

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, August 19<sup>th</sup>, 2020, - 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Room/Zoom**

**ALL TO ORDER**

Clarence Vetter, Chairman, called the August 19, 2020, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:00 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

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

Absent was: Ken Vein.

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 JULY 15<sup>TH</sup>, 2020, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY ROST, TO APPROVE THE JULY 15<sup>TH</sup>, 2020, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF 2020 SELF CERTIFICATION**

Haugen reported that annually, when updating the T.I.P., we do self-certify that we are meeting the requirements of federal rules and regulations; however every third or fourth year instead of just the one page certification statement we have a document with more detail on how we are self-certifying, and this is the year we are doing that.

Haugen stated that included in the packet was the full report that identifies how each of these individual items are being satisfied by the MPO. He said that it was reviewed and did get a recommendation for approval from the Technical Advisory Committee at their meeting last week, and staff is recommending approval as well.

***MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE 2020 SELF-CERTIFICATION DOCUMENT, AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Mock and Vein.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT FINAL 2021-2024 T.I.P.**

Haugen reported that this is the time of year when we are asked to adopt a new T.I.P. document that covers the next four years of transportation improvements in our metropolitan area. He said that last week we held a public hearing and no public comments were received on the draft that was available. He stated, however, that last Wednesday we did receive several comments from our State and Federal partners; and he will say that we do have new State and Federal partners that we haven't had in the past and it is good to get some new eyes on our documents that we have been approving routinely for the last several years, however with those new eyes comes perhaps new ways of seeing how things are done, so in general, based on the number and types of comments they had, included in your motion today we will ask that you agree to work with our State and Federal Partners on reformatting the T.I.P. document itself, possibly with some substantial changes; we will have to work through that process with them, however it is unlikely that you will see the document in this form again in the near future.

Haugen stated that there was one rather substantial change to the document that we revised with assistance from our State and Local Partners that had to do with the performance based planning and programming section. He explained that in the past we were able to basically generically state what the performance measures were, what status they were in the adoption process, and some citation as to how they worked.

Haugen referred to the document, and explained that, to highlight, the changes that we have done was to insert what our specific targets were for each of the performance measures that we have adopted targets on.

Haugen referred to Page 88, and stated that before when we talked about safety we just identified that there were five safety factors, and we didn't identify targets, so now we have inserted what the MPO targets are and in regard to safety we have annual targets so we show our success of the targets that we have adopted.

Haugen commented that when it comes to pavement and bridge we inserted a map that shows what, when we talk about the NHS Systems, all of the lines in red are those segments of the National Highway System that is located within our area. He said that we also indicate whether or not we have adopted the State targets or our own targets, and if we adopted our own what they are versus what was adopted at the State, and this is what we have adopted. He added that these are four year targets for the MPO, and as noted in the discussion both State DOTs have to review their targets after the first two years, and they are now going through that process, so if, in the

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 19, 2020

case of non-interstate pavements, if either State decides to make a change mid-year to their target, we will be asked to either accept that change from the State level or consider our own target 180 days after the States make that decision.

Haugen stated that when it comes to the bridge, we are adopting both State targets, and just as with pavement they are right now going through their two year review, and if they make a change we will be asked to support that change or adopt our own.

Haugen said that when it comes to reliability, we have adopted our own targets for these, and these are four year targets for the MPO, but again the States are required to review their targets every two years, and they are in the process of doing that and if they do revise their targets we will have to consider revising ours within 180 days.

Haugen stated that our Transit Targets, we adopted these targets, and ours have to be reviewed every five years; annually our Transit Operators have to adopt a target, and once they notify us of what their annual targets are we can review how they compare to our five year targets, and of course we can adjust them if we wish on an annual basis or when the Transit Operators have very significant changes to their annual targets.

Haugen commented that we also identified, within each of these targets, what an example project was previously, we were more generic in our description, that targets help us in safety; here we identify specifically a target in the T.I.P. that makes efforts for us to reach our safety targets, and we did the same for our pavement, bridge, etc.

Haugen summarized that those are the substantial changes that we did to satisfy our State and Federal Partner's comments from the Technical Advisory Committee meeting; other than that the most significant thing that this is doing is adding a new fourth year, so 2024 we have projects that are new to the T.I.P. cycle for both sides of the river. He added that we dropped most of the 2020 projects, and most of the 2021-2023 projects are the same as what is in the current T.I.P., with some minor changes. He stated that overall we are programming just slightly over \$100,000,000 worth of investment. He said that the bulk of those are federal funds; \$76,000,000 of the 107,000,000, and \$15,000,000 in local funds to satisfy all the projects listed.

Haugen said that other than what he has highlighted, unless there are specific questions about individual projects, he should explain or clarify, in our Transit Project Listings so far Transit is the only mode of transportation that received additional funding through CARES, in response to COVID-19, and so what that has done in our T.I.P. documents is it has caused us to have the statement shown in red that each year Transit gets a federal appropriation to help fund their operations for that year, but the CARE funding, in essence provided three years of annual appropriation funding in one year, so it is likely that in 2021 some of those CARE Act funds will still be paying for Transit operations, and so normally we are showing this \$1.2 million dollars, and this happens to the Grand Forks Federal portion, and define towards the operations of 2021, right now we aren't certain how far the CARE Act funding will carry it, so working with our Transit friends and partners, we added this red statement saying that there may be some of those

funds not used in this year towards this operation, so we tried to note that to the best of our ability at this time.

Haugen said that, again, unless there are specific questions, both the Technical Advisory Committee and Staff are asking the Board to approve the T.I.P. document; and we did submit this re-draft to our State and Federal Partners, but we still haven't heard back from our Federal Partners of any changes, so the motion would be to approve the T.I.P. document subject to; working with the State and Federal Partners on a revamp of the document, and to any further technical corrects that State and Federal Partners want made to the document.

***MOVED BY ROST, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE 2021-2024 T.I.P. DOCUMENT SUBJECT TO ANY FURTHER TECHNICAL CORRECTS SUBMITTED BY OUR STATE AND FEDERAL PARTNERS, AND TO WORK WITH OUR STATE AND FEDERAL PARTNERS ON RECONFIGURING FUTURE T.I.P. DOCUMENTS.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Vein.***

#### **MATTER OF APPROVAL OF 2020 T.I.P. PROCEDURAL MANUAL**

Haugen reported that, as you know, for most of the year we have been working on updating our T.I.P. Procedural Manual. He explained that this is a manual that we have had in place for 10 years, and it tries to outline the process that we use to prepare the annual T.I.P. document. He added, if you recall, we've also gone through, almost month by month, looking at certain sections of the document for review and digest. He said that last month we were looking at the individual scoring sheets for the programs, so this month we placed all of the updates into one draft document and are asking for your approval. He added that the document itself has over 80 some pages, half of those pages are appendices that identify certain aspects, and the first half basically lays out the T.I.P. process.

Haugen said that with the changes that we have noted as we've gone through each section we've updated the draft to reflect those changes so both the Technical Advisory Committee and Staff are recommending adoption of this new T.I.P. Procedural Manual to reflect MAP-21/FAST requirements and also now the ten planning factors we are required to meet as well.

***MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE ADOPTION OF THE UPDATED 2020 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (T.I.P. PROCEDURAL MANUAL, AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Vein.***

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON 2021-2022 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM**

Haugen reported that last month we gave a little precursor to this agenda item; each month we give you a monthly update as to how we are progressing in the current annual work program, and our current work program covers the years 2019 and 2020, and now we need to adopt a new one for 2021 and 2022.

Haugen stated that the work program is a document that tells our local, State and Federal partners what planning activities and programs we are going to focus on within that two-year period. He said that 2021 is fairly captured as to what we will be doing; at the end of 2021 we will revisit the work activities we show for 2022, so that second year is penciled in, not cast in stone.

Haugen commented that the first thing that we need to do is to identify what revenue we may have to work from on the work program. He said that in the past we have been able to enjoy considerably more planning funds, and we have gone through some discussion about what has been happening to the consolidated planning grant distribution, so for the next two-year work program we are kind of at our bare minimum allocations that we work from so therefore there is not a lot of discretionary funds available to the MPO. He added that we are carrying over several of the projects that we started this year into 2021, and the funding that we set aside for this year will also carry over into 2021; those major projects are the two land use plans and the future bridge traffic impact study, however we do believe that even with our core funding and carrying over those 2020 funds for those projects for 2021 we will have about \$50,000 that won't be needed to cover those items. He said that in the past every three years we have done an aerial photograph of the study area, so 2021 would be the year in that cycle to do that and \$50,000 would basically cover that cost, so while we haven't identified specifically that that is the project, we are identifying that if we continue our regular cycle that \$50,000 we have available would likely go towards that project unless something else comes up.

Haugen stated that we also note, and getting back to our T.I.P. document and the note we showed in red for Transit, both our Transit Operators do have appropriations from prior years still sitting in the bank, if you will, so in discussions with them, since we are doing the Transit Development Plan Update, we had discussions with them on whether or not they could allocate some of those funds towards that effort, that would then free up our regular planning funds so we could do other studies. He added that there is also the possibility that the State of Minnesota, which has never helped us financially on the Transit Development Plan, while they have the rest of the Minnesota MPOs, might be also providing some assistance with the Transit Development Plan, which would also free up some funds, so if those things would work out we are asking our local partners that if they have studies they wish us to consider they should go through the process of determining if they are eligible for our planning funds and if they are then further defining what the scope of work would be and allocating a cost estimate towards them, but at the same time we will be working through our transit partners whether there are funding opportunities for them to help us do that Transit Development Plan Update.

Haugen commented that in the end our Work Program has to be submitted to our Lead State Agency, NDDOT, by November 1<sup>st</sup>; that means in October we will have a final draft before you for consideration so between now and the 1<sup>st</sup> of October we will be working to see if there are more funds available, and if so are there more work studies we would like to see accomplished, and if the only thing we have available is the \$50,000, if the aerial photo is the right activity to peg those funds towards. He added that during the Technical Advisory Committee discussion there was a request to consider increasing our pixel count from a 6-inch resolution to a 3-inch resolution, and the higher the resolution the higher the cost so Ms. Kouba is researching how much that might change the budget to do that as the \$50,000 would cover the cost of doing 6-inch resolution. He said that right now we are just identifying that right now we have just a little bit of funds available and we are working with our Transit Partners to see if there are more funds that could become available and if there are more funds available, determining what studies or activities would the partnering agencies of the MPO would use those funds towards, so if you have any ideas work through your staff and the MPO staff to see if they are eligible and we will try to accomplish more if we can get more revenue.

Information only.

#### **MATTER OF DISCUSSION ON FUTURE BRIDGE TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY**

Haugen reported that there was no staff report, this is basically for the Board members to have discussion on this item. He explained that there was a meeting a week ago, when the Sewer Interconnect Group discussed bridge possibilities, and it was felt that this body should discuss the bridge issue as well.

Vetter asked what the Impact Study would entail. Haugen responded that the traffic impact would look at one or more alignments where a bridge might be placed; we would look at; in particular, what type of roadway would be necessary to carry the estimated traffic. He said that at the key intersections it would look at what geometric changes would have to be done to accommodate the major shift in traffic patterns in the metro area.

Haugen added that based on past board discussions we will be paying particular focus on pedestrian traffic, specifically around schools, that might see a significant traffic change around the school, and also how the bridge will interact with the Greenway Trail System itself.

Vetter asked, when we do the impact study will it tell us how much; are we going to keep Minnesota/4<sup>th</sup> in play to tell us how much traffic is going to be alleviated at that site as well or not. Haugen responded that it would, added that it will still tell us how much traffic shift will come down to the new bridge. He said that it will give us that basic information as to; if you recall from the past bridge studies, our traffic demand model gives us some sense of where the traffic change is coming from and where it is going; and as we went further south with the alignments; basically from 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue North, the majority of the traffic the model was estimating was still local traffic, meaning it was either Grand Forks to East Grand Forks or East Grand Forks to Grand Forks. He added that south of 32<sup>nd</sup> we started to see that more of the traffic was talking the Red Lake River bridge, or the Mallory Bridge on 220 South.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 19, 2020

Haugen commented that the major difference is that we will introduce the more detailed traffic modeling on those corridors, that will give us more refined more reflective of the base traffic pattern; more at a micro level than our macro level looks so far, so at the micro level we waded through some of those concepts of how many lanes, the geometric at intersections, and those types of issues with a little more refinement than we can at the macro level.

Vetter said that he would like to pose a question to the Board; would we like to throw 47<sup>th</sup> Corridor out as the hydraulics weren't very promising on that site and the cost/benefit ratios aren't very promising and it doesn't really do a lot for the local traffic, it is more of a regional traffic corridor than a local traffic corridor, so for all of those reasons he is wondering if we just want to say goodbye to 47<sup>th</sup> and just concentrate on Elks and 32<sup>nd</sup> Corridors. Rost stated that he was at the meeting and there was some discussion, from the City of Grand Forks, to throw 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue back into the mix, and that they would pay for that study. Vetter commented that Mr. Sande wanted us to look at 17<sup>th</sup>, and we discussed 17<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> in the past and they have never been included, but he took Mr. Sande's comments as a way to just delay this a little further, to be politically correct. Haugen added that he thinks the discussion was to just have 17<sup>th</sup> for a hydraulic analysis. Rost agreed that that is what he believes as well.

Powers asked where are at with the hydraulic study for 32<sup>nd</sup>. Haugen responded that staff did share with the Board the Hydraulic Analysis Report that was presented to both City Councils; an email including it was sent to each of the Board Members, the presentation that was submitted, and they also advised everyone that you could watch the presentation on-line. He said that from a simplistic point of view the hydraulic report is basically saying that all of these sites can have a bridge built, there is mitigation that would need to be done at each, and based on location those mitigation costs change substantially based on the height of the bridge, but hydraulically it appears that there is a possibility that a bridge can be built at the three sites that were looked at. Powers asked if they were basically all the same, hydraulically wise, is that what you are saying. Vetter responded that we have to do more mitigation at some sites than other sites. Powers said, though, that from an engineering perspective it is possible to build a bridge at all the sites. Vetter responded that that is correct, but 47<sup>th</sup> is probably the worst as it would require the most mitigation. Rost commented that 32<sup>nd</sup> was the one that shined the most. Vetter said that in his opinion 32<sup>nd</sup> had the best results. Rost said, though, that we would have to do a public safety study as well as 32<sup>nd</sup> has two schools, 21 driveways, so that could be an issue.

Powers asked if staff was looking for a motion to eliminate 47<sup>th</sup>. Haugen responded that that would be something that has to be decided. He added that the hydraulic report looked at a different alignment for 32<sup>nd</sup> (he showed the alignment that is in the transportation plan versus the alignment used for the hydraulic study) and pointed out that the hydraulic study took the bridge and shifted it south, and then weaved it back up, so for us to look at traffic impacts we kind of have to know where the touch down point is on the existing street network, as it would make a difference where it is located. He referred to the 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue location and commented that if we are going to introduce 17<sup>th</sup> back into the mix; he pointed out the alignment we looked at for 17<sup>th</sup> in the transportation plan, and stated that the question is whether this would be the alignment that we would be analyzing with the traffic impact analysis or is there another alignment that we would be looking at, so ultimately in order to draft the RFP we need to know which corridors we

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 19, 2020

still want to include in the study and then, based on those corridors, which alignment, if it is different from the ones shown, are we going to be studying, which basic touchdown points and major intersections will be impacted.

Further discussion on possible touchdown points and alignments for the corridors ensued.

Haugen stated that ultimately he isn't sure if there is discussion that needs to be held between all of our partners as to what alignments we want to use, if we want to drop 47<sup>th</sup>, if we want to add 17<sup>th</sup>, go with the south alignment of 32<sup>nd</sup> or the northerly alignment of 32<sup>nd</sup>, etc. Strandell commented that he has a concern with Rhinehart Drive; that road is just not built anywhere close to having any traffic on it. He stated that if you go further east, maybe a half mile east, to Hartsville Road, it would make much more sense, but if you stay on Rhinehart some of those homes are very close to the road and there isn't any right-of-way, plus you would have to remove all that elevated roadway and get down to some curb and gutter, so it would be very expensive, but if you go to Hartsville it is an open road and would be a lot easier to build up that one. Vetter suggested if you come in on the Section Line you would have the option of going either way, but the problem with it coming in on the Section Line is the amount of mitigation that would be needed, all those houses at the intersection would either need to be purchased or a ring dike would need to be built around them.

Vetter stated that he doesn't know that this body can make that decision; he agrees with Mr. Haugen that the two entities have to get together and decide if we want the northerly alignment or the southernly alignment on 32<sup>nd</sup>. He said that as far as our traffic impact study, do we need to pick one of those or can we look at both of them, would that impact the traffic study that much. Haugen responded that it wouldn't likely impact them too much. He pointed out that the 32<sup>nd</sup> and Belmont intersection would be studied under either alignment. He added that, again, under all of the additional river crossings, whether it is Elks, 17<sup>th</sup>, 32<sup>nd</sup>, or 47<sup>th</sup>, there is still going to be a pull from traffic on Minnesota/4th, but at 32<sup>nd</sup> going north more of the cars are coming from the north to get to the bridge to cross, south of 32<sup>nd</sup> more of the cars are going back and forth, so this intersection will be studied, so the question is will it be a four-way intersection or will it remain a three-way intersection. He added that we have two "T" intersections that we are studying for the short-term and then we need to know what the long-term build-out will be for East Grand Forks out there. He commented that at 47<sup>th</sup> we are tying into a section line again, and the hydraulic study makes no cost estimate of what it would be to make that roadway higher and drier, or at what level we want it to be high and dry. He pointed out that, as you can see on the aerial photo of the area, there are at least a couple of low spots, so if we are doing a traffic impact, if we do 47<sup>th</sup>, those would be additional things that we would have to ask if the Board wants to have answers as to what it would take to make that roadway dry during a flood event.

Powers commented that he heard more than once that a bridge isn't much good if it is under water. Rost said that that is what they said at the meeting. Powers responded that it is a good point, although it is a lot more money. Rost agreed, adding that the higher you go the more it costs. Strandell said, though, that the Kennedy has never been underwater, if you can build something to that level it would make sense, but if you try to go to what they call a high and dry level it will cost, and he thinks that is kind of goofy because you don't have use of a lower bridge



PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 19, 2020

for maybe one week every ten years, so why have the expense, we could use that extra money for a lot of other things.

Powers asked how much thought has gone into what Fargo is doing with their diversion project, is that going to impact the water coming towards us. Vetter responded that it will. Rost stated that there are a lot of unknowns out there right now. Vetter asked if Mr. Haugen could pull up the cost analysis again for Mr. Strandell, that compared the low, medium and high costs and commented that it shows that the medium and high costs are pretty close.

Powers asked to go back to the 32nd alignment slide and said that if we were to move the touchdown on the East Grand Forks side further south, then go east, where would it touchdown. Haugen pointed out that if we were to make a connection to the intersection, from our traffic modeling point of view at the macro level the majority of traffic that would be crossing this bridge would be coming from the north area, there would be a good portion of traffic making this movement. Powers asked where Hartsville is on that. Vetter responded that there may be some coming from Hartsville, especially if they are dropping kids off at school and then going over to Grand Forks to work. Haugen said that you have to remember that what is labeled 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue on the East Grand Forks side, the cul-de-sac doesn't intersect with Bygland, so 13<sup>th</sup> or Greenway Boulevard becomes the connection. Vetter said that if they are coming from either school they would be on 13<sup>th</sup>, and whether they would take Hartsville down or go all the way through over to Rhinehart we don't know.

DeMers asked if there was an estimate of what, if you do put it on the more southern point, and grab traffic from Highway 2, so you have a breakdown of what type of traffic it is, is it commuter, is it trucks, is it freight versus local. Haugen responded that it would be mostly traffic that is 95% or more non-freight or non-truck volume. He added that that gives you some sense of what type of traffic it is; more doing your commute to work, shopping, school kind of trips. He said that they can tell you that about 60% goes north and 40% comes over here, and we are obviously using GPS based, basically cell phone data, to get that information, but there is another source of information through MnDOT that we can get access to that might tell us a little more detail to allow us to pinpoint further out or more specific areas in either State as to where they are coming and going to. He commented that there is some additional information that can be gleaned from that.

Vetter asked if Mr. Haugen was in the process of writing the RFP for the impact study. Haugen responded that there was a draft RFP that was presented to this body a year ago that included the hydraulics but we were just looking at one alignment, beyond that he hasn't drafted anything. Vetter said that, just to move this along; he doesn't know that we are getting a lot of discussion here, to put it into everyone's mind that we need to look at this and decide whether we want to do three, two, or one alignment then we can put it on the agenda for another meeting and have further discussion on it. Haugen commented that we did, in the work program; initially we had funds set aside to look at one alignment, we did add to the budget the possibility of doing additional alignments.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 19, 2020

Powers asked what the three alignments are again. Vetter responded that they would be Elks, 32<sup>nd</sup>, and 47<sup>th</sup>. Strandell asked if there is a diagram that shows where Elks comes out next to Rhinehart and Greenway Boulevard. Haugen then referred to slides illustrating where the three alignments are located on both sides of the river and went over them briefly, and also pointed out where, if you decide to include 17<sup>th</sup>, it is located as well.

Powers stated that he feels we should eliminate 47<sup>th</sup>. He said that the hydraulics are against this and it is too far south and it isn't a benefit, so we should just concentrate on the other two locations and save some money and time.

Vetter reiterated that, again, we should keep this in our minds and bring it back to a future meeting so if we have any questions we can bring them up at that time.

Information only.

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

Haugen reported that included in the packet was an update on the NDDOT Statewide Long Range Transportation Plan. He said that the big thing is he believes that later this week or next week North Dakota is going to be soliciting public feedback on some scenarios that they are presenting on their website: [www.transportationconnection.org](http://www.transportationconnection.org). He stated that this body is invited whether you live on the North Dakota or the Minnesota side to take part in the scenarios.

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
- b. Downtown Transportation Study Virtual Open House

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

Haugen stated that the only thing we haven't discussed on this is the Downtown Transportation Study. He said that on Monday our Virtual Public Open House closed for comments, and we had a lot of people click on the site but we didn't receive a lot of comments or feedback from them visiting the site. He added that we had a lot of people look at the information but didn't receive many comments and the consultant is still assembling all of that so we don't have final tallies but we should have that next month.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 19, 2020

Information only.

- c. Approval Of Bill/Check List For 7/11/20 To 8/14/20 Period

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY ROST, TO APPROVE THE BILL/CHECK LIST FOR THE 7/11/20 to 8/14/20 PERIOD.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY ROST, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO ADJOURN THE AUGUST 19<sup>TH</sup>, 2020, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:54 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully Submitted,  
Peggy McNelis, Office Manager

**Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO**  
**Transaction List by Vendor**  
 July 11 through August 14, 2020

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
<b>AFLAC.</b>							
Liability Check	07/24/2020	AFLAC	501	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-517.90
Liability Check	08/10/2020	6952	VOID: 501	104 · Checking	X	213 · Aflac	0.00
<b>Alerus Financial</b>							
Liability Check	07/24/2020	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-2,538.54
Liability Check	08/07/2020	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,538.52
<b>Business Essentials</b>							
Bill	07/31/2020	Inv. #...	Office Supplie...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-32.00
Bill Pmt -Check	07/31/2020	6950	Office Supplie...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-32.00
<b>CitiBusiness Card</b>							
Bill	07/31/2020	Acct. ...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-293.38
Bill Pmt -Check	07/31/2020	6951	Charges For ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-293.38
<b>East Grand Forks Water and Light</b>							
Bill	07/28/2020	7/23/20	2020 2nd Qu...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-352.15
Bill Pmt -Check	07/28/2020	6949	2020 2nd Qu...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-352.15
<b>Fidelity Security Life.</b>							
Liability Check	07/24/2020	6945	50790-1043	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-8.44
<b>Kadmas, Lee &amp; Jackson, Inc.</b>							
Bill	07/13/2020	Inv. #...	For Work On ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		550 · Corridor ...	-11,281.49
Bill Pmt -Check	07/13/2020	6942	For Work On ...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-11,281.49
<b>KLJ Engineering, LLC</b>							
Bill	08/12/2020	Inv. #...	Work On Dow...	206 · Accounts Pay...		550 · Corridor ...	-6,242.26
Bill Pmt -Check	08/12/2020	6953	Work On Dow...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-6,242.26
<b>Liberty Business Systems, Inc.</b>							
Bill	07/17/2020	Inv. #...	Contract Bas...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-162.66
Bill Pmt -Check	07/17/2020	6944	Contract Bas...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-162.66
<b>LSNB as Trustee for PEHP</b>							
Liability Check	07/24/2020	NWR...		104 · Checking	X	216 · Post-Hea...	-123.76
<b>Madison Nat'l Life</b>							
Liability Check	07/24/2020	6946		104 · Checking		215 · Disability...	-66.56
<b>Mike's</b>							
Bill	07/15/2020		MPO Exec Bo...	206 · Accounts Pay...		711 · Miscellan...	-77.00
Bill Pmt -Check	07/15/2020	6943	MPO Exec Bo...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-77.00
<b>Minnesota Department of Revenue</b>							
Liability Check	07/24/2020	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-189.00
Liability Check	08/07/2020	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-189.00
<b>Minnesota Life Insurance Company</b>							
Liability Check	07/24/2020	6947		104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-111.72
<b>Nationwide Retirement Solutions</b>							
Liability Check	07/24/2020	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-433.07
Liability Check	08/07/2020	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-433.07
<b>NDPERS</b>							
Liability Check	07/16/2020	NDPE...		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,532.36
Liability Check	07/24/2020	NDPE...	D88	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-3,024.08
Liability Check	08/10/2020	NDPE...	VOID:	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	0.00
Liability Check	08/10/2020	NDPE...		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,532.36
<b>QuickBooks Payroll Service</b>							
Liability Check	07/23/2020		Created by P...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-6,372.65
Liability Check	08/06/2020		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-6,372.66
<b>Standard Insurance Company</b>							
Liability Check	07/24/2020	6948		104 · Checking		217 · Dental P...	-118.88
<b>The Exponent</b>							
Bill	08/07/2020	Inv. #...	Public Notice ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		550 · Corridor ...	-147.00
Bill Pmt -Check	08/07/2020	6952	Public Notice ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-147.00