

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, May 20th, 2020, - 10:30 A.M.
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Room/Video Conference Call**

ALL TO ORDER

Clarence Vetter, Chairman, called the May 20, 2020, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 10:32 a.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Clarence Vetter, Warren Strandell, Mike Powers, Bob Rost, Al Grasser (via video), Ken Vein (via video), and Jeannie Mock (via video).

Absent was: Marc DeMers.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; 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 APRIL 22ND, 2020, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY ROST, TO APPROVE THE APRIL 22ND, 2020, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

NEW MPO WEBSITE

Haugen reported that he just wanted to showcase the MPO's new website. He said that he hopes that everyone had a chance to look at it. He pointed out that he is showing the home page on the screen right now and pointed out that the way you will know whether you are on the new website or the old website is the new website has the .org behind it and the old one has .com. He illustrated how easy it is to get to the new agenda packet on the new site.

Haugen stated that we will be using the new site today, but he would ask that you bear with us as we work through the technology. He added that for those that are participating today via Zoom,

we will be able to have another laptops camera project the people here; and for those here today he would point out that the microphone for those participating via Zoom to hear the meeting is on his laptop so he would ask that everyone speak loudly.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FY2020 ANNUAL LISTING OF OBLIGATION

Haugen reported that this is an annual requirement that we have to do, and it consists of us doing a review of what was actually obligated against all of the projects in our T.I.P. that we had programmed, and today we are reviewing FY2019.

Haugen commented that we are doing this a little different than we have in the past. He explained that in the past this document used to be an appendix in our T.I.P., however in discussing this with our State DOT Partners we decided that because of the way obligations occur versus when our T.I.P. document is being done it is better to have this as a separate stand-alone document than to try to combine everything into one document, so that is why it is now a separate document. He added that, again, this is only looking at projects that were programmed in 2019 and how much federal funds, if any, were obligated to those projects.

Haugen said that this is a sort of financial planning tool that is required of us to keep track of how our programs are, our financial plan is in programming versus what is being actually obligated or delivered.

Haugen commented that another thing to note is that we are required to specifically identify any bicycle and pedestrian facilities that were part of a project if we can, so that is why you will see on the listing themselves a cell box or column that focuses on bike/ped facilities.

Haugen said, with that, we go into that comparison of what was programmed verses what was obligated, so we are doing that by showing the actual T.I.P. Program listings, and then highlighting in yellow what the actual amounts were that were obligated for that project. He pointed out that the first two projects are regarding our Transit Program on the Grand Forks side, and both of them are mainly geared to our operation so there is no provision for bike/ped facilities so that is not applicable to those two projects.

Haugen stated that they went through and listed what was programmed, as it shows up in our T.I.P., and then highlighted in yellow we show what was actually obligated to the project.

Haugen referred to Page 7 of the document, the blank cell that was left that way intentionally, and explained that what was discovered at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting is that there was a multi-use trail that was not amended into the T.I.P. until FY2020, but the actual obligation for that project appears in FY2019, so in the final document we are going to insert that 17th Avenue South Multi-Use Trail. He added that it was roughly \$230,000 total, with \$205,000 in federal funds being obligated to it and obviously it provided bike/ped facilities, so that would be the one amendment to the document that was included in the packet.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, May 20, 2020

Haugen commented that there are some projects that were delayed, and those are noted as well. He said that instead of having obligated dollar amounts they were simply noted as being delayed one year.

Haugen stated that in total the programmed amount was just under \$38 million dollars to occur in 2019, but what actually was obligated was \$23 million. He added that two big projects were delayed; the first one was the 32nd Avenue safety project that we just discussed recently, that was originally a \$7.5 million dollar project, so when it got delayed that dropped our program dollar amount considerably. He said that the other project that we delayed was a project that is currently taking place out on U.S.#2 toward the Air Force Base. He stated that that was a multi-million dollar project originally programmed for 2019, but what is occurring now is a project that is double the cost so even though the project is delayed and it shows up, that perhaps our program year versus obligations we drop quite a bit, but that project is actually going to end up being more than what we originally programmed in the 2019 total so in the summary we have \$9.5 million Federal Highway funds and \$5.6 million FTA funds.

Haugen said that the other thing to note is there were 25 projects total between both sides of the river, but five were delayed, otherwise 19 were obligated in 2019. He stated that all five of the projects that were delayed were on the North Dakota side and all the projects on the Minnesota side focused on transit.

Haugen stated that both staff and the Technical Advisory Committee are asking you to adopt this FY2019 Annual Listing Of Obligations with the inclusion of the 17th Avenue Multi-Use Trail Project. Vetter asked if that change is reflected on the last page showing all the totals. Haugen responded that it is not reflected but it was not a different amount.

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY ROST, TO APPROVE THE FY2019 ANNUAL LISTING OF OBLIGATIONS SUBJECT TO INCLUSION OF THE 17TH AVENUE MULTI-USE TRAIL PROJECT.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: DeMers.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF RFP FOR EAST GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN UPDATE

Kouba reported that we have been working with the City of East Grand Forks on this Land Use Plan update, and we do so every five years so that we are up-to-date on any changes that occur throughout the City, and to incorporate any plans that have been either implemented or updated during those five years as well. She stated that they are including some livability and ladders of opportunity into the Land Use Plan.

Kouba commented that some of the basic tasks that we are looking for from the consultant are:

Task 1 – Existing Community Demographics

Task 2 – Future Land Use and Methodology – figuring out where the City is going to be growing, what land will start being developed in the future. This will help with the planning of future road networks for the City of East Grand Forks.

Task 3 – Revise Goals and Policies – looking at and revising any goals and policies that need updating.

Task 4 – Review and Update Implementation Tools – updating the vision, goals, and area concept plans that the City has changed.

Task 5 – Produce a final report with the assistance of the MPO and City Staff.

Task 6 – Prepare a public involvement plan based on the MPO’s public involvement process.

Kouba stated that public participation is going to be key in this timeframe because of COVID-19, and the fact that we aren’t going to be able to gather in large crowds so we will be asking the consultant to try to come up with some innovative ways of getting the public involved in this process. She added that the Land Use Plan is generally the plan that people tend to envision where the City is going to grow and how it is going to grow so that in the future they aren’t surprised about things that being developed.

Kouba said that the project is going to be split between 2020 and 2021, and they hope to have a contract submitted to the MPO Board for approval by July 15th. She commented that this is a \$60,000.00 project, and staff and the Technical Advisory Committee are recommending approval of the RFP.

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE RFP FOR THE EAST GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN UPDATE, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: DeMers.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT NORTH DAKOTA SIDE T.I.P.

Haugen reported that we are asking the Board to approve the North Dakota side of the next T.I.P. He reiterated that last month the Board approved the Minnesota side T.I.P. He added that due to the timing of information we could not hold the public hearing during the Technical Advisory Committee meeting last week, so we did advertise for it to happen at today’s meeting, but originally the advertisement identified that it would be taking place during a noon meeting, so whatever action you take today we would ask that the motion include the statement subject to any potential participation that might come in in the next half hour. He said that to-date they have not received any participation, however we did advertise it and that is the official time and date in the advertisement.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, May 20, 2020

Haugen stated that in this draft there aren't any major projects that were taken away from the MPO study area. He said that they did keep some of those big ticket items, and he did mention the U.S.#2 project taking place in 2020 going one direction and then the next year it will go in the other direction, so that is a \$17 million dollar project discussed in the staff report. He added that there is also the complete reconstruction of the Washington Street Underpass that is still showing up in 2022, and that is an \$18 million dollar project as well.

Haugen commented that there are a couple of programs that the NDDOT has not awarded funds yet, so this draft is silent on any potential Transportation Alternative award that might be done on the North Dakota side. He said that they have done some Safety or HSIP awards, but they have not completed awarding all of the funding so there might also be some future awards from that program as well.

Haugen said that the only new project that has come up, that is new from what is in the current T.I.P. is work that is being done on the DeMers Overpass Bridge structure, which is being programmed by the NDDOT in 2023.

Haugen stated that the only other items in this would be the new 2024 projects, and the City of Grand Forks did submit for their Columbia Road Overpass project, that is in the program; and the NDDOT and the City of Grand Forks submitted the reconstruction of South Washington Street, but that is not in the program. He added that also, as you know, for the Regional side the Traffic Signal Rehabilitation project is slipping a year from the current T.I.P., but it is still pending, which means that in 2024 if it is not able to be funded it will then slip another year to 2025.

Haugen commented that this is our standard draft T.I.P. document with the resolutions and projects in draft form that are programmed. He said that the first three years shouldn't have a lot of changes to them, and they don't except for those, primarily, that he did already identify but there are a few other little administrative type changes like 32nd Avenue, we already approved the termini being at South 20th instead of South Washington, that is reflected in this document.

Haugen stated that FY2024 is the year where we have a lot of addition, and that is because it is a new year in the T.I.P.

Haugen reported that the total for each year are: FY2021 - \$38 million; FY2022 - \$26.6 million; FY2023 - \$10 million; and FY2024 - \$19 million. He added that those include Federal Highway and Federal Transit projects.

Haugen stated that in the past we have always had a progress report of the current year projects in the appendix, which is a listing of the projects that should be occurring in 2020, and what their status is. He said that Transit has been overloaded with COVID responses so we haven't gotten any information from them, but for most every other project we do have that information provided in the progress report and most projects are on their of being delivered if not already having cones in the street, etc.

Staff and the Technical Advisory Committee are recommending approval of this draft North Dakota Side T.I.P., subject to any potential public input.

MOVED BY ROST, SECONDED BY VEIN, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT NORTH DAKOTA SIDE FY2021-2024 T.I.P., SUBJECT TO ANY POTENTIAL PUBLIC INPUT.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: DeMers.

MATTER OF DISCUSSION ON T.I.P. PROGRAM SPECIFIC SCORING SHEETS

Haugen reported that if you will notice, on the Agenda there was another name attached to this item, that was our MPO Intern, Nessa Mahmood. He explained that normally she would be presenting this information, however she has left the MPO and accepted employment with the EERC at UND, her husband is there at UND as well and she is a graduate student there as well. He added that she was only with the MPO this basic spring semester, so he will be pinch-hitting for her and trying to cover this topic, which is information only at this time as it is still a work in progress.

Haugen stated that, if you will recall, we have been working on our T.I.P. Procedural Manual, and have provided information on that at previous meetings, and did mention that one of the last pieces we were going to work on was the scoring criteria. He explained that as an MPO we are required to have documentation as to how we select projects for our T.I.P. program, and so back ten years ago when we had to develop this document there was a program supported by Federal Highway called ELUS, and we did implement that system and we are suggesting we carry on with a simile of that system but TELUS itself is no longer supported or available for updates, so one of the things the Nessa was doing for us was converting a former data base program into a spreadsheet program that will then allow integration with our GIS system and give better visualization of the projects.

Haugen referred to the packet and pointed out that it includes the proposed changes that we are making to the weighting system of the various funding programs. He displayed a sheet illustrating the Urban Local Road side, which applies to both sides of the river, and pointed out that it shows the previous scoring system as well as the proposed system. He said that they tried to highlight in red and green where points were being allocated, and added that it is based on a 100 point system.

Haugen commented that two things that we've identified through this process that we will be doing is; there are new factors that we need to apply to our scoring system, they are resiliency, liability and tourism, so we had proposed elimination of the local regional factors and insertion of Factor 9 and 10, and then reallocated the points that were for the local regional factors, and some of those went to the two new factors, and then we also reduced some of the previous factors for this as well.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, May 20, 2020

Haugen reported that how we use this point system is that each project that gets submitted to the MPO by these programs should attach how it scored against the criteria that we have identified in our planning documents. He stated that the scoring system itself, which we will discuss next month, is a yes/no question under each of these factors, and it is essentially a yes/no of how it met our objectives and standards that are listed in our transportation plan, so out of a score of 100 most projects are getting in the 60 to 70 scoring system; we do not have a minimum scores, so if a City, County, or State submitted something that scored fairly low on the 100 point system, it doesn't automatically make that project unacceptable to be selected; but on one hand we have to come up with a scoring system, and on the other hand it is a scoring system that requires people fill it out, but it isn't something that is overly critical to the actual project ending up in the T.I.P. document itself.

Haugen commented that right now we are just showing you, and offering you the opportunity, to review and comment on the weights that are going on in the various programs; the first one was for the Local Federal Aid System and the second sheet is essentially for the State Highway System or the Regional System. He added that you will notice that for each of these it isn't just a mirror weight system, there are different weights based on different portions, but we do have all these programs that do provide funding for projects. He stated that the third sheet is the Transportation Alternatives, and most of those are multi-use trails that are happening on both sides of the river.

Haugen stated that even though neither county typically submits projects in the MPO Study Area, every once in a while, primarily just on the North Dakota side, we do get some projects, but still though the paperwork is required to be in place in case it happens; and this is the same for bridges.

Haugen reported that this information was shared with the Technical Advisory Committee last week, and there wasn't much feedback from the committee at that time, so we are hoping that we will get more feedback as people have more time to review this and provide comments/questions on the system that is being proposed. He stated that, again, this is taking our current system, expanding it to add the two new planning factors, 9 and 10, that were required, and adjusting the weights to account for a 10 factor system versus a 9 factor or less system as in the past.

Grasser said that he has a question on the process; at this point in time, at least on the North Dakota side, the City of Grand Forks ends up doing a lot of paper work on both the Urban and the Regional side, and yet the ultimate decision maker on the Regional side comes out of the District Office, and it is all subjected to review by the MPO, so the question he has on the process is if we are funding different numbers in here it makes it hard on any particular project. Haugen responded that in practice how this works is that each Agency that is formally submitting the candidate project completes the scores; although before that is done, obviously as part of our T.I.P. Procedural Manual the MPO Board will adopt the scoring system and the weights on each of the different programs, and then each candidate project will submit the application or project scoping work sheet and attached to that will be how they respond to the scoring system. He said that if there is a difference in opinion between say the candidate project proposal and the MPO staff, it will go through the typical MPO process where the Technical

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, May 20, 2020

Advisory Committee will weigh in and give a recommendation and then the Board will make the decision. Grasser said that we should probably anticipate later this summer having a training session on this to make sure that everyone is on the same page as to how to submit paperwork, not just this but all the paperwork required for projects so we make sure we have all of this moving in the right direction.

Information only

a. 2020 Annual Work Program Project Update

Powers asked what the status is of the Hydraulic Study for the bridges, as it appears that it is only at 2% on this update. Haugen responded that the item Mr. Powers is referring to isn't the Hydraulic Study it is the Future Bridge Traffic Impact Study, with a status update of 2% completion. He explained that the reason for only 2% being completed is because it has been delayed until the results of the Hydraulic Study have been received. He added that the 2% only reflects what the MPOs work program will be doing on that, it doesn't reflect what the actual Hydraulic Study status is, but we aren't overly informed on that status so maybe Mr. Grasser, Mr. Vein, or Ms. Mock can provide an update on the status of that study. Grasser responded that the study is ongoing; the hydraulic consultant chose one location to just generally start the analysis so that the work team could try to figure out some of the technical details on how it needs to be examined and how things should be applied, then they can refine the process so it can be used on the other two sites, and we should have something this summer yet on the hydraulics.

b. Downtown Transportation Study Update

Haugen stated that just before the COVID emergency hit us hard we were able to squeeze in a public input opportunity for the Downtown Transportation Study Update at the River Walk Center.

Haugen referred to the packet and said that what you have is the results of both the input received from that event, plus we had our Steering Committee provide input on the study itself as well, so this is just a report showing what questions were asked and what feedback we were given regarding the study, so there is some interesting information, some direction in some places where the Steering Committee and the general public were in agreement, and there are also some areas where there is a split between what the Steering Committee and the public were identifying.

Haugen said that they had roughly about 25 people show up, as was reported at the April meeting, and this just shows the results of the input we received, so that is the status and more detail of where the Downtown Transportation Study is at.

Vein asked, when you say "the public", is that just one person or multiple persons, or how do you count the public when there is a response. Haugen responded that this report would characterize the public as two primary inputs; those that participated at the River Walk Center, and they also provided on-line capabilities for this as well. He stated that those that participated, and he is showing Page 7 of the report, where they have on the top half of the page, a question

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, May 20, 2020

about preferred north/south connections through Downtown Grand Forks for bicyclists. He said that you will see over on the axis, where we had 12, and it was split between public input and steering committee, we had roughly 8 public comments specifically on this question, so when you go down to the next item in the report you will see that the axis is 8, and you also see the split there too; so for each one of those things, overall 25 appeared in person and the numbers tell us what was written down giving us feedback from the public, and we can differentiate between the Steering Committee and the public.

Vein commented then, is that the obvious difference is the scientific analysis of what the public perceives is from those that decided to respond. Haugen said that was correct.

Information only.

- b. Approval Of Bill/Check List For /18/20 TO 5/15/20 Period

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE BILL/CHECK LIST FOR THE 4/18/20 TO 5/15/20 PERIOD.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY ROST, TO ADJOURN THE MAY 20TH, 2020, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 11:08 A.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully Submitted,
Peggy McNelis, Office Manager

Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO
Transaction List by Vendor
 April 18 through May 15, 2020

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
AFLAC.							
Liability Check	05/15/2020	AFLAC	501	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-776.85
Alerus Financial							
Liability Check	05/01/2020	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,628.50
Liability Check	05/15/2020	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,584.44
Audit Adjustment							
Bill Pmt -Check	05/07/2020	6925	VOID:	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	0.00
CitiBusiness Card							
Bill	04/24/2020	Acct. ...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-48.24
Bill Pmt -Check	04/24/2020	6914	Charges For ...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-48.24
East Grand Forks Water and Light							
Bill	05/04/2020	Inv. #...	1st Quarter 2...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-570.40
Bill Pmt -Check	05/04/2020	6918	1st Quarter 2...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-570.40
Fidelity Security Life.							
Liability Check	05/15/2020	6920	50790-1043	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-8.23
Intrado Interactive Services Corporation							
Bill	05/07/2020	Inv. #...	CivicLive Prof...	206 · Accounts Pay...		525 · Citizens ...	-2,350.00
Bill Pmt -Check	05/07/2020	6919	CivicLive Prof...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-2,350.00
Kadmas, Lee & Jackson, Inc.							
Bill Pmt -Check	04/29/2020		QuickBooks g...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	0.00
Bill Pmt -Check	05/07/2020		QuickBooks g...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	0.00
KLJ Engineering, LLC							
Bill	05/12/2020	Inv. #...	Work Done O...	206 · Accounts Pay...		550 · Corridor ...	-9,049.58
Bill Pmt -Check	05/12/2020	6924	Work Done O...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-9,049.58
Liberty Business Systems, Inc.							
Bill	04/29/2020	Inv. #...	Contract Bas...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-147.87
Bill Pmt -Check	04/29/2020	6917	Contract Bas...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-147.87
LSNB as Trustee for PEHP							
Liability Check	05/15/2020	PEHP		104 · Checking		216 · Post-Hea...	-123.76
Madison Nat'l Life							
Liability Check	04/24/2020	6915		104 · Checking		215 · Disability...	-66.56
Liability Check	05/15/2020	6921		104 · Checking		215 · Disability...	-66.56
Minnesota Department of Revenue							
Liability Check	05/01/2020	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-189.00
Liability Check	05/15/2020	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-189.00
Minnesota Life Insurance Company							
Liability Check	04/27/2020	6916		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-223.45
Liability Check	05/15/2020	6922		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-111.72
Nationwide Retirement Solutions							
Liability Check	05/01/2020	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-433.07
Liability Check	05/15/2020	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-433.07
NDPERS							
Liability Check	05/15/2020	NDPE...		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,532.36
North Dakota State University							
Bill	04/24/2020	Inv. #...	Work On GF-...	206 · Accounts Pay...		545 · Transpor...	-24,340.00
Bill Pmt -Check	04/24/2020	6912	Work On GF-...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-24,340.00
Peggy McNelis							
Bill	05/14/2020		Reimburse Fo...	206 · Accounts Pay...		711 · Miscellan...	-21.81
Bill Pmt -Check	05/14/2020	6926	Reimburse Fo...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-21.81
QuickBooks Payroll Service							
Liability Check	04/30/2020		Created by P...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-6,916.42
Liability Check	05/14/2020		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-6,651.69
Standard Insurance Company							
Liability Check	04/24/2020	6911		104 · Checking	X	217 · Dental P...	-118.88
Liability Check	05/15/2020	6923		104 · Checking		217 · Dental P...	-118.88