

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, July 15<sup>th</sup>, 2020, - 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Room/Zoom**

**ALL TO ORDER**

Clarence Vetter, Chairman, called the July 15, 2020, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:05 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

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

Guest(s) present were: Will Young, Brady-Martz; Stewart Milakovic, NDDOT-Bismarck; Baird Bream, and Evan Enarson, Consultants with Cambridge Systematics

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 MAY 20<sup>TH</sup>, 2020, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY ROST, TO APPROVE THE MAY 20<sup>TH</sup>, 2020, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF DISCUSSION ON NDDOT STATEWIDE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

Haugen reported that we do have representatives from the NDDOT and the consultant team that will do the majority of the presentation; he just wanted to highlight the staff report. He stated that, of course, North Dakota and the MPO do coordinate our transportation planning efforts; he just wanted to let you know the unique differences between what we are required to do and what North Dakota State is required to do, and the two biggest differences are; first we have to be fiscally constrained and the NDDOT, from a Federal perspective, does not have that same

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 15, 2020

mandate and the second is that we are a Bi-State entity, so our metropolitan area is not just the desired wishes of the State of North Dakota as we have to fashion our Metropolitan Plan with both North Dakota and Minnesota Transportation Plans, policies, etc., into one Metropolitan Plan, so there is that uniqueness. He said that there are a lot of similarities, but he just wanted to highlight those two differences between what we have to have adopted as a Metropolitan Transportation Plan and what NDDOT has to have as a Statewide Transportation Plan.

Haugen introduced Stewart Milakovic, NDDOT, and said that he would now turn the presentation over to him. Milakovic stated that actually Evan Enarson will be giving the bulk of the presentation.

Milakovic thanked the board for having them today, and introduced Evan Enarson, Project Manager and Baird Bream, Deputy Project Manager with Cambridge Systematics. He stated that he is the Transportation Planner with the NDDOT in Bismarck, and also the Project Manager for the NDDOT on this project.

Milakovic explained that what they are going to do today is to provide a brief overview of what the plan is going to involve. He said there may be some new areas that we haven't necessarily covered before in our long range transportation plan, and they will discuss what the goals of the plan are, and where we are in terms of engagement and public input, and then will talk a bit about guidelines and what the next steps will be.

Milakovic commented that even though this is a North Dakota plan, we encourage our friends from Minnesota to participate, even if you live in Minnesota but work or shop in North Dakota you should participate as we want to hear from everyone. He added that they are tracking where they getting some of their input from and we hear more from folks in East Grand Forks than from St. Paul, so they definitely hope to get more eyes on the plan and hopefully craft a really good policy going forward.

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

Presentation ensued.

Enarson stated that the real heart of the plan is their website: [www.transportationconnection.org](http://www.transportationconnection.org). He explained that they are continuously updating it with information and new opportunities to weigh in through surveys, or you can click through kind of an interactive tour or meeting and just kind of learn a little bit more about the plan. He asked that everyone please bookmark them, check them out and come back frequently because there will be a lot of great information coming out on-line, and he would also encourage you to weigh in and share your thoughts because this is really a plan for all of North Dakota and they really want to hear your input on what matters to you, what are some of your priorities; what should they be looking at from a State perspective and how can they support the work of Grand Forks and other partners.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 15, 2020

Enarson commented that they also have a very active social media component, so please check them out at:

Website: [www.dot.nd.gov/projects/lrtp/](http://www.dot.nd.gov/projects/lrtp/)

Facebook: [www.facebook.com/TransportationConnection/](http://www.facebook.com/TransportationConnection/)

Twitter: [www.twitter.com/ndlrtp](http://www.twitter.com/ndlrtp)

Instagram: [www.instagram.com/transportationconnection/](http://www.instagram.com/transportationconnection/)

E-Mail: [Connect@TransportationConnection.org](mailto:Connect@TransportationConnection.org)

Phone: (701) 328-2500.

Enarson added that they really encourage you to follow them as they will be posting surveys and pop quizzes and other such things, and they really appreciate any chance that you might have to share with your personal and professional networks too as they are trying to build a following, and, again, really hearing from a diverse set of voices from Minnesota and North Dakota residents, businesses, and community leaders, and all those others that aren't necessarily involved in the transportation planning process on a regular basis, so please check them out.

Enarson said that he knows that this is a lot of information in a short amount of time but they just wanted to provide an overall introduction to Transportation Connection and let you know that there is going to be a lot more fun opportunities to be engaged and opportunities for you to weigh-in and tell the DOT what is important moving forward.

Vein asked, is this going to kind of end up; you said that this doesn't necessarily have to be fiscally, maybe sound, but it ends up being kind of a long range wish list of where we think we want the State to be in the future; and then afterwards maybe come back and look at funding. Enarson responded that he thinks they were suggesting that the fiscally constrained; the MPO plans kind of do identify that these are the projects that we want to do, these are the projects that we can do under fiscal constraint; the State plan really won't necessarily invest or look at things at the project level, it is really going to look at our overall needs at the programming level and what we need to invest in the future to meet our safety goals or our maintenance, or to encourage international trade, and economic development; kind of broad guidance like that. He explained that the idea is that this helps provide the DOT with direction to be able to say that they maybe need some new programs or policies or funding sources or coordination opportunities in any one of these areas so it will be more in that policy and vision level rather than any specific guidance; the Statewide Plan provides kind of an umbrella plan to a number of others that are developed internally at the DOT that do address very specific asset management and safety and ITS kind of project needs.

Vein asked if this would be something that you might share with the Legislators and the Governor as they look at their policies and funding for the future. Enarson responded that that is

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 15, 2020

correct. He added that they are closely aligning with a lot of the Governor's priorities, and the idea that this plan does kind of, again, set that vision. He cited an example that they did hear back from their community leaders and their business partners that they really want the DOT to be a leader in technology over the next 20 years; and so as a DOT, as a State, as regional planning partners what can they start doing to make that happen.

Haugen said that, as he mentioned at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting as well, Minnesota is just initiating a similar exercise for the Minnesota Long Range Statewide Transportation Plan, and they are also asking to be able to come and give a presentation as well. He added that he also hopes to be able to have both DOTs attend a meeting at the same time although they won't be at the same level in the process but at least we can have some conversations and get to know better how each of the States are similar and how there are those differences between the two States that we, at the MPO level, have to merge and meld into our own Transportation Plan.

Information only.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF 2019 MPO AUDIT REPORT**

Haugen reported that Brady Martz performed an audit for the MPO. He stated that normally we would have had this presented well before July, however, you all know what has been occurring the last few months. He explained that one major thing the Auditor's did find that we had to address earlier this year, was the overcharging of salaries in 2019, and that was something that Mr. Young and his crew helped us with.

Haugen asked if Mr. Young had anything he wanted to project out, adding that everyone present does have a copy of the Audit, so if he wants to reference pages that might be the best thing to do at this time.

Young referred to the audit documents included in the packets, and said that he would like to start with the letter dated March 31<sup>st</sup> at the top that begins by stating that they have audited the financial statements of the governmental activities and general fund of the GF-EGF MPO for the year ending December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2019, and have issued their report thereon dated March 31, 2020. He said that he just wanted to identify some items; first in the second paragraph it states that there are no new accounting policies that were adopted by management during the year, nor were any existing policies changed during 2019. He said that below that there are a couple of accounting estimates that were used; the first one was management's estimate of its actuarially calculated pension liability. He explained that these aren't really estimates that management creates, they are more estimates that the State NDPERS program has, and they pass it down to all of their members. He stated that the second one is also related to NDPERS but it is related to the health insurance portion of their program and it is the other post employment benefits (OPEB).

Young referred to the second page of the letter and stated that the first section says that the encountered no significant difficulties in dealing with management in performing the audit, they actually had no difficulties what-so-ever with management. He said that the second section is

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 15, 2020

just describing the corrected and uncorrected statements; they did have some year end accruals that are typically set up by them, as requested by management. He stated that if you will skip forward a couple of pages you will find the list of all of the adjusting journal entries.

Young referred to the second letter included in the packet and said that then second paragraph identifies that there was a deficiency that they had noted that did not make it up to an audit finding, but is more of a better business practice, and Mr. Haugen had mentioned this before introducing him, that the calculated rates that were used were improperly using the hour bank or the total hours that were accumulated instead of the current year accumulations; so Ms. McNelis had actually worked really hard with the State to get everything corrected, and he does appreciate her work on that as it really sped up the process on the audit.

Young commented that the second observation was that the Board Chair and the Secretary don't maintain their corresponding signature stamps, and they are kept in the office; and they just recommend anything with signature stamps to not have them in the possession of anyone other than the owner of the stamp, so their recommendation is for them to physically maintain them and bring them in.

Young stated that the final document is the Audit Report for FY 2019. He referred to Page 1, and pointed out that it is the Independent Auditor's Report. He then referred to Page 2 and said that he just wanted to highlight the second paragraph, underneath the opinion, and pointed out that it says that in their opinion the financial statements referred to above are presented fairly and in all material respects, the respective financial position of the governmental activities and the general fund information of the GF-EGF MPO. He explained that this is known as an Unqualified Opinion, it is the best opinion you can get, and basically states that they agree with the financial statements that are here and there is nothing material that would throw them off.

Young referred to Page 3; Management's Discussion and Analysis, and explained that this is a section that is required for Governmental Audits and it is basically a highlight of the current year results at a very high level.

Young referred to Page 8; the Governmental Funds Balance Sheet and the Statement of Net Position, and said that for anyone that has been on the boards of other governments or seen other governmental reports this might look familiar, yet a little different because they have both the Governmental and the GASB 34 statements, or the Government wide statements combined into one. He then went over the statement briefly.

Young continued going over the report.

Young referred to Page 32; The Government Auditing Standards Report, otherwise known as the Yellow Book Report, and stated that he just wanted to identify; unlike in previous years, and he believes last year you didn't have one either, in 2019 there was no single audit required, meaning that your federal expenditures were less than \$750,000. He said that within this report, looking at the internal controls of the organization, on Page 33, the paragraph at the top does state that there were two deficiencies that they identified and they are listed as items 2019-001 and 2019-

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 15, 2020

002 and are described on Page 34. He said that these are actually the same items that reoccur every year and they are very common for governmental entities of your size to have, and he will touch on that a little more in a bit. He pointed out that the next paragraph states that the results of their test disclose no instances of non-compliance or other matters that are required to be reported under Government Auditing Standards. He said that even though they have a couple of findings they are not compliance issues, they are more items that should be corrected to fix internal controls, however small governments of your size don't really have the ability to change these as they are small in size and due to economic resources.

Young referred to Page 34 and explained that the first finding 2019-001, is that the organization does not have the internal resources to identify all journal entrees required to maintain a general ledger and to prepare the full-disclosure financial statements. He explained that this is nothing against the organization, or Ms. McNelis in particular, this is strictly due to; to be able to issue reports and everything, for an organization to be able to get out of a finding it would need to have a Certified Public Accountant on staff running the books and things like that, and preparing the reports, and if there isn't anyone like that on staff then you are kind of relying on the auditors to prepare them for the organization and to find those journal entries that need to be made, so it isn't a big issue but it is still something that they have to identify.

Young commented that the second finding, 2019-002, talks about the segregation of duties, and this is mainly due to the fact that Ms. McNelis is basically performing almost all of the accounting functions, so it is almost impossible to have a proper segregation of duties to insure that internal controls are in place and are properly being met; so again it isn't due to any staff member or anything in particular, it's due to just the size of the organization and not being able to have multiple employees that are working within that area. He said that, at minimum, to kind of get rid of the segregation of duties issues you would need to have two accounting staff on hand to be able to pass things back and forth and not have just one working on everything together, but due to the size of the organization it just isn't feasible, and they understand that, however, as with the first one, they do have to identify it as a finding.

Young said that the two findings, overall, are ones that they primarily see in every governmental audit that they perform with the exception of some of the larger ones like the City of Grand Forks or Grand Forks Public Schools as they do have a larger accounting staff.

Vein left the meeting.

Grasser said, maybe starting at the end, the comment about not having enough staff as they are approving bills and those kinds of things; we as a board actually approve all of the bills on a monthly basis, does that help negate that or should that be recognized at all. Young responded that that does help but really what should be occurring in a proper set of internal controls or a proper system is one individual is performing a purchase order process, another individual actually orders those items, and the person ordering the items should not be the person receiving the items, comparing that to what was ordered, entering it into the system, and then the person separate from the person receiving the items and the invoice would actually enter the invoice into the system and getting things ready to prepare the checks; so it is great to have the board to

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 15, 2020

overlook that and it does help with the internal controls, it is just more of a way to better the internal controls having another person on staff, it would be beneficial, however, as mentioned before, due to the size of the governmental entity it is not really cost effective, and they do a pretty thorough search of invoices and expenditures and there was nothing noted during their testing to feel there are really any concerns with this.

Grasser said he had a couple more questions, and this may go to Mr. Haugen, under facilities and overhead we had an \$18,000+ shortfall this year, are we going to have a way of rectifying that moving forward or what do we expect on that line item in the future. Haugen responded that it was an anomaly for 2019, we had the financial crunch in November where we laid off Mr. Viafara, and that is reflecting in some of those abnormalities that we had in 2019 and we shouldn't have that in future years. Grasser asked if that also relates to the compensated absences that had to do with that departure as opposed to routine vacation and sick leave. Haugen responded that would be correct. Grasser said he had one more comment, and he probably made the same comment last year, to a degree; but he wouldn't mind seeing these things run through the Finance Committee, recognizing that Board has said that they are comfortable taking them direct, but he thinks at minimum we should send a copy to the Finance Committee members that aren't Board members just so they have it for their basic information and invite them if they have any comments to do so. Haugen responded that just to follow up there are no Finance Committee members that aren't Board members. Grasser said that he thought that Maureen Storstad was on the Finance Committee. Haugen responded that the Finance Committee is made up of the current Chair, the past Chair, and the current Secretary who will become the Chair.

Vetter thanked Mr. Young for his presentation.

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO ACCEPT THE FINAL 2019 MPO AUDIT REPORT, AS PRESENTED, FOR SUBMITTAL TO OUR STATE AND FEDERAL PARTNERS.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Vein.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF EAST GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN UPDATE CONTRACT**

Kouba reported that back in May we presented an RFP that was approved and we set about advertising it, with a deadline of 12:00 Noon on June 19<sup>th</sup> for proposals to be submitted. She said that they received four proposals and held interviews with all four firms on June 25<sup>th</sup>.

Kouba stated that the Selection Committee recommended hiring the firm of WSB to do the East Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update. She said that their proposal was included in the packet.

Kouba said that both NDDOT and MnDOT had comments on the proposal, and those comments were included in the contract, and are highlighted.

***MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE EXECUTING A CONTRACT WITH WSB TO DO THE EAST GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN UPDATE, AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Vein.***

Haugen commented that you just authorized the contract for the East Grand Forks Land Use Plan, and the consultants will be hired and on the ground working from now until the end of next year. He said that, just to update you on the North Dakota side, he is still anticipating that we are a couple of months away from having an RFP for your consideration, which would mean that we would be closer to October or November before we can have a consultant for you to consider hiring for the Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF TIME ONLY EXTENSION FOR COMPLETION OF DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION STUDY**

Haugen reported that for the Downtown Transportation Study the first item we have is an extension of the timeline, which technically ended in June, but in discussion with the Chair that was the only agenda item that we needed to have addressed at our June meeting, but it was agreed that we felt we could push it off until July's meeting. He explained that there is no cost to this extension, it is just extending the deadline due primarily to COVID-19, and to shift the work that was to be done during the beginning stages of COVID-19's impact to March, April, and parts of May, and to tag them onto the back end now so that we will finish up in October and give final approval in December, so that would be the extension, from June 30, 2020 until November 30, 2020.

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE A TIME ONLY EXTENSION FOR COMPLETION OF THE DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION STUDY TO NOVEMBER 30, 2020.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Vein.***

**MATTER OF DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION STUDY UPDATE**

Haugen reported that the Draft Alternative Analysis Report was submitted and it is available on the website: [www.dtforksmobility.com](http://www.dtforksmobility.com). He said that included in the packet were summary

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 15, 2020

pages from that. He added that a Steering Committee meeting was held to go over that report, and they had fair representation of the committee at the meeting. He explained that it was held on a Friday morning, June 26<sup>th</sup>.

Haugen referred to a graphic and explained that it, at very high levels, summarizes all of the alternatives and the locations, primarily we have, for DeMers Avenue itself; a big opportunity that we are hoping to get out of this study is how to have better and more reliable traffic flow. He stated that it seems like two of the more favorable alternatives are interconnecting the signals that are on the Minnesota side with the already interconnected signals on the North Dakota side, and then, as you can see we do have an alternative where we have adapted traffic signal control, so instead of having passive timing plans that are almost out of date as soon as they are put in place, the adaptive signal control is more of an artificial intelligence algorithm equation that on the fly will adjust the timing plans based on the actual traffic that is out there.

Haugen commented that we also have some kind of bike/ped suggestions included in the alternative analysis; some are specific to both sides of the river, some are specific to one side versus the other side. He said that they haven't had a lot of discussion on transit, although there are some alternatives that try to address the transit mode as well.

Haugen stated that, finally, we do have some comments concerning railroad crossings on both sides of the river; on the North Dakota side it is more of determining if there is a way to get information out that the crossing is closed by a train; but on the Minnesota side the big issue was quieting the train horns.

Haugen referred to the Alternatives Scoring graphic and said that it is trying to give you some sense of how these were being evaluated by the consulting team; so on the one side they are trying to give a sense of whether it improved traffic, that specific traffic mode, or did it hinder it or was it more neutral; and then on the other side it was trying to give some sense of the planning level costs and how much that improvement would cost to implement.

Haugen referred to the next few slides and explained that they list the Universe of Alternatives that were submitted to you. He added that they did ask the Steering Committee, and they have provided to us a ranking of all of these alternatives, giving us a range of no need to they would be useful and then to they are critical. He said that for all of those alternatives that the committee felt were critical to pursue, they were asked to give them a ranking as well, so we have had a dozen to fifteen of those worksheets submitted back to us that we will use to sort of narrow down our Universe of Alternatives, and those alternatives that the Steering Committee is indicating are more critical to implement.

Haugen referred to the DeMers Avenue Roundabout graphic and commented that there was some discussion about the roundabout concept at the bottom of the DeMers Overpass, so this graphic is in the Alternative Report, and it was part of the Steering Committee meeting, however the smaller diagram was blown up to full-size; and again, this is a planning level conceptualization of how a roundabout would work, the two unique features of this would be that it is four lanes on DeMers Avenue and the intersections of 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue and 8<sup>th</sup> Street; typically a

roundabout would have more of a “T” intersection concept, this is a little more unique with 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue and 8<sup>th</sup> Street, so that would be the second unique factor in that it is more of a square intersection.

Haugen said that there was some discussion that East Grand Forks and MnDOT are already working on what is called a local partnership project. He explained that MnDOT has some funds on a State Trunk Highway System that they can partner up with local funds to make improvements. He said that the bigger project is improving the asphalt touchdown on the Sorlie Bridge itself, to make it comparable in smoothness to its counterpart on the North Dakota side. He added that there are a couple of other asphalt areas that aren't shown on this graphic, but up by the U.S.#2/4<sup>th</sup> Street Intersection, that would have improvements made to the roadway itself and the sidewalk on 4<sup>th</sup> Street. He added that another thing that this graphic is trying to depict, there are these crosswalks that exist that are stamped concrete; one is located between the Cinema and Cabela's, and there are a couple more down the road, and those would be replaced and initially the proposal was just to put standard concrete back in and stripe them but the City Council has asked that they be colored concrete instead of standard concrete as that would match better with what was implemented on the North Dakota side. He stated that there is a crosswalk on the dry side of the floodwall but there has been discussion as to whether or not that is still the proper place for it or if it should be moved down the road and Option C seems to be the preferred option.

Haugen reported that they are still trying to schedule their next public engagement opportunity with these alternatives and the Steering Committee's feedback that they have received so it should be happening within the next three weeks or so and we will let you know when that has been scheduled, and, depending on COVID-19, whether or not it will be an in-person, in-person and on-line, or just on-line.

Haugen commented that we did talk about the local partnership project that is moving forward; and he didn't mention this, but it will likely be done next year. He added that also in the T.I.P. document they do have traffic signal replacement going on, with the two traffic signals in the downtown. He said that they have had some communication recently from MnDOT indicating less enthusiasm for interconnecting those signals, and probably even less enthusiasm for the adaptive traffic signal control option, so we are trying to work with the district, and we have also communicated with Steve Emery, Consulting Engineer for the City of East Grand Forks, earlier this week regarding the City Council's question on the local match for that project, just to make sure that we let MnDOT know that those two opportunities are, according to this report, quite beneficial to the overall traffic flow on DeMers Avenue.

Information only.

### **MATTER OF T.I.P. SCORING SHEETS UPDATE**

Haugen reported that the last time we met we went over the scoring system itself, and focused just on the bigger weight systems that the scoring system utilizes. He said that we have now gone into each of the individual programs, and we now have ten factors, or ten goals that we are

scoring things based off of, and so within that we have then added to, for each of the individual factors, the questions that we are asking have simple yes or no answers to the question of whether or not the project is supporting our transportation planning document. He said that we do not have a minimum score required for these, however we think that most of the projects will score, there will be no project that will score zero, so we have to have a system in place, how we use the system is up to our discretion, and so far, for the last ten years we have been using a similar system and we are just updating that to reflect the ten new factors that are reflected in our new transportation plan, and are meeting our requirements that way.

Haugen commented that we have asked that the Technical Advisory Committee provide feedback on this, but if you wish to have feedback as well that would be welcome. He said that they are hoping that next month, if you recall last month we worked through our Tip Procedural Manual earlier this year and we had a lot of manual documents to discuss with you, updating the funding program to identify what the various funding programs we solicit for, now we are getting into the appendices, which this would be one of, and we think we will have everything in a good wrap up draft form to try to have consideration of the final document at your August meeting.

Information only.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Haugen reported that no public comments were received prior to the meeting so there is nothing to forward to you.

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

a. 2020 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that this shows where we are at with the projects remaining in our 2020 Work Program.

Haugen stated that we already discussed the East Grand Forks Land Use Plan; hiring a consultant, and we already gave an update on where we think we are at with the Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update.

Haugen commented that we still have little work that the MPO has done on the Bridge Impact Study as we are still waiting for the hydraulics report.

Haugen stated that you have heard the update on the Downtown Transportation Study.

Haugen said that before we move off this agenda item, we do have to establish a new two-year work program, and we are looking at having that document before the Board in October. He added that next month we will give you a sense of what the funding opportunities are. He said that he did describe to the Technical Advisory Committee last week that it looks like we have

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 15, 2020

enough funds coming in that would support our core programs, although we don't have a lot of discretionary funds available to do things like the Downtown Transportation Study that we are doing, or a Future Bridge Traffic Impact Study. He said that next year a lot of our commitment will be updating our Transit portion of our Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the Land Use Plans are also going to finishing up next year, so there is a possibility that the one optional thing that we could fund, that we normally have funded every third year, would be the update of the Aerial Photo. He added that maybe next month we will have a surprise with some unforeseen funding source becoming available where we could actually have room to solicit and generate study ideas to try to work into the work program, but that is kind of how it looks it will shake out right now, so we will be asking for other study ideas that might take the place of the Aerial Photo update, but we are walking into that discussion identifying that as the likely project to take the discretionary funds.

Information only.

- b. Approval Of Bill/Check List For 5/16/20 To 7/10/20 Period

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE BILL/CHECK LIST FOR THE 5/16/20 TO 7/10/20 PERIOD.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

- c. New State Aid Engineer For MnDOT District 2

Strandell reported that the new State Aid Engineer for District 2 is Brian Ketring. He said that Mr. Ketring grew up about 10 miles south of town and went to high school in Fisher. He added that he was a County Engineer for the last 15 or so years, and is taking over for Lou Tassa, who retired.

Information only.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY STRANDELL, SECONDED BY ROST, TO ADJOURN THE JULY 15<sup>TH</sup>, 2020, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:07 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully Submitted,  
Peggy McNelis, Office Manager

**Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO**  
**Transaction List by Vendor**  
 May 16 through July 10, 2020

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
<b>AFLAC.</b>							
Liability Check	06/26/2020	AFLAC	501	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-517.90
<b>Alerus Financial</b>							
Liability Check	05/29/2020	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-2,634.64
Liability Check	06/12/2020	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-2,521.44
Liability Check	06/26/2020	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-2,521.44
Liability Check	07/10/2020	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,538.48
<b>CitiBusiness Card</b>							
Bill	06/02/2020	Acct. ...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-520.08
Bill Pmt -Check	06/02/2020	6931	Charges For ...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-520.08
Bill	06/24/2020	Acct. ...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		-SPLIT-	-761.45
Bill Pmt -Check	06/24/2020	6941	Charges For ...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-761.45
<b>City of East Grand Forks</b>							
Bill	06/19/2020	Inv. #...	3rd Quarter 2...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-2,490.30
Bill Pmt -Check	06/19/2020	6935	3rd Quarter 2...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-2,490.30
<b>Fidelity Security Life.</b>							
Liability Check	05/18/2020	6929	50790-1043	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-8.42
Liability Check	06/26/2020	6937	50790-1043	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-8.44
<b>Forum Communications Company</b>							
Bill	06/09/2020	Inv. #...	Public Notice ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		555 · TIP	-166.20
Bill Pmt -Check	06/09/2020	6933	Public Notice ...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-166.20
<b>Intrado Interactive Services Corporation</b>							
Bill	05/19/2020	Inv. #...	Cost of Logo ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-500.00
Bill Pmt -Check	05/19/2020	6930	Cost of Logo ...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-500.00
<b>KLJ Engineering, LLC</b>							
Bill	06/09/2020	Inv. #...	For Work On ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		550 · Corridor ...	-7,987.27
Bill Pmt -Check	06/09/2020	6934	For Work On ...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-7,987.27
<b>Liberty Business Systems, Inc.</b>							
Bill	06/19/2020	Inv. #...	Contract Bas...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-162.66
Bill Pmt -Check	06/19/2020	6936	Contract Bas...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-162.66
<b>LSNB as Trustee for PEHP</b>							
Liability Check	06/26/2020	NWR...		104 · Checking	X	216 · Post-Hea...	-123.75
<b>Madison Nat'l Life</b>							
Liability Check	06/26/2020	6938		104 · Checking	X	215 · Disability...	-66.56
<b>Minnesota Department of Revenue</b>							
Liability Check	05/22/2020	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-199.00
Liability Check	06/12/2020	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-186.00
Liability Check	06/26/2020	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-186.00
Liability Check	07/10/2020	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-189.00
<b>Minnesota Life Insurance Company</b>							
Liability Check	06/26/2020	6939		104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-111.72
<b>Nationwide Retirement Solutions</b>							
Liability Check	05/29/2020	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-433.07
Liability Check	06/12/2020	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-433.07
Liability Check	06/26/2020	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-433.07
Liability Check	07/10/2020	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-433.07
<b>NDPERS</b>							
Liability Check	05/22/2020	NDPE...	D88	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-4,536.12
Liability Check	05/29/2020	NDPE...	VOID: D88	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	0.00
Liability Check	06/15/2020	NDPE...		104 · Checking	*	-SPLIT-	-2,532.36
Liability Check	06/26/2020	NDPE...	D88	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-3,024.08
<b>QuickBooks Payroll Service</b>							
Liability Check	05/28/2020		Created by P...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-6,836.08
Liability Check	06/11/2020		Created by P...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-6,328.76
Liability Check	06/25/2020		Created by P...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-6,328.76
Liability Check	07/09/2020		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-6,372.68
<b>Standard Insurance Company</b>							
Liability Check	06/04/2020	6932	Policy #160-1...	104 · Checking	X	217 · Dental P...	-118.88
Liability Check	06/26/2020	6940		104 · Checking		217 · Dental P...	-118.88
<b>State Tax Commissioner</b>							
Liability Check	06/04/2020	NDST...	VOID: 45038...	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	0.00
Liability Check	07/01/2020	NDST...	45038827301	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-430.00