

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, October 21st, 2020, - 12:00 Noon
Zoom Meeting**

ALL TO ORDER

Clarence Vetter, Chairman, called the October 21, 2020, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:04 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

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

Absent was: Bob Rost.

Guest(s) present were: Stewart Milakovic and Baird Bream, NDDOT Transportation Connection Project Team.

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 AUGUST 19TH, 2020, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 19TH, 2020, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF NDDOT TRANSPORTATION CONNECTIONS

Haugen reported that we have NDDOT staff and consultant who will make a short presentation. He said that, included in the packet was the full presentation that they provided to the Technical Advisory Committee last week.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 21, 2020

Baird Bream, Consultant, referred to a power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and stated that they just want to give a brief update on what they have been up to and what they have coming up for Transportation Connection.

Presentation continued.

Bream stated that October has been a very active month, they have done a lot of partner and public outreach, getting rolling on some introductory meetings with some of the Tribal Authorities, they are scheduling follow-up meetings with them to make sure we get their input and perspective on Transportation Connection.

Bream said that they also launched two surveys; a Priority Survey that can be accessed at https://form.jotform.com/NDDOT_LRTP/priorities, and a Bike/Ped Survey in partnership with North Dakota Active Transportation Alliance. He explained that the Priority Survey is asking for people to provide input on the issues and opportunities they see for North Dakota's Transportation system, both now and in the future; and the Bike/Ped Survey asks for input on need and priorities specifically as it relates to bike and ped issues.

Bream commented that the main thrust of their work in October has been the funding and performance tool that they are in the process of launching. He explained that it is a tool that is designed to both educate the public on how transportation funding in North Dakota works, and to provide a connection between performance and investment in certain areas. He added that it is also an opportunity for the public to experiment with that tool and see what it is like to set the budget for the North Dakota DOT, and we also get some feedback from the public on willingness to pay for transportation benefits.

Bream continued, stating that he would also like to comment on their Engagement Reach. He said that they have seen steady continuing engagement across their different platforms; such as the online survey responses they've seen has the most significant increase, and a lot of that, as he mentioned is due to a high level engagement with the bike/ped survey where they have had nearly 400 responses. He added that these numbers reflect the engagement through the end of September when they had about 150 responses on that survey and they've added more than an additional 250, but they have had additional engagement on their Priority Survey as well, and their other tools, so people are still reaching that content.

Bream said that he would like to quickly touch base on some of the feedback they are getting on that Priority Survey, because they feel it sets them up well for what is to come. He stated that they asked people to identify their top three issues, and they see a good level of response on the fundamentals of transportation; fixing what we have and being safe, which indicates that people know how they want to use their transportation system, they want to be able to rely on it and get where the need to go; but we also see a high level of engagement around the paying for transportation, which to them suggests an awareness of the issues of transportation funding, that is people are already thinking of, and they are hoping that this represents fertile ground for the funding and performance tool they can engage with and plant seeds for the public.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 21, 2020

Bream stated that he would like to walk through the funding and performance tool and show some of the content to you. He pointed out that the slide of the Story Board provides an overview of the different content, and what people are supposed to kind of take away from each component of the funding and performance tool. He added, however, that the Story Board itself does not appear within the actual tool, they are simply lead through a series of potentially pages with graphics and text, but essentially they try to achieve three different things: 1) To introduce how transportation is funded, and how much people contribute out of their own pocket for transportation in North Dakota; 2) Highlight some of the funding challenges and explain why North Dakota is needing to reassess how it funds its transportation network and to see if people are willing to pay additional funds based on making them learn about those funding issues; and 3) Ask people to set priorities and demonstrate their willingness to invest in the transportation network in seven different investment areas. He reiterated that they give them the opportunity to essentially experiment and build a budget for NDDOT that links performance and investment, and then asks them to consider how much more they would be willing to pay if there are setting a level of performance that goes above and beyond what the current level of investment can achieve for North Dakota. He stated that it closes out by giving people more resources on where they can find additional information.

Bream reported that the next slide shows an overview of how transportation is funded in North Dakota, illustrating the federal and state revenue streams associated with fuel taxes and license and registration fees. He added that it shows that while these revenues are distributed to different levels of government at both the federal and state sources, the majority of revenues from both sources go to the State. He said that they explain to the public that this is because, while the State DOT is only responsible for a relatively small percentage of roadway, these roadways receive the highest volumes of traffic and travel demand; so essentially resources are going towards where demand is the greatest.

Bream stated that they also introduce the different services the NDDOT provides to help people understand that the NDDOT isn't just roads and bridges, it is also all these other services related to travel from safety to registration to alternative forms of transportation; which all adds up to about \$694.2 million in 2020.

Bream commented that the next slide is one they are pretty excited about because it helps contextualize the \$694.2 million in terms of each person's contribution to it. He went over how the Gas Tax Calculator works.

Bream stated that the next slide highlights the funding challenges that North Dakota is facing, where they really try to explain to the audience the fundamental challenge of transportation funding. He added that this isn't unique to North Dakota by any means, because fuel taxes are levied on a per gallon basis so that they don't track with gas prices, and furthermore the revenue stream is facing the challenge of essentially losing its value because fuel efficiency is improving, so as people get more fuel efficient cars, they buy less gas to travel the same amount of distance or time, but the amount of revenue that is generated decreases, so demand is essentially remaining constant or even growing in a State like North Dakota which is having more economic activity and more population growth, but the revenue stream isn't keeping track with that so as a

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 21, 2020

result we start to see that gap between projected funding based on current scenarios, and projected need. He stated that this is why they are taking this opportunity to check with the audience to see if they support additional transportation funding at this point, hopefully the idea is that they communicated this funding gap sufficiently so that they are starting to build support for it.

Bream commented that the next slide is really where the rubber hit the road, in terms of what they are trying to explain to the public, and trying to help them understand the issues. He stated that they identify the seven different investment areas for NDDOT for the different parts of the system and services that the NDDOT maintains or manages and ask them to set a performance expectation based on what they want out of the system. He said that at each indicator that you see in these blue bars, going from left to right with left being the lower performance level and the right being the higher performance level, these green text boxes will adjust to reflect the outcome associated with that expected performance level; and as you can see they try to contextualize this for the user, in terms of the user experience, so that how long I wait at the DMV shows an investment outcome that suggests the DMV could have additional services if investment were increased and that would have a material impact on the user because their wait time would decrease and similarly how smooth our roads and bridges are represents the Road and Bridge Maintenance Program that NDDOT maintains. He explained that the right hand bars, that are red and blue, represent essentially, the blue bar maximum being filled by the red bar investment level at each performance value that the user selects; so for example, how safe the system is set for the highest value in the performance level, which means the investment level is at the maximum of \$63 million. He added that these maximums are set on various models that NDDOT maintains internally for essentially setting their own investments and understanding their performance over time, so this is essentially representative of the NDDOTs actual system, and people can understand what that system performance means for them and how much it costs. He pointed out that the values total up at the bottom to represent an investment total that then compared in that middle box to the total current spending. He went over how it works briefly.

Bream stated that the next slide allows the audience the opportunity to try to match the additional monthly contribution based on existing revenue streams, the change in State Fuel Taxes and the change in Registration Fees, so they can set those values themselves and they will get a calculation of the total contribution that those new revenue values would represent above and beyond what they currently pay, and then that additional monthly contribution is calculated based on an average to a total contribution or a total revenue increase for the NDDOT, so it is an opportunity for the audience to understand that if they set a higher performance level, they might have to increase their revenue much more significantly than they were expecting; someone might think that an additional nickel in State Fuel Tax is going to yield an additional \$10.66 but now they see that isn't the case, and so they are able to toggle back and forth between the two tabs to try to balance out these numbers and find what works best for them.

Bream said that at the conclusion of that exercise they then ask the user to essentially make a commitment to increasing, decreasing or maintaining funding levels in each of the investment areas they have walked through so they have an opportunity to signal to them where their priorities lie and where they want to see investment change. He added that based on those

selections they also ask them to indicate whether they want an increase or decrease in the current revenue stream, the fuel taxes and the monthly registration fees; the idea is, again, that now that they have seen what they get out of the transportation system at different levels of investment, they can signal to them their willingness to pay more or less in order to achieve the transportation system that they want.

Bream commented that the next steps are; they are currently finalizing the testing of the Funding and Performance Tool with their NDDOT Project Advisory Team and they are looking to roll the tool out to the public later this week or early next week. He said that as soon as they do that they will be conducting an extensive social media blitz to promote the funding tool along with their other components across their different platforms to really try to drive engagement and attention on these issues and then they will use that information to develop the actual framework for Transportation Connection.

Grasser said that he has a comment; the category you have DMV, he is assuming that includes both the driver's license component and the vehicle registration component. Bream responded that it is representative of the spending in both those categories. He explained that for the sake of simplicity, in terms of helping the viewer understand what this investment area represents and what it means to them, they focus more extensively on the DMV. He added that they had to simplify the investment areas a little bit in order to make the overall tool more legible. Grasser said that he struggles with that a little bit, just as a user, he hasn't tried to register a vehicle lately, but he knows a couple of people that have, and the last time he did a license upgrade, the fact that we can schedule those and whatnot makes that a pretty workable system, he thinks six minutes seems like a pretty good representative number, but talking to people that have tried to go through a vehicle registration effort, they are there for 45-minutes or an hour trying to do vehicle registration and as a user he would be willing to spend a little more money trying to improve the vehicle registration component, but as a user of this particular tool that we are using you can't really differentiate those two things. Bream responded that that is a good point, and they can revise some of the language to emphasis that this would capture the registration process as well. Grasser stated that they may want to have a note, if you have the data, what the wait times are for the vehicle registration program if you have that data. Bream agreed, and thanked him for the comment, adding that they will review that and see if they have that data.

Information only.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FUTURE BRIDGE TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY

Haugen reported that as you know, the work program does have us doing this activity; we last discussed it a couple of months ago in trying to implement the work program, just seeing where the MPO Board is at with implementing this study.

Haugen stated that included in the packet were a few things he gathered together from the various materials; the first thing would be, just based on our regional travel demand model, if we have no additional river crossing, we do have a couple of intersections that we do need to address

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 21, 2020

with additional traffic control and those are located at Belmont and 4th Avenue and Belmont and 32nd Avenue.

Haugen commented that with a bridge we can resolve some of the issues at Minnesota/4th and Belmont and 4th Avenue; if we implement a bridge at any location except for the Merrifield location. He added that with Belmont and 32nd Avenue, with a bridge the worst traffic we would have with any of the bridges would be a bridge at 32nd Avenue, and we are already saying that without a bridge we should convert to a traffic signal, and with a bridge that traffic signal would be sufficient for the bridge traffic in addition to the regular traffic that is there; He said that he is just trying to point out that not having a bridge there are some things we need to address in the future, and with a bridge, depending on where it is at we may have additional investments or we may have the same investments.

Haugen stated that as part of our travel demand modeling we do what is called a Select Link Analysis, and in this case he is showing the Elks Drive Bridge in our model, and basically we select the link that represents the bridge and ask the model to keep track of where the vehicle changes are based on the 2045 model without a bridge; in this case the red lines represent where there will be an increase in traffic across that roadway and the green line indicates where there will be a decrease in traffic, so again the travel demand model can give us some idea of the origin/destination from the vehicles crossing the bridge in this case, and we have that for each of the river crossings that we have done an analysis on.

Haugen commented that the reason he is showing the Elks Drive location is just to iterate that if he were to show 17th Avenue, it would just be a red line straight across, just as if he showed 32nd Avenue, it would be a straight line across, so by showing Elks he is giving you information that the vehicle disperses twice as it migrates to or from the western part of the metro-area.

Haugen referred to the selection criteria slide and explained that this is how they internally ranked the red river bridge crossing options based on these criteria. He said that it gives you some sense of how they ranked comparing one to the other, in the cardinal order 1-4, and then some notes as to what was the defining factor.

Haugen commented that from the Bridge Hydraulics study, there was the introduction of this southern route that came into play, and as the discussion was during the presentation of this information, he isn't showing the 47th Avenue area, however there was discussion that we should eliminate 47th and one of the primary reasons is because we introduce having to do flood mitigation for properties, particularly on the Minnesota side, that are outside the flood protection system, and with this southern 32nd alignment we introduce that same issue.

Haugen stated that, just as we are discussing 47th Avenue, and perhaps not pursuing 47th further, with one of those reasons being the additional flood mitigation and all that entails, this southern route, outside the flood protection system, also would introduce that flood mitigation, outside of the flood protection system, and so if we focus on however this alignment ties within the flood protection system, whether it is on top of the dike, or elsewhere, we are really looking at, then, analyzing a "T" intersection, and it being located here versus being located there isn't going to

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 21, 2020

make a great deal of difference in the intersection analysis, so perhaps that would allow us not to have to identify an exact alignment from the traffic input point of view. He added that knowing that any of these corridors, and any of the costs and other things that we have identified, are all subject to further detail project development, and there are numerous amounts of different variations in bridge design concepts, etc, that would affect the cost and alignment, but this would give us some sense of base areas that we know where the landings will likely be on the either side.

Haugen said that when looking at cost comparison, he added the benefits; again, so far the benefits that we derived during the Metropolitan Transportation Plan process aren't changing too much based on low, medium, high, but because the difference between closure on an annual basis is only a few days, and it doesn't have a significant impact to the benefit we are calculating, the cost that he shows are the ones that came from the hydraulic analysis study, which are in a little finer detail than what the MTP was, so even though one study is hydraulics and the other is from the MTP, the numbers on the benefit side aren't changing much so you can see that the benefit/cost ratio is ultimately what he is trying to point out here; with the Elks Drive outside of the high one, with the variations in bridge design, etc., we could get probably close to a benefit cost of 1, with 32nd, with the benefits being substantially higher than any of the other river crossing locations, we do have a better than 1 benefit cost, and he highlighted the \$8 million mitigation cost because that might be reduced depending on not doing that southern route and that outside of the flood protection mitigation.

Haugen commented that we have had discussion on 17th Avenue, and when you look at the cost in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, all of the costs that they are showing on the slide are a little bit higher than what they were doing for the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, so he is just pointing out that if there was an inclusion of 17th Avenue, it would be done as part of supplement to the hydraulic study, so the cost would likely be slightly higher, if we are looking for a medium height; the benefit, again, is that it isn't changing much and we are getting further away from a benefit/cost ratio of 1 or greater. He added that most of the funding sources likely to be pursued from a federal perspective, we would be looking at benefit/costs, while technically and legally a benefit/cost of 1 or greater is not actually part of the criteria, in a competitive nature, the greater the benefit/cost ratio is so it is to our advantage to try to present something that has more benefits than cost in the analysis.

Haugen stated that you saw a similar scope of work draft roughly a year ago when we were looking at just the 32nd Avenue corridor; he has included now looking at not just 32nd but also incorporating potentially the Elks Drive area as well in the analysis. He said that for the most part, this is our standard corridor scope of work that we have been using in the last several studies that we've done so there hasn't been much change to the things that we look at. He pointed out that the study map identifies much of the key intersections that we would be looking at to get a better idea of the geometrics that would be necessary, the traffic control that would be necessary at the various locations throughout the metro area. He said that he does have a study area box; there are a couple of intersections outside of that box that would likely need to be looked at but there isn't much land use socio-economic environmental out in this area to be overly concerned with whereas most of those items would be within the box shown on the map.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 21, 2020

Haugen commented that the one thing that this draft didn't really flesh out much is the public involvement process, and we would be looking to have more guidance from the board and others as to if we are looking at two corridors, how to engage the proper interest groups, concerned citizens, public officials, etc., that would cover the corridors of concern in this. He stated that the Chair asked that he put this information together and present it to this body today, and to open it up for discussion as to where the MPO is at when it looks at its work program and this work activity.

Vetter said that there are two questions that he has: 1) are we comfortable looking at just the Elks Drive and the 32nd Avenue crossings as possible locations; and 2) what kind of public input would we like this analysis to partake in.

Vein stated that the question he would ask is what other, besides the Elks Avenue and 32nd Avenue locations, would we possibly consider. Vetter responded that the others that we looked at were 47 Avenue, which was in the hydraulic study but doesn't seem to meet the criteria so we are looking at taking that one out, and then there was some talk about whether we wanted to add the 17th Avenue location to this analysis. Vein stated that for him, in the surface, he isn't sure we would add 17th Avenue at this late time, although he knows that that request was made by at one of the City Council members, the president of the council had talked about that location. He asked if Mr. Haugen could give an update on why 17th Avenue would be added, and why it wasn't in there to begin with. Haugen responded that he thinks 17th would be added for a couple of reasons; 1) to obtain a similar cost estimate as the other alternatives. He added that as you compare these costs to what is in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, particularly when you get to the high levels, the dike top to dike top alternative, there is a pretty significant difference in the cost range, so that would be one reason, 2) the second reason would be the same reason why we did the hydraulic analysis in the first place and that was to see if any of these locations could be allowed within the flood protection system or in connection to the flood protection system, and the basic answer is all three of these locations could be allowed, it is just a matter of mitigation, therefore you would have to reasonably conclude that 17th Avenue would be allowed, without knowing exactly what the mitigation costs are, however there is still a wide variability of what the difference between what the cost could be at the detailed level that it is here but the benefits are still relatively low compared to the cost.

Grasser said that this is more of a political question than it is maybe a cost/benefit and whatnot, and he is wondering, once the consultant has this model up and running how much additional effort would it be to just do this traffic impact, which is essentially what we are talking about now, how much more would it cost to have them add 17th into the analysis, as they are going to have a model up and running anyway. Haugen responded that that is correct, but the model, with the way the RFP is currently drafted, they are essentially establishing two different models; one would clearly be 32nd Avenue, and the other would be Elks, so in order, as we are finding out, there is a lot of work that needs to be done to model and micro-simulate the corridors so if they add 17th, and now we've introduced a third model, and while they do have two models already in play they have to go in and detail out that third corridor so there is some economy of scales, but there is also a loss because the corridor is different than what the other two corridors are, in some regard. He added that what could be done would be to just take a planning level conceptual, if

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 21, 2020

your traffic volumes are similar to 32nd Avenue, as they might be on 17th, and you are now analyzing the traffic control at the three key intersections, you could do a lesser degree of analysis; you could give a planning level conceptualize that you might have to invest the same type of geometry, etc, improvements along the corridor. He said that the difference is that you get on the Minnesota side and how exactly that alignment in the current Metropolitan Transportation Plan analysis, 17th curves down to enter East Grand Forks. He explained that there is a kind of township road that exists here, and there are homes that have driveways connecting to a public road, and there is also a blockage of the roadway that doesn't allow the traffic off the roadway to utilize and access the other roadway, so we get a little bit of an interesting potential on how exactly it lands in East Grand Forks, and how we would model that.

Vein stated that he is trying to look at how that would lay out; would the one on 17th, it looks like it would impact the golf course, would it not, wouldn't that be 4F land or is that still being used as the descriptive for impacts to recreation. Haugen responded that it is, but added that if you will recall, during the development of the reuse of the floodway and the greenway we did identify in that redevelopment plan corridor preservation for a bridge either at 17th, Elks, or 32nd, so there is already some allowance for it just because we did it as part of the redevelopment it relaxes some of the 4F issues. He said, though, that there would likely have to be some relocations and other things identified with the golf course even though it is in the official greenway plan document. He stated that the other two locations would have almost similar protection as 17th; again, both Elks and 32nd are included as bridge preservation corridors within the greenway plan that was developed as part of the flood protection process; the only difference is that 32nd, the corridor is loosely identified as just a straight east/west line whereas we are now discussing more of a northwest/northeast alignment so how that impacts that he isn't sure.

Vein asked if greenway is the same type of 4F land as the golf course is. Haugen responded that part of the golf course, in the redevelopment of the greenway, the golf course was part of the redevelopment of the greenway and the dike system coming through, so there is some of the land outside of the flood protection that is part of the golf course, and so it might have a slightly different stance since it is now technically outside of the flood protection system, but that is a nuance that we won't know until we get knee deep into it.

Grasser asked what year of traffic counts are we using when modeling these corridor analyses. Haugen responded that our base year in our Travel Demand Model is 2015, and our two forecasted years are 2030 and 2045. Grasser asked how it worked out last time we bought some of that data, electronic data, on origin destination. He said that he is just wondering if there is any value in doing some updating. He added, however, that right now would be a bad time as we are in the middle of the COVID thing, but he is just wondering about the traffic patterns; our whole retail shopping and things like that have changed pretty substantially, even before COVID hit. Haugen responded that the last time we had to purchase origin destination, since then we have access to a program via MnDOT, it is called Street Lite, and Street Lite is capturing that data on a continuous basis, and we have the ability to access, then, that origin destination. He commented that in the Downtown Transportation Study we utilized the Street Lite data to give us information on the type of traffic flowing through the downtown or flowing into or out of the downtown, so we have access to the data. He stated that he believes the scope of work that he

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 21, 2020

had laid out would utilize that Street Lite information, just as we did in the Downtown Transportation Study to give us a better idea of origin destination. Grasser said that that sounds good; he likes to see it updated.

Grasser asked if this would be going back to the Technical Advisory Committee. Haugen responded that he isn't sure, if that is what the Board wishes it to do or not; it has been sitting at the Board level for the last several months, so it is at the direction of the Board. Vein commented that one of the advantages of having it go back to the Technical Advisory Committee would be to get a non-politicized technical recommendation. He said that it would be something that he would be interested to hear as we would move it forward. Grasser stated that he would agree. Haugen said that he wouldn't dispute that, but he would point out that the last time it went through the Technical Advisory Committee it provided some kind of kicking the can to the Executive Policy Board. Vein said that he still thinks it would be worth the request to see where they are at, if they do that he guesses they do it, but he is still thinking that that is their role, to give the Executive Policy Board technical advice.

Strandell commented that he would like to know how we are going to address the Rhinehart Drive issue. He said that he thinks that any type of connection that is south of 13th in East Grand Forks is a real problem; the road is extremely narrow, there is not right of way there, and you would have all kinds of problems getting too close to homes, so in that way he would prefer that some study be given to 17th, because that connection could go to the north of that problem area on Rhinehart Drive, so he would support adding 17th to the study.

Vetter stated that we will send it back to the Technical Advisory Committee and ask them to look at whether or not we should add 17th. He said that the other piece we were looking at was the public input, so we have any insight or suggestions on gathering public input. Vetter said that if we don't have any suggestions we can send it back to the Technical Advisory Committee and ask them to look at those two issues; whether we should add 17th to this study, and what kind of public input they would suggest we add also. Vein commented that he thinks they were highly critical of us last time that we didn't have enough public input, even though we had many, many meetings; so it would seem to be appropriate that we would also see what we could do additionally to make sure that nobody says that this was done in a vacuum. Grasser added that this probably isn't the appropriate study but at some point you almost need to send some mailings to people on these corridors, but he doesn't think we do that on this particular study because he doesn't think that is where we are going exactly with it, but he thinks getting maybe the ward representatives involved, and we certainly want to get the school involved, and maybe get some neighborhood representation at least, citizen representation in the process. He said that it might mean reaching out a little more than what we have. Vetter asked if this gives Mr. Haugen enough direction to take it back to the Technical Advisory Committee. Haugen responded that it does, but the only question would be regarding 17th, would the request be to just look at the traffic impacts or would it also include trying to capture anything from at least a cost component without knowing mitigation costs, how much of a hydraulic type of review does the 17th location need to have. He stated that he thinks that with the work shown here, we could look at a couple of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan layouts of 17th and come up with perhaps up to and outside of mitigation costs for 17th, but just how far so you want 17th to be studied, and if

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 21, 2020

it is hydraulic and mitigation than that is outside the MPO, it would be something that would be possible to add as an addendum, paid 100% with local funds, to the study if that is what is desired, or it could be a separate study as well. Vetter stated that for him personally he is looking to see what the Technical Advisory Committee thinks, whether we should even add 17th, whether it is a benefit to look at it or not. He said that he doesn't know that we want to expand; if we add 17th his personal opinion is if this is a traffic study, he doesn't know that we want to get into adding hydraulics into this study, or any of the other information, he thinks we just stick with the traffic flow patterns. He stated that if we add 17th he thinks we can extrapolate out that it is going to be pretty close to the Elks comparison, and the cost/benefits aren't going to be there to support that site anyway, but he still would like the Technical Advisory Committee to look at it and get their feedback on if we should add it or not.

Vetter stated that if there isn't any other discussion we will just send this back to the Technical Advisory Committee with a request that they look at those two areas; whether we should add 17th and what kind of public input we could add in, and bring it back to the Board next month for further discussion. Consensus was to send it back to the Technical Advisory Committee for their input.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN RFP

Haugen reported that we have been working with the appropriate officials and subcommittees on the Grand Forks side to come up with the scope of work for the updating of the City of Grand Forks Land Use Plan.

Haugen referred to the packet and pointed out that the full RFP is included. He stated that it has been approved by the Land Use Subcommittee, and with noted changes shown in color, there have been some changes asked for by the Land Use Subcommittee and also the Technical Advisory Committee.

Haugen commented that most of this is our standard RFP requirements. He said that the due date, assuming approval today, we would get it advertised through the North Dakota Qualifications Based Website tomorrow, so November 30th is when the proposal would be due to the MPO and then sometime during the week of December 7th through the 11th, there would be interviews done virtually, then selection of a consultant and negotiated scope of work presented to the MPO Board at their December meeting.

Haugen stated that when we look at the scope of work what is highlighted in yellow is language that the City's Land Use Subcommittee wanted included that the public involvement is based on the MPO's and City's processes.

Haugen said that, as you note here in red, there are a couple of things that are minor in the scope of work that are not eligible for federal funding assistance, and those would then be 100% City funded, as identified.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 21, 2020

Haugen stated that one of the big activities that this land use plan will be working with the City on is how to really look at these two mile to four mile boundaries; in past plans we have always gone the full four miles but the actual City jurisdiction has always remained at 2 miles, so this study will be helping us understand where it is appropriate to perhaps trim back some of the planning area to an appropriate size, and then perhaps expand it due to the City infrastructure that is here, so that is one the major tasks.

Haugen commented that the tier system; the City of Grand Forks historically uses a tier system to guide growth, tier one is the darker area and is where growth is desired to occur, either inside the City or compact development contiguous to the City. He stated that the consultant will be reviewing those tiers. He added that the City has had various initiatives, they start out strong, but then they seem to wane, so the consultant will be helping to see if there is a way to make those more sustainable.

Haugen stated that the paragraphs shown in blue; the Technical Advisory Committee wanted clearer verbiage for looking at how to incorporate some of the initiatives that we were asked to do; because of the federal connections and red tape we have to look at sustainability, livability and the ladders of opportunity, so the language in blue was written and reviewed by City Staff to sort of provide clarity that there are some opportunities for transportation choices, yet there are still some challenges to those opportunities, so as we look at land use and growth we need to also look at some of those challenges to see how they can be overcome.

Haugen commented that what is highlighted in orange are the NDDOT and Federal Highway additions, the wanted to make sure that we are always identifying in a deliverable the connection back to transportation.

Haugen said that one of the things they aren't focusing too much on in this Land Use Plan as we have in the past several is concept designs, so you will see that stricken out. He stated that the only other substantial change is that we typically only ask for 10 days prior to look at materials being released to the public, but the City wanted 14 days and that is now included in the RFP.

Haugen stated that both staff and the Technical Advisory Committee are recommending of the RFP and allow it to be released.

MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO APPROVE THE GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN UPDATE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS, AS PRESENTED.

Grasser said that to him there would be some benefit if in the staff report we actually have the Technical Advisory Committee motion included for clarity as to what they approved. He added that he is just kind of following along with the process they use in the City; by the time it goes to the City Council they see what the Committee of the Whole recommendation was, so he is just wondering if we can add that into these reports as well. Haugen responded that that can be done.

Voting Aye: *Vetter, Mock, Strandell, Vein, DeMers, Powers, and Grasser.*
Voting Nay: *None.*
Abstain: *None.*
Absent: *Rost.*

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF T.I.P. AMENDMENT FOR TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Haugen reported that staff has been working with the local Transit Operators, State and Federal Agencies, and also engaging the Technical Advisory Committee, to determine if there was a way to have some additional funds come in to help offset some of the tightness in our work program; so we have identified the likelihood that if things work out we can utilize some regular 5307 Operating funds that East Grand Forks annually gets, and put those monies towards the development of the Transit Development Plan element of our Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

Haugen said that they have identified \$120,000 in federal funds, and in order to utilize these funds we have to show it in our T.I.P. how they are being used, which is the reason for a T.I.P. amendment. He stated that included in the packet is the actual change; adding in our Project #3 into East Grand Forks, so the Minnesota side of our T.I.P., and it is identifying that the funds will be used to do the Transit Development Plan. He pointed out that, again, the federal funds are \$120,000 and we always have to show at least a minimum match, and in this case it would be \$30,000, so that is a total of \$150,000.

Haugen commented that a public hearing was held at last week's Technical Advisory Committee meeting and they received no public input on the T.I.P. amendment and both the Technical Advisory Committee and staff are recommending approval of the T.I.P. amendment.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VEIN, TO APPROVE THE FY2021 T.I.P. AMENDMENT, AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: *Vetter, Mock, Strandell, Vein, DeMers, Powers, and Grasser.*
Voting Nay: *None.*
Abstain: *None.*
Absent: *Rost.*

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF 2021-2022 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM

Haugen reported that every two years we have to develop a brand new work program that identifies what we will be doing with the federal planning funds that we receive; the one that we need to consider today is the 2021 and 2022 years.

Haugen stated that what he did with the Technical Advisory Committee, that may have been effective, was to just scroll down to the tables at the end of document. He referred to a table and commented that we just approved the amendment for the 5307 funds; \$120,000 is the annual appropriation that we receive from planning funds; the CPG is Consolidated Planning Grant

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 21, 2020

funds, which is roughly \$550,000 a year, that requires local match. He said that with the Land Use Plan and the Bridge Study not being really done in 2020 we will carry over some of the funds from those programs; it is carry over funds, so for 2021 we have just shy of a million dollar budget to work from. He said that, again, this identifies the various funding sources and the match that is necessary for that; with the inclusion of the \$120,000, \$150,000 with the match; we did have additional work activities that we could do, and he did have to send these separately to you, as you will see on the worksheet.

Haugen explained that this table shows 2021 projects, and with the additional infusion of funds we were able to add some items that are new in 2021 that weren't identified previously. He said that he highlighted them in green, and pointed out that we added back in a line item for equipment. He said that we do have some uncertainty as to our Grand Forks office space, in particular, and we also have put off some equipment purchases due to the tightness of our budget, so we identified a line item here to introduce the possibility of upgrading some of our laptops, etc., and then also fitting out any Grand Forks City Hall space.

Haugen commented that with the transit element we are adding that as our major focus on 2021, as far as maintaining and updating our Transportation Plan. He stated that included in green we have worked with the Technical Advisory Committee and City Staff and both City Councils have approved adding this into our Work Program and that it to update the Pavement Management Systems in both Cities. He said that the MPO number shown here are the federal aid eligible cost estimates; both Cities have also authorized to have their local streets updated with their Pavement Management System, so next year you will see an RFP that includes not just the federal aid routes, but all of the streets in Grand Forks and East Grand Forks having the pavement management system updated to reflect the 2021 conditions. He added that the last time we did a major update metro-wide was in 2014.

Haugen said that the other item that was added was; every three years we do an aerial photo update. He said that most years we do a 6-inch pixel resolution, this year the request is to do a 3-inch resolution in the urbanized area of Grand Forks/East Grand Forks, and then just use the 6-inch resolution for the rural areas of our study area.

Haugen stated that those, then, were the items in green that were added primarily due to the infusion of transit funds.

Haugen commented that carry over; in yellow we are doing the traffic count program with A.T.A.C. as new intersections come on board, to get them included in the counting program, and it also allows for funds when there are disruptions to the system, A.T.A.C. is able to go in and assist us in reestablishing connections, etc., and then the Future Bridge Feasibility Study is carried over because it won't start until the end of this year, so we will carry it into the next year.

Haugen said that the Land Use Plans are in blue just because we said, initially, that in 2020 we would initiate the Land Use Plans, and in 2021 we would carry them over and finish them, and that is what we are doing with this work program.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 21, 2020

Haugen reported that in 2022 we lose the \$150,000 of additional funds, so our total work program funding drops down to just over \$800,000. He said that we are still carrying over some funds, primarily with the Transit Development Plan, as we aren't going to finish in 2021, so we will include it in 2022. He stated, though, that our major focus in 2022 is initiating the rest of the Transportation Plan Update to get us to the Year 2050, and that is completing the Bike/Ped, and he is anticipating a consultant will be involved with that study, and then starting our Street/Highway Element, which would be a two year commitment, and this is only showing the first of those two years.

Vetter noted that a couple of members have logged off; Mr. Vein and Mr. DeMers, so we no longer have a quorum, thus he doesn't think we can vote on this now.

Grasser said that he has a quick question or comment; when we ran this, he doesn't know if this affects the documents here or if it is just an FYI when we get into it later on, but we talked about maybe trying to get some LIDAR information when we do the aerial photography. He stated that they understand that that would probably be 100% local, so they would like to see that as an alternate bid so they can see if it is something that they will or won't want to pursue at the time, and he thinks similarly the Pavement Management we may want to add on to the base or something like that. He added that they may or may not be piggybacking on the MPOs process for the local roads, at 100% funding, it kind of depends on them making sure they have compatibility with the consultant as to doing that work with the processes that they internally have in place. Haugen responded that those won't affect this document because we are only showing what is eligible for federal aid, and when we do release the RFP we have to go through the usual Technical Advisory Committee vetting and Executive Policy Board approval of what the RFP is actually looking at in the scope of work and there we would work out whether there is an option for LIDAR and aerial more, how we do the local streets and the pavement.

Vetter asked if we want to just forward this item on to next month for a vote. Haugen responded that if we can get a vote from those members that are present, then we can follow up with those members that had to leave today's meeting due to time constraints, because this is something that we do need to present to our State and Federal partners.

Haugen suggested that, as we have done in the past, it might be best to send out an e-mail vote on this item. Consensus was to do an e-mail vote on this item, the results were as follows:

On Thursday, October 22, 2020, 09:41:11 AM CDT, Peggy McNelis <peggy.mcnelis@theforksmmpo.org> wrote:

Earl:

I contacted everyone and this is the result:

2021-2022 UPWP

Motion to approve by DeMers, seconded by Powers - Voting
Aye: Strandell, Vetter, Powers, Grasser, Mock and DeMers -
Motion carried

MATTER OF 2022-2025 T.I.P. SOLICITATION

Haugen reported that this is that time of year when we start the process of beginning our new T.I.P. cycle. He said that included in the packet is a presentation that identifies all of the different programs on either side of the river, and what the due dates are for projects submittal for those programs.

Haugen referred to the presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request), specifically the summary slide, and just note that on the North Dakota side December 2nd is important, that is when most programs are going to be due to the MPO. He said that on the Minnesota side there are still some variations with the dates, depending on the program, but as one date for sure, January 8th, will be a critical date for any of the high profile street type programs to get their applications in to the MPO.

Haugen commented that on the Minnesota side the City gets the City Subtarget every four years, the current is 2022. He said that if there is any change in the project in the City Subtarget for 2022, that most likely would be processed now as a T.I.P. amendment to the current T.I.P. and that part of the process of adopting the new 2022-2025 T.I.P.

Haugen stated that your staff is well aware of these deadlines, and if you have any particular projects you want to have considered please contact your staff and MPO staff will work with them to make sure the projects are eligible for the particular program they are seeking funding from.

Haugen said that one last thing, on the North Dakota side there are still unannounced solicitation of the Urban Roads and the Regional Roads Program. He stated that earlier this week the Urban Grant Program, or the Main Street Program, was solicited and we are waiting for word from the NDDOT to finalize the Regional Roads and Urban Roads programs, they are still not officially out for solicitation, but hopefully they will be soon.

Information only.

MATTER OF DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Haugen reported that the Steering Committee met a couple of weeks ago, and based on the public input they received during their August virtual meeting process, we have identified the highest ranking alternatives that the Subcommittee is forward for consideration. He said that he will just focus on those high priority projects that are banked of medium priority, and another bank of low priority projects that are being identified through this study, but for essence he just wants to focus on what are the highest priority the Steering Committee wishes to push forward to both City Councils and DOTs. He explained that a lot of them are items that could be done with some current projects that are already programmed or are being solicited for funds currently that could be implemented.

Haugen said that a couple of the bigger ones that he would like to focus on are the Adaptive Signal Control on DeMers Avenue. He explained that North Dakota just replaced DeMers

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 21, 2020

Avenue, as we are all aware, a lot of traffic signals etc. were upgraded. He stated that in Minnesota we currently have programmed the replacement of the two key traffic signals, and it seems like there is general agreement that interconnecting those signal systems will be done as part of that project, however the adaptive signal control component is something that is still being discussed, and we are trying to promote, heavily, with this study why. He said that one of the reasons is that even with the old signals that were placed on the North Dakota side, and the timing plans that were in place, we still had unreliable traffic; we had times when backup was occurring, so even if we get Minnesota to interconnect, we will still have similar issues.

Haugen stated that the Adaptive Signal Control is really changing on the fly, the computer algorithms establish themselves, based on actual traffic flow, and adjust the timing plans and the inner operability of the signals to have them be more reliable. He said that as you can see there is considerable improvement to the way that that is anticipated, if we can get this implemented.

Haugen reported that the other item is the cost, because of the current opportunity that we have, the cost is relatively inexpensive to get this benefit. He said that even though there is an annual maintenance cost that might be substantial, in the whole realm of things, \$28,000 and \$5,000 a year to have more reliable traffic flow conditions on DeMers Avenue is well worth that type of investment.

Haugen commented that the other thing that is in the news on the Minnesota side is pedestrian crossings; and the Steering Committee is identifying that it is a high priority, not just the ones that have been talked about with the local partnership project, but also some other key locations on DeMers Avenue where pedestrian crossing improvements are preferred and are identified as a higher priority by the Steering Committee, and with the solicitation of the Transportation Alternatives Program, or even some of the other federal programs and federal funds currently available to the City, it is something that can be considered easily implementable.

Haugen stated that the 3rd and 4th Street bulb-outs; there are current programs and the likelihood that in the reconstruction of North 3rd Street they will be occurring, there is opportunity with the reconstruction of 4th Street already programmed, to make improvements at 1st Avenue, which was part of the Urban Grant Program, so it could be easily incorporated with those projects.

Haugen commented that as part of the Grand Forks Downtown Action Plan there was this concept of a cycle track on Kittson; our study slightly altered it. He explained that the Downtown Action Plan had it coming through this undeveloped park area and parking lot, but we, as part of the Steering Committee thought it would be better, and more easily readily implementable if we put it on Kittson and not wait for any development concept to come to fruition here, so we could get it implemented independently from the development of the site, and thus make connections to this existing path underneath the DeMers Overpass, and over to the Greenway System.

Haugen said that a New Bridge has been something that has been discussed for many years, and this was also something that the Steering Committee and public input identified as a high priority to get done. He explained that the next step is to have the consultant scoped to make

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 21, 2020

presentations to both City Councils, so we will be trying to set up and schedule those presentations to both City Councils in the next few weeks so that we can finalize this study, perhaps as soon as for your November 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
- b. East Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update

Haugen stated that the only thing that we haven't discussed yet, and Ms. Kouba can probably step in and tell us if there is any additional information than what is written here about the East Grand Forks Land Use Plan.

Kouba commented that they did have their first Steering Committee meeting, at which we were mostly giving them directions as to what we are expecting from them, as well as to be able to get some ideas from them. She explained that we are hoping that we can get their ideas because they are very close to the subjects of the Land Use Plan.

Kouba said that they also went through some of the City information that we need for the Land Use Plan to go forward in the future, specifically things like the growth of the City, etc., which is very important to our Metropolitan Transportation Plan as we go forward.

Haugen asked if there was a website available with information on this agenda item. Kouba responded that there is, the address is: www.egfplan.org. Haugen asked if Ms. Ellis was going to work with City Administration to get this announcement out.

Information only.

- c. FAST and Continuing Resolution

Haugen reported that the FAST Act itself officially expired at the end of September, however Congress did authorize a one year extension of FAST for the next year. He said that we know that the FAST Act is the law of the land when it comes to transportation.

Haugen commented that in terms of Continuing Resolution, the FAST Act authorizes funds for transportation and Continuing Resolution appropriates funds for the year, and the current Continuing Resolution expires December 11, so there are only a few months of the year that are actually appropriated funds; how that affects, particularly the MPO, it doesn't have a significant

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 21, 2020

impact on us, there are enough funds in the North Dakota DOT to cover expenditures. He said, though, how it impacts the street and transit projects he isn't well versed on, but we do have an extension of the FAST Act and we do have Continuing Resolutions like we have, unfortunately, for too many years now as far as getting funds on an annual basis appropriated.

Information only.

c. Approval Of Bill/Check List For 7/11/20 To 10/16/20 Period

Vetter said, then, that when you send the e-mail out for action on the Unified Planning Work Program do we also want to include the list of Bills/Checks to be included as well. Haugen responded that we do.

On Thursday, October 22, 2020, 09:41:11 AM CDT, Peggy McNelis <peggy.mcnelis@theforksmmpo.org> wrote:

Earl:

I contacted everyone and this is the result:

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| October Bills/Checks | Motion to approve by Strandell, seconded by Powers - Voting Aye: Strandell, Vetter, Powers, Mock and DeMers - Motion carried. |
|----------------------|---|

ADJOURNMENT

CHAIRMAN VETTER CLOSED THE OCTOBER 21, 2020 MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD MEETING AT 1:28 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,
Peggy McNelis, Office Manager

Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO

Transaction List by Vendor

July 11 through October 16, 2020

| Type | Date | Num | Memo | Account | Clr | Split | Amount |
|---|------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----|---------------------|------------|
| AFLAC. | | | | | | | |
| 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 |
| Liability Check | 08/21/2020 | AFLAC | 501 | 104 · Checking | X | -SPLIT- | -517.90 |
| Liability Check | 09/18/2020 | AFLAC | 501 | 104 · Checking | X | -SPLIT- | -517.90 |
| Alerus Financial | | | | | | | |
| 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 | X | -SPLIT- | -2,538.52 |
| Liability Check | 08/21/2020 | EFTPS | 45-0388273 | 104 · Checking | X | -SPLIT- | -2,538.52 |
| Liability Check | 09/04/2020 | EFTPS | 45-0388273 | 104 · Checking | X | -SPLIT- | -2,538.54 |
| Liability Check | 09/18/2020 | EFTPS | 45-0388273 | 104 · Checking | X | -SPLIT- | -2,538.54 |
| Liability Check | 10/02/2020 | EFTPS | 45-0388273 | 104 · Checking | | -SPLIT- | -2,538.50 |
| Liability Check | 10/16/2020 | EFTPS | 45-0388273 | 104 · Checking | | -SPLIT- | -2,538.54 |
| Business Essentials | | | | | | | |
| 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 | X | 206 · Accounts... | -32.00 |
| Bill | 10/13/2020 | Inv. #... | Office Supplie... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | 517 · Overhead | -17.40 |
| Bill Pmt -Check | 10/13/2020 | 6973 | Office Supplie... | 104 · Checking | | 206 · Accounts... | -17.40 |
| CitiBusiness Card | | | | | | | |
| 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 | X | 206 · Accounts... | -293.38 |
| Bill | 08/28/2020 | Acct. ... | Charges For ... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | -SPLIT- | -159.32 |
| Bill Pmt -Check | 08/28/2020 | 6961 | Charges For ... | 104 · Checking | X | 206 · Accounts... | -159.32 |
| Bill | 10/13/2020 | Acct. ... | Charges For ... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | -SPLIT- | -86.91 |
| Bill Pmt -Check | 10/13/2020 | 6974 | Charges For ... | 104 · Checking | | 206 · Accounts... | -86.91 |
| City of East Grand Forks | | | | | | | |
| Bill | 10/15/2020 | Inv. #... | 2020 4th Qua... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | 517 · Overhead | -2,490.30 |
| Bill Pmt -Check | 10/15/2020 | 6977 | 2020 4th Qua... | 104 · Checking | | 206 · Accounts... | -2,490.30 |
| East Grand Forks Water and Light | | | | | | | |
| 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 |
| Fidelity Security Life. | | | | | | | |
| Liability Check | 07/24/2020 | 6945 | 50790-1043 | 104 · Checking | X | 210 · Payroll Li... | -8.44 |
| Liability Check | 08/21/2020 | 6954 | 50790-1043 | 104 · Checking | X | 210 · Payroll Li... | -8.44 |
| Liability Check | 09/18/2020 | 6964 | 50790-1043 | 104 · Checking | X | 210 · Payroll Li... | -8.44 |
| Liability Check | 10/16/2020 | 6969 | 50790-1043 | 104 · Checking | | 210 · Payroll Li... | -8.44 |
| Forum Communications Company | | | | | | | |
| Bill | 09/11/2020 | Inv. #... | Public Notice... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | -SPLIT- | -414.34 |
| Bill Pmt -Check | 09/11/2020 | 6962 | Public Notice... | 104 · Checking | X | 206 · Accounts... | -414.34 |
| Kadmas, Lee & Jackson, Inc. | | | | | | | |
| 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 |
| Bill | 09/11/2020 | Inv. #... | Work On Dow... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | 550 · Corridor ... | -2,171.47 |
| Bill Pmt -Check | 09/11/2020 | 6963 | Work On Dow... | 104 · Checking | X | 206 · Accounts... | -2,171.47 |
| KLJ Engineering, LLC | | | | | | | |
| 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 | X | 206 · Accounts... | -6,242.26 |
| Bill | 10/15/2020 | Inv. #... | For Work On ... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | 550 · Corridor ... | -7,911.37 |
| Bill Pmt -Check | 10/15/2020 | 6978 | For Work On ... | 104 · Checking | | 206 · Accounts... | -7,911.37 |
| Liberty Business Systems, Inc. | | | | | | | |
| 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 |
| Bill | 08/18/2020 | Inv. #... | Contract Bas... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | 517 · Overhead | -162.66 |
| Bill Pmt -Check | 08/18/2020 | 6958 | Contract Bas... | 104 · Checking | X | 206 · Accounts... | -162.66 |
| Bill | 09/18/2020 | Inv. #... | Contract Bas... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | 517 · Overhead | -162.66 |
| Bill Pmt -Check | 09/18/2020 | 6968 | Contract Bas... | 104 · Checking | X | 206 · Accounts... | -162.66 |
| LSNB as Trustee for PEHP | | | | | | | |
| Liability Check | 07/24/2020 | NWR... | | 104 · Checking | X | 216 · Post-Hea... | -123.76 |
| Liability Check | 08/21/2020 | PEHP | | 104 · Checking | X | 216 · Post-Hea... | -123.75 |
| Liability Check | 09/18/2020 | PEHP | | 104 · Checking | X | 216 · Post-Hea... | -123.75 |
| Liability Check | 10/16/2020 | PEHP | | 104 · Checking | | 216 · Post-Hea... | -123.75 |
| Madison Nat'l Life | | | | | | | |
| Liability Check | 07/24/2020 | 6946 | | 104 · Checking | X | 215 · Disability... | -66.56 |
| Liability Check | 08/21/2020 | 6955 | | 104 · Checking | X | 215 · Disability... | -66.56 |
| Liability Check | 09/18/2020 | 6965 | | 104 · Checking | X | 215 · Disability... | -66.56 |
| Liability Check | 10/16/2020 | 6970 | | 104 · Checking | | 215 · Disability... | -66.56 |

Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO Transaction List by Vendor July 11 through October 16, 2020

| Type | Date | Num | Memo | Account | Clr | Split | Amount |
|---|------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----|---------------------|-----------|
| Mike's | | | | | | | |
| 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 |
| Bill | 08/19/2020 | | MPO Lunche... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | 711 · Miscellan... | -72.07 |
| Bill Pmt -Check | 08/19/2020 | 6959 | MPO Lunche... | 104 · Checking | X | 206 · Accounts... | -72.07 |
| Minnesota Department of Revenue | | | | | | | |
| Liability Check | 07/24/2020 | MNDOR | 1403100 | 104 · Checking | X | 210 · Payroll Li... | -189.00 |
| Liability Check | 08/07/2020 | MNDOR | 1403100 | 104 · Checking | X | 210 · Payroll Li... | -189.00 |
| Liability Check | 08/21/2020 | MNDOR | 1403100 | 104 · Checking | X | 210 · Payroll Li... | -189.00 |
| Liability Check | 09/04/2020 | MNDOR | 1403100 | 104 · Checking | X | 210 · Payroll Li... | -189.00 |
| Liability Check | 09/18/2020 | MNDOR | 1403100 | 104 · Checking | X | 210 · Payroll Li... | -189.00 |
| Liability Check | 10/02/2020 | MNDOR | 1403100 | 104 · Checking | | 210 · Payroll Li... | -189.00 |
| Liability Check | 10/16/2020 | MNDOR | 1403100 | 104 · Checking | | 210 · Payroll Li... | -189.00 |
| Minnesota Life Insurance Company | | | | | | | |
| Liability Check | 07/24/2020 | 6947 | | 104 · Checking | X | -SPLIT- | -111.72 |
| Liability Check | 08/21/2020 | 6956 | | 104 · Checking | X | -SPLIT- | -111.72 |
| Liability Check | 09/18/2020 | 6966 | | 104 · Checking | X | -SPLIT- | -111.72 |
| Liability Check | 10/16/2020 | 6971 | | 104 · Checking | | -SPLIT- | -111.72 |
| Nationwide Retirement Solutions | | | | | | | |
| Liability Check | 07/24/2020 | NWR... | 3413 | 104 · Checking | X | -SPLIT- | -433.07 |
| Liability Check | 08/07/2020 | NWR... | 3413 | 104 · Checking | X | -SPLIT- | -433.07 |
| Liability Check | 08/21/2020 | NWR... | 3413 | 104 · Checking | X | -SPLIT- | -433.07 |
| Liability Check | 09/04/2020 | NWR... | 3413 | 104 · Checking | X | -SPLIT- | -433.07 |
| Liability Check | 09/18/2020 | NWR... | 3413 | 104 · Checking | X | -SPLIT- | -433.07 |
| Liability Check | 10/02/2020 | NWR... | 3413 | 104 · Checking | | -SPLIT- | -433.07 |
| Liability Check | 10/16/2020 | NWR... | 3413 | 104 · Checking | | -SPLIT- | -433.07 |
| NDPERS | | | | | | | |
| Liability Check | 07/16/2020 | NDPE... | | 104 · Checking | X | -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 | X | -SPLIT- | -2,532.36 |
| Liability Check | 08/21/2020 | NDPE... | D88 | 104 · Checking | X | -SPLIT- | -3,024.08 |
| Liability Check | 09/14/2020 | NDPE... | | 104 · Checking | | -SPLIT- | -2,532.36 |
| Liability Check | 09/18/2020 | NDPE... | D88 | 104 · Checking | X | -SPLIT- | -3,024.08 |
| Liability Check | 10/16/2020 | NDPE... | | 104 · Checking | | -SPLIT- | -2,532.36 |
| QuickBooks Payroll Service | | | | | | | |
| 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 | X | -SPLIT- | -6,372.66 |
| Liability Check | 08/20/2020 | | Created by P... | 104 · Checking | X | -SPLIT- | -6,372.66 |
| Liability Check | 09/03/2020 | | Created by P... | 104 · Checking | X | -SPLIT- | -6,372.65 |
| Liability Check | 09/16/2020 | | Created by P... | 104 · Checking | X | -SPLIT- | -6,372.65 |
| Liability Check | 10/01/2020 | | Created by P... | 104 · Checking | | -SPLIT- | -6,372.67 |
| Liability Check | 10/15/2020 | | Created by P... | 104 · Checking | | -SPLIT- | -6,372.65 |
| Standard Insurance Company | | | | | | | |
| Liability Check | 07/24/2020 | 6948 | | 104 · Checking | X | 217 · Dental P... | -118.88 |
| Liability Check | 08/21/2020 | 6957 | | 104 · Checking | X | 217 · Dental P... | -118.88 |
| Liability Check | 09/18/2020 | 6967 | | 104 · Checking | X | 217 · Dental P... | -118.88 |
| Liability Check | 10/16/2020 | 6972 | | 104 · Checking | | 217 · Dental P... | -118.88 |
| State Tax Commissioner | | | | | | | |
| Liability Check | 10/16/2020 | NDST... | 45038827301 | 104 · Checking | | 210 · Payroll Li... | -366.00 |
| The Exponent | | | | | | | |
| 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 | X | 206 · Accounts... | -147.00 |
| Bill | 10/13/2020 | Inv. #... | Public Notice ... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | 555 · TIP | -157.24 |
| Bill Pmt -Check | 10/13/2020 | 6975 | Public Notice ... | 104 · Checking | | 206 · Accounts... | -157.24 |
| WSB & Associates, Inc. | | | | | | | |
| Bill | 08/26/2020 | Inv. #... | Work On 205... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | 560 · Land Us... | -814.98 |
| Bill Pmt -Check | 08/26/2020 | 6960 | Work On 205... | 104 · Checking | X | 206 · Accounts... | -814.98 |
| Bill | 10/13/2020 | Inv. #... | Charges For ... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | 560 · Land Us... | -5,001.09 |
| Bill Pmt -Check | 10/13/2020 | 6976 | Charges For ... | 104 · Checking | | 206 · Accounts... | -5,001.09 |