hopefully will build more ridership. He said that he is wondering; those routes will be fare free, is the goal to get people from campus to use it, so will there be educational awareness things used because at some point they are going to have to pay, so will there be a fare app, or how are they planning on doing this. Haugen responded that they still count the ridership, and they do have an agreement now with the student government and the staff/faculty to have them use a swipe card to get on, so they do have the ability now to capture how many people have those IDs to get on board, otherwise they would be taking a guess as to whether someone is truly a staff, student, or something else.

DeMers said that his other question is kind of along what Mr. Grasser was saying; he wonders how much flexibility there is in the system, obviously they have your fixed routes; at certain points is there an opportunity to make these routes more flexible for events, as we try to access the Englestad Arena or the Alerus Center, there will be a lot of traffic going off campus-on campus and vice versa so he is wondering if there is some way at some point that we can look at changing the fixed routes to be more flexible or to work better with those events that wouldn't

severely those people that still want to use the fixed routes at those times. He stated that he knows there are some private people that are doing buses to and from, but it might be something to look at at some time because, again, you think about it as a private business, what you want to do is you want to have more market share, you want to have people aware that it is an option all the time, so it could be something in the future, especially as UND continues to grow, he would image that a lot of that parking area, at some point in time, will be eaten up, especially to the North, by building space, but he knows it isn't going to happen for this fall start-up, but at some point we might try to integrate that better. Haugen responded that he thinks the concept you want to look towards is what we currently offer as tripper services. He explained that many years ago all the schools had a bus dedicated to primarily serve that school, those have been dripped and about the only tripper service we currently keep operating is one that services a particular employer of the disabled community, and that is primarily being offered to save on the paratransit side of service, but it is technically open to the public; so, in the past, because of the sporadic nature of events, they typically consider using a charter service, which federal transit can't support.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE CAT/UND SHUTTLE MERGER STUDY, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Strandell.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON FAMILY OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLANS

Civil Rights Title VI Program

Haugen stated that before he gets to what is on the agenda he does have to mention the Civil Rights Title VI Program. He explained that when we started on this process we initially thought that we wouldn't have much work to do on the Title VI Plan, and so we haven't been openly discussing it. He said that the reason we didn't think we would have to do much with it was because every year FTA requires North Dakota to pick one of four eligible entities to do a full-bore audit of it's Title VI Program, and we were the lucky ones two years in a row just recently so we thought that our Title VI Program has been well audited but just last month North Dakota, kind of without much fanfare to us, updated their Title VI Program and so we have been going through and comparing documents. He stated that some things were found that needed to be changed, so we initially thought that this would be the wrap-up of putting together this family plan, but now we are just identifying that you will see a Title VI document next month as part of our final wrap-up of the documents.

Limited English Proficiency Plan/Private Sector Participation

Haugen reported that just as we heard about Environmental Justice and specific populations, Limited English Proficiency is a requirement that we have to have available, resources for those

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 20th, 2019

that don't speak English well, and we had to show that we analyzed what the likely languages would be that are not English, and so according to the most current American Community Survey; we did the statistical analysis, and not too surprising we have a small part of population that does not speak English well. He stated that the American Community Survey does not really give us specific language in many of these categories, so we can't further break it down, but the important thing to note is that for those languages that are specific, such as Spanish, if we have less than a 1,000 of those populations identified in our study area we automatically don't have to translate everything into Spanish; if we had any other language that 1,000 or greater we would have to translate everything that we do into that language, but because of our size and because of our lack of strong diversity, in particular languages, we are below that threshold so we are most likely having to just get prepared to speak and have things in Spanish, so if people respond to our notices that they need to have that Spanish translation available.

Haugen stated that other than that we do have to show that we do have concentrations. He added that we are carrying over our Environmental Justice concept of if there is a census tract that has 50% or more they are automatically identified; or two-times the metro average then they would be identified.

Haugen said that we do, with that analysis, have some areas that do pop up as having a potential for us to encounter a language other than English, so as we do studies specific to these areas, we need to sync in our public participation process if you are probably more prepared than other places to encounter another language.

Haugen commented that the one thing that we are hoping will help us is; one of the reasons we talked about getting a new website last month is that it will translate automatically into a lot of languages, so once we have that onboard, and we just met with them yesterday, and we are looking at February of 2020 to go live with the new website.

Haugen reported that the last thing is that we had to identify how often we have to update the Limited English Proficiency Plan; and we are now stating that it will be done every four years, which seems to be the standard practice across the nation for these LEP's.

Haugen stated that because there are primarily FTA dollars involved, and if you go through the history of transit, most transit was run by private firms back in the day, as they became funded through the Federal Government, there has been this protection that we always allow private sector to participate, and possibly bid on providing the services rather than just automatically being a public service, and so with that we have to show that we do have a private sector participation policy in place, separate and distinct from our other participation programs; so this is a fairly straightforward statement that the feds have developed for us to adopt.

Haugen said that those are the two programs, Limited English Proficiency and Private Sector Participation.

MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY ROST, TO APPROVE ADOPTING THE LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY AND PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION PLANS, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Strandell.

Public Participation Plan

Haugen reported that all of this is kind of under the broader umbrella of our Public Participation Plan. He pointed out that included in the packet is a draft that staff and the Technical Advisory Committee is recommending be approved.

Haugen commented that one thing to note with this is that you are not actually adopting it today, but instead what you are being asked to do is to approve distributing it to the public and to many of our coordinating agencies to review and comment on what we could do to improve or change the Public Participation Plan.

Haugen stated that specific to this document the Federal Law requires a 45-day comment period, it is the only document that they require have this 45-day public review process take place, so again what we are asking you to do today is to approve it so it can be distributed out to the broader public to get their feedback on any changes.

Haugen said that a couple of big takeaways that we are doing with this update is the older one had a lot of exact language out of the Federal Law and Federal Regulations included in it and we are removing that language from this update, and instead we are trying to focus on what it is that public participation is, so we will update our study area, but what is shown in the dark gray and light gray are still the geographies that our MPO Planning Area is focused on so we have to concern ourselves with transportation within the lighter gray area and more specifically within the darker gray area.

Haugen commented that we updated the graphics of who we are as an organization, instead of actual requirements we have six guidance that Federal Highway has put out, we cited those and tried to show how, in the goals and objectives standards sections, that we have done them.

Haugen reported that they haven't changed too much of the goals, objectives and standards. He said that the one significant change that we have done is that we made a distinction between a public hearing and a public notice. He explained that our current draft has everything needing a ten day prior notice; but now we are separating it out so our public notices or our legal things that we are required to do will still have a ten day prior notice; but things like the notice for this meeting, or press releases, or other such events will only have a five day prior notice.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 20th, 2019

Grasser asked, on the regularly scheduled meetings, is that posted on the website so that you can look for 2020 and see what all the normal meeting dates will be. Haugen responded that the current website doesn't have a calendar, so what it states is that the Technical Advisory Committee meets the second Wednesday of every month at 1:30 at a set location, and that the MPO Executive Policy Board meets the third Wednesday of every month at 12:00 noon at a set location, but the new website will have a calendar.

DeMers commented that he was looking at notices where the objective was considered use of innovative forms of public notice, and it kind of sounds like it was developed between 1975 and 1997 or something like that, but it talks about use of local cable tv, programming website presentations, but it doesn't talk about how everybody except for probably him gets their information now from social media, so if we don't address that he doesn't think we are really trying because he thinks that is what people are talking about when they say that we aren't reaching out to them. He added that the typical form of channels that we have been using have worked but now it seems like we need to completely reshuffle that and start thinking about better methods. He said, though, that he doesn't know if we want to designate just certain methods because these mediums change, and different companies provide different things; such as Facebook, Instagram, etc., so if we want to get eyeballs, that is where we need to go. He added that he would also say that not just using the local cable tv; as a side that both cities have their own cable access or channel, so he feels that we should be televising out stuff and just recording it and putting it out there because the more eyeballs you get on it, that is the type of thing that we need to do, so do we want to address that somehow. Haugen responded that we do use social media, the MPO maintains a Facebook site. He said that we did have a Twitter account, but it was hacked so we moved away from that. He added that we also utilize primarily both City's capabilities of doing their notifications via text so we asked both of them to assist us with those things as well. He stated that we left it as "innovative" just because it seemed to capture all terms. DeMers suggested that we should probably note specifically social media, that language just because it talks about website presentations, tv programming, and to him that isn't innovative anymore.

Grasser commented that, just kind of building on that a bit, and he thinks some of these comments will come in from others when we circulate it out and it comes back, but we are criticized as an organization relative to the communication that we did, again, specifically on the bridges, but he is going to kind of refer that, he thinks that any potential project that is kind of highly impactful to a neighborhood; and after that we can define it on a case by case basis. He said that it could be something as simple as where we are going to put in a bikepath we are going to take out all of the parking, that neighborhood will likely want to be more involved than what they would catch on a broader scale, so he thinks we need to consider maybe some special meetings like neighborhood oriented and evening meetings periodically on a situation like that, and we might even have a way for people to be on a notification list of some kind, because, again, it seemed to be one of the criticisms that came out pretty heavy in some of the bridge discussions, specifically, and he doesn't want to open that wound up but he thinks any impactful project should have some special public input on it.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 20th, 2019

DeMers added that after a certain amount it affects more than just the neighborhood; certain people will claim it as a neighborhood impact but it really impacts either half the city or all of the city, etc., but he understands what Mr. Grasser is saying, we can do more. Grasser agreed, adding that we can figure those out on a case by case basis.

Vein stated that the problem that he sometimes has is you will never be perfect when you try to figure that out; somebody will say they are a block off or two blocks off or whatever, and it is hard to be as inclusive as we would like to be, and our intentions are always good; why wouldn't we want everybody to have access to the information that is valuable in making decisions on our feedback, so the question is how do we do that. He added that he likes the idea of having a list because then people can do that but we don't always know who something is important to or not, and he doesn't know what the right answer to that really is. He said that we place a notice in the paper but how many people even get the paper anymore, so all of that process he thinks will have to somehow be looked at and then separately there is the legal part but then there is the practical part that needs to happen, but if you are like him he is so overloaded with information already, that most everything is just erase, erase, erase. He stated that it would seem to him, and always thought this, but in those bigger areas somebody in there has seen it, not everybody, but we should be able to rely somewhat on word of mouth, but then some are quite small and that might not do it, so it seems like there isn't necessarily a perfect way to do it, but somehow we have to change it.

DeMers asked at what point is it the Cities and the Counties problem versus the Planning Commissions problem to do it because he thinks our role in this is mostly to do that higher level of planning and then once we get to the engagement phase he thinks that is primarily when you ask your elected officials to do it. He added that a lot of us are elected on this board but we come here as a representative of the body we are on, not as an elected person. Grasser commented that it would be a part of that process that we kind of communicate with and help those organizations assist us at the level, and again that could be part of this plan, but for now he doesn't think that that expectation is out there. Vein added that we are going to put this out for public comment, but the problem is we need to communicate to people that it is available for public comment; so we are already starting out needing to find a way to make sure everybody knows about it, and obviously the bridge issue was in the paper multiple times, and people still said they didn't know about it, so how do we even get input on the public input process.

DeMers commented that his thought is, at the planning level less public input is better because what happens; especially once you get to the social medias, is that the ability to say no to everything becomes so much easier, so at the planning level he thinks you want the flexibility and freedom to at least plot out a big grand scheme; you want to hear from people and from certain stakeholders, and you want to take it into consideration, but at some point if you are at the planning level and you are talking about every minor detail, then you don't plan anyway, and that is why he says that at some point you have to hand that type of integration or engagement off to the Cities and Counties to do that type of engagement once a project actually happens. He added that at least that way we can get some things forward because there are too many opportunities to just say no. Vein stated that he is afraid that a certain segment of the public will disagree with you on that. DeMers agreed that that is absolutely true.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 20th, 2019

Mock stated that she thinks we just have to keep it simply to the process; its not really our job to decide which projects are important to people; she thinks that is always going to be a moving target, so we can't really control that. She said that what she sees this as is that we need to clearly set out and define what our process is so that if people say they weren't aware of a project we know that we followed our process and that our process is the process, so at this point and as this moves forward we can do our part to take this back to our councils and inform them to look at it to try to get that public input as best we can. She added that things like social media are always a moving target so she thinks it could be enough that we say that the MPO will rely on each City's respective social media and announcement platforms and work with that five or ten day prior timeframes because if the City has gone away from say twitter, and are relying on some new thing that doesn't exist right now they would have control of that; we have this 311 system in Grand Forks and she assumes East Grand Forks has something similar thing. She said that another venue that is out there is the Next Door app, but she doesn't think a lot of people use it yet, but she knows that the City pushes that so she knows that they are trying that, and that is much more neighborhood based whereby we could get the word out among neighbors. She stated that she just hesitates to say that this will be a flash point project or it won't be because the second you do that, and you miss something, that could be a problem, so if we just focus on the process and make it as good as possible, and let people know that it isn't exactly perfect and that we are open to different ideas and suggestions.

Vein suggested that maybe what we do to advertise is the communication and the process that you can go to to get the information versus the information itself; but continuously refer the questions for this; go to the website, go to the calendar, etc., for the project that matters to you.

Vetter asked if staff was asking for approval of the draft report and approval to circulate it to our partners, correct. Haugen responded that he is asking for approval to start the 45-day process. He added that a couple of things; we could tweak this specific area to talk more modern terms. DeMers commented that he things the Ms. Mock's idea was very clear and should be considered.

Haugen stated that given that you really don't have an updated Title VI maybe you want to wait to see what the Title VI changes are next month and then officially start the 45-day period after you've seen us tweak some of this language that we just discussed. He added that this is already out in the public; the constant contact has already gone out to several other people, and it is posted on our website and Facebook page, but the formal 45-day would need action from this body and we can do that next month instead of doing it today, it is up to you. Vein commented that it seems to make sense to wait because when we do go out with something he would like to have it be kind of fresh with what we do here recently, and make sure that we at least put that in instead of keeping it as traditional or close to what the federal requirement is because we have to go well beyond that requirement.

Haugen reported that what the actual federal requirement is is to have a least one opportunity for the public to comment on the materials, and then document what the comment is, that is what the actual requirement is so it is pretty minimal.

Consensus was to table this item until the December MPO Executive Policy Board meeting.

MATTER OF ANNOUNCEMENT OF CANDIDATE PROJECT SOLICITATION

Haugen reported that having just amending our T.I.P. we are now starting a new T.I.P. cycle. He stated that last month we announced that several programs were open for solicitation, and now this month we are announcing a few more programs are open for solicitation as well.

Haugen stated that on the Minnesota side there was solicitation for the Transportation Alternatives, however there aren't any being pursued in our study area. He said that the HSIP program, which has a short window, is another program that has already closed. He stated that the only other Minnesota side programs is the City Sub-Target, which is the one we get the most action on, and that is available to us every four years, but we have a project currently in 2022 that is already programmed so there wasn't a solicitation for any new projects. He said that they did send out notice to both the County and State letting them know that if they have any projects in this cycle they can use the enclosed forms to apply, fill them out and give them to the MPO by December 27th. He stated that he doesn't anticipate anything from the County, but there might be something from the State, depending on the Downtown Traffic Signal situation.

Haugen commented that on the North Dakota side the three major programs are now open for solicitation; they are the Urban which is also known as the Main Street Initiative, the Urban Roads which is the City Streets that are classified, and then the Urban Regional which are the State Highways. He explained that because we expect more detail on the submittals there is a December 20th timeline for applying. He pointed out that if you looked at the calendar, January shows our Technical Advisory Committee meeting being held on the 8th, and that is pretty early in the month so that is why we are suggesting those deadlines for these forms.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON FUTURE BRIDGES

Haugen reported that there has been some movement, particularly by East Grand Forks, so he just wants to make sure everyone is up-to-date on the status of where we are at. He asked Mr. Grasser if there was a deadline date for submittals for the RFP itself, but that is what this agenda items' purpose is, to get everyone up-to-date.

Powers commented that last night the City of East Grand Forks approved feasibility at Elks Drive. Vetter added that they approved support up to \$15,000.00. Powers asked when that would be done. Vetter asked if Grand Forks had done the RFP yet. Grasser responded that he apologizes, he thought they would have it out by now but with all of the rain delays they are behind, but they are still planning getting it out soon. He said that he thinks they will get the advertisement for submittals out in the next two or three weeks.

Grasser stated that one of the things they wanted to try to ascertain before they sent it out; not critical to the hydraulic analysis, but just for informational purposes they were trying to figure out how to communicate what a reasonable timeline might be on constructing the bridge, so they reached out to both DOTs, and they found that there is some difference of opinions about how the environmental document should be approached; can it be more of an actual environmental assessment or does it need to go to a full EIS, and if it goes to a full EIS you are probably

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 20th, 2019

looking at a year or two for the study and another year or so to get property and so your construction is starting to get out into certain timelines, and the piece that goes along with it is kind of a type of management decision because even if you don't need an EIS should we do one anyway because no matter what location we look at it will likely be challenged by somebody somewhere, so should we just go ahead and do a full EIS anticipating that it might get pushed into that anyway, and he doesn't necessarily have the answer to those questions, but some of that might be a bit more strategic as opposed to; you have the necessary funding requirements and then you maybe have a more strategic plan; and again it is his understanding right now that there wouldn't be any federal dollars involve on either side, because that would an important item relative to how much investigation we have to do. DeMers asked why that is. Grasser responded that you would then end up meeting all of the federal requirements as opposed to if it is strictly local. He explained that local would be the easiest dollars, adding in State dollars would add another step. DeMers commented that dollars are easiest if they come from the federal side. Grasser agreed, but added that then you have to go through a federal process that impacts those timelines also; so that isn't exactly part of the RFP but when they went back and talked to people they want us to provide a sense of timeline, and it certainly is not something that looks like it could be built in 2020 or 2021 or maybe even 2022, so they just want to set some expectations on it.

Vein commented that right now we are staying at a really high level, we have to do a hydraulic to see if one bridge works versus another one, so we wouldn't be looking at an EIS at this time, we may identify that as part of the timeline, because we would typically identify the issue that we felt were very critical and hydraulic issues are certainly high, as well as safety and impacts to pedestrians. He said that those are the pieces that he is looking for sooner rather than later, so that is what we need to get done. Grasser responded that, again, it isn't mission critical to the hydraulic analysis, but he thinks there is some in the community that may have different ideas about the potential timeline so we wanted to try to give the best information we can, but that isn't what is holding us up necessarily, but it is just one of the issues we are dealing with. Vein stated that he would like to see this be done, he would like to get this off the table as soon as we can. Grasser said that it is more a matter of trying to sit down and figure out in the scope what things we want to truly capture.

Mock stated that no matter where you put a bridge you are going over a Section 10 river, so you are going to have the Corp involved, and with the floodway you may possibly have FEMA. She said that she doesn't know who will take the lead, but no matter what it will be federal nexus. Grasser commented that there is a federal nexus on the regulatory side, but that has less potential impact versus if you are actually accessing federal dollars, and accessing federal dollars brings another set of requirements that go on the dollars. Mock agreed, but added that what she is saying is its environmental analysis verses EIS, but there probably won't be much of a choice once we start getting into the details with the Corp. Grasser said that that is a good point and we should check with the Corps and see if they are going to require an EIS, he doesn't think they would, but we should ask them. Mock stated that obviously we are going to have significant flood impacts there, and there will be Section 10 requirements so they will have an interest. Grasser added that he can guarantee they will have environmental concerns so there will be another flood potential to consider, and he doesn't want to spend a lot of time doing

environmental assessment and get 90% done and then find out we have to almost start over again and do an EIS; and he isn't sure how to decide that at this point in time, but that is his fear that that could stretch that environmental process out two or three years, and that is what he is trying to avoid.

Vein commented that when they did River Valley Water Supply, as an example; when they eliminated federal funding they still were able to go over Section 10 lands without having to do an EIS. Mock agreed that that is possible. Vein said that it true, the idea is to get this done. He added that the other thing he is thinking of is is that he has had some level of concern about the downstream didn't pass the Fargo Diversion Project, and there was a time to potentially address that as they were already having somebody looking at the hydraulics at this location, it might be an opportune time to take that to a another secondary level of study. He stated that he did work with their legislature this last session and in the statutes now there is an issue about impacts downstream and he would like for those funding that project to know that there are impacts that maybe need to be mitigated, so we need to have some level of discussion about how we might do that. He said that they assured us that we would have a lot of hydraulologists looking at it, that says there are none, and so he still doesn't feel 100% assured, so he doesn't know where East Grand Forks is at with this but that might be something that he thought could be a lead off from that; they are two separate issues but they certainly overlap.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no one present for comment.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2019 Annual Work Program Project Update

Vetter 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 10/12/19 TO 11/15/19

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO APPROVE THE BILL/CHECK LIST FOR THE 10/12/19 TO 11/15/19 PERIOD.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

c. Skewed Intersection Steering Committee Meeting November 25th

Vetter reported that the Skewed Intersection Steering Committee Meeting is scheduled for November 25th and the draft report is on the MPO website and can be found at:
<https://theforksmpo.files.wordpress.com/2019/11/us-2-81-skewed-intersection-study-final-report-10.30.19.pdf>.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 20th, 2019

- d. Downtown Parking Study Presentation To City Council December 2nd

Vetter reported that the Downtown Parking Study Presentation to the City Council is on December 2nd.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VEIN, TO ADJOURN THE NOVEMBER 20TH, 2019, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:045 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully Submitted,
Peggy McNelis, Office Manager

Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO
Transaction List by Vendor
 October 12 through November 15, 2019

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
AFLAC.							
Liability Check	10/18/2019	AFLAC	501	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-585.22
Alerus Financial							
Liability Check	10/18/2019	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-3,326.82
Liability Check	11/01/2019	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-3,398.20
Liability Check	11/15/2019	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,893.52
CitiBusiness Card							
Bill	10/28/2019	Acct. ...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		-SPLIT-	-204.06
Bill Pmt -Check	10/28/2019	6828	Charges For ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-204.06
Earl Haugen							
Bill	11/06/2019		Travel Expen...	206 · Accounts Pay...		530 · Educatio...	-78.00
Bill Pmt -Check	11/06/2019	6830	Travel Expen...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-78.00
East Grand Forks Water and Light							
Bill	10/18/2019	Inv. #...	3rd Quarter 2...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-602.55
Bill Pmt -Check	10/18/2019	6826	3rd Quarter 2...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-602.55
Fidelity Security Life.							
Liability Check	10/18/2019	6820	50790-1043	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-16.88
Jairo Viafara.							
Bill	10/29/2019		VOID: Reimb...	206 · Accounts Pay...	X	6560 · Payroll ...	0.00
Kadrmaz, Lee & Jackson, Inc.							
Bill	11/08/2019	Inv. #...	Work On Dow...	206 · Accounts Pay...		550 · Corridor ...	-5,970.71
Bill Pmt -Check	11/08/2019	6831	Work On Dow...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-5,970.71
Liberty Business Systems, Inc.							
Bill	10/16/2019	Inv. #...	Contract Bas...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-147.87
Bill Pmt -Check	10/16/2019	6824	Contract Bas...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-147.87
LSNB as Trustee for PEHP							
Liability Check	10/18/2019	PEHP		104 · Checking		216 · Post-Hea...	-165.00
Liability Check	11/15/2019	PEHP		104 · Checking		216 · Post-Hea...	-123.75
Madison Nat'l Life							
Liability Check	10/18/2019	6821		104 · Checking		215 · Disability...	-90.28
Liability Check	11/15/2019	6832		104 · Checking		215 · Disability...	-70.52
Mike's							
Bill	10/16/2019		MPO Lunche...	206 · Accounts Pay...		711 · Miscellan...	-95.00
Bill Pmt -Check	10/16/2019	6825	MPO Lunche...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-95.00
Minnesota Department of Revenue							
Liability Check	10/18/2019	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-192.00
Liability Check	11/01/2019	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-192.00
Liability Check	11/15/2019	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-192.00
Minnesota Life Insurance Company							
Liability Check	10/18/2019	6822		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-117.78
Liability Check	11/15/2019	6833		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-113.40
Nationwide Retirement Solutions							
Liability Check	10/18/2019	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-640.92
Liability Check	11/01/2019	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-390.92
Liability Check	11/15/2019	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-390.92
NDPERS							
Liability Check	10/18/2019	NDPE...	D88	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-3,853.50
Liability Check	10/18/2019	NDPE...		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-3,273.38
Liability Check	11/15/2019	NDPE...		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-3,273.38
North Dakota State University							
Bill	10/30/2019	Inv. #...	Base Particip...	206 · Accounts Pay...		546 · ATAC	-10,000.00
Bill Pmt -Check	10/30/2019	6829	Base Particip...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-10,000.00
QuickBooks Payroll Service							
Liability Check	10/16/2019		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-8,114.79
Liability Check	10/31/2019		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-8,398.32
Liability Check	11/13/2019		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-7,307.51
SRF Consulting Group, Inc.							
Bill	10/22/2019	Inv. #...	Work Done O...	206 · Accounts Pay...		565 · Special ...	-1,894.81
Bill Pmt -Check	10/22/2019	6827	Work Done O...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-1,894.81
Standard Insurance Company							
Liability Check	10/18/2019	6823		104 · Checking		217 · Dental P...	-158.60
Liability Check	11/15/2019	6834		104 · Checking		217 · Dental P...	-158.60