

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, November 18<sup>th</sup>, 2020, - 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Room/Zoom Meeting**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Clarence Vetter, Chairman, called the November 18, 2020, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:08 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

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

Absent: None.

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 OCTOBER 21<sup>ST</sup>, 2020, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY STRANDELL, SECONDED BY ROST, TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 21<sup>ST</sup>, 2020, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2021 OFFICE RENTAL AGREEMENTS**

Haugen reported that the MPO is currently on a one (1) year lease agreement with both City Halls for our office space. He explained that part of that was due to the possibility of the MPO leasing space in the Grand Forks Herald building and other space issues in Grand Forks City Hall, but it seems that things are shaking out a little bit more in Grand Forks.

Haugen stated that we have two lease agreements for your consideration today. He said that Ms. McNelis worked with staff from both City Halls to come up with them.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 18, 2020

Haugen referred to the Grand Forks City Hall lease agreement and pointed out that it is a one (1) year agreement, as there are still some issues with space availability for the MPO. He explained that, if some are not aware, the MPO is currently located on the second floor along with the Planning and Community Development staff, but they are going to be relocating down to the first floor in what is currently the Mayor and City Administrator offices, however there isn't space available in that area for the MPO to be able to move with them so we are working with Engineering and Inspection staff who will be moving into the current Planning and Community Development area, to try to determine where space may be available for the MPO, thus the need for a one (1) year lease at this time.

Haugen referred to the East Grand Forks City Hall lease and explained that a possible two (2) year agreement has been in discussion, however what their City Council received from staff at their last meeting was a one (1) year lease agreement even though they did discuss at their working session a two (2) year agreement. He stated that City staff is following up with the next round of City Council meetings to make it a two (2) year agreement so MPO staff is suggesting that for the Minnesota side it could be a two (2) year agreement.

Haugen pointed out that both leases are using the same rate for the square footage in both locations, and the second year it will be based on the Consumer Price Index cost of inflation for that year.

Vein said that Mr. Haugen said that this was coordinated with City Hall staff, was that with Mr. Feland. Haugen responded that the one shown on the screen was primarily worked through with Ms. Storstad, Finance Director, but he would assume that she worked with Mr. Feland, Mr. Gengler, and Mr. Grasser as well. Vein commented that at one time, of course, we were trying to at least address the possibility of consolidating with Planning and Community Development staff in the Grand Forks Herald Building, but is that, as far as you know, off the table. Haugen responded that it is. He added that investments are being made on the first floor of City Hall to relocate Planning and Community Development, the bulk of the investment is being spent there to refashion the old Mayor's office for them.

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE GRAND FORKS CITY HALL AND EAST GRAND FORKS CITY HALL 2021 RENTAL AGREEMENTS, AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF 2021 MINNESOTA STATE GRANT AGREEMENT**

Haugen reported that annually we receive funds from the State of Minnesota to assist us with MPO Planning funds. He explained that these State funds can be used as 100% local match of the Federal funds. He added that these State funds do need East Grand Forks to provide a 20%

match in order for us to access the State funds, that is included in the East Grand Forks budget for this, so this is our standard contract, there haven't been any significant changes, and it is about \$11,000 a year that the State provides, and again that offsets what would otherwise be local match for the Federal funds.

Haugen stated that staff recommends approving the contract and authorizing the Chairman and the Executive Director to sign the contract.

***MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING THE CHAIRMAN AND THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIGN THE 2021 MINNESOTA STATE CONTRACT, AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: None.***

#### **MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION STUDY**

Haugen reported that for the past year staff has been providing the Board with regular updates on the progress of the Downtown Transportation Study. He stated that they held the last Steering Committee meeting back in September, and they have also given presentations to both City Councils. He said that at last weeks Technical Advisory Committee meeting they recommended the Board approve the study, however they did have a couple of questions, and the responses to those questions are included in the staff report, so staff is recommending the Board approve the final study report.

***MOVED BY ROST, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE FINAL DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION STUDY REPORT, AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: None.***

#### **MATTER OF APPROVAL OF NDDOT FTA #5339 CANDIDATE PROJECT**

Kouba reported that solicitation for this went out in September and we received only one application from Cities Area Transit. She stated that this was submitted to the Grand Forks City Council for approval.

Kouba commented that the only thing different this time around is that this project will be funded with an 85/15 cost share split instead of the normal 80/20 cost share split. She said that both staff and the Technical Advisory Committee are recommending approval of the NDDOT FTA #5339 Candidate Project in the priority order given.

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY ROST, TO APPROVE THE NDDOT FTA #5339  
CANDIDATE PROJECT IN THE PRIORITY GIVEN.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF ADOPTION OF FHWA PERFORMANCE TARGETS**

Haugen reported that the reason why the agenda item says FHWA Performance Targets, there are also Safety Targets, but the Technical Advisory Committee held that at their level for some clarifications, but they did move forward with the Pavement/Bridge and Travel Reliability Targets.

Haugen commented that, just to highlight that these are, at the MPO level, four (4) year targets we adopted a couple of years ago but the regulation require that each State have a two (2) year review of their target, and they have the ability, then, to make some adjustments. He stated that if the States make adjustment to their targets then the MPO has 180 days to respond to those adjustments.

Haugen referred to a table and explained that it shows what adjustments have been made by the States, with their targets. He pointed out that originally Minnesota, for the percentage of bridges in good condition, had it set at 50% but they have since lowered that target to 35% because that is what the data is really suggesting, otherwise for the PM2, all of the condition targets there were no other adjustments made so we

a. Pavement/Bridge Condition (PM2) 2-Year Adjustment

Haugen referred to a table and explained that it shows what adjustments have been made by the States, with their targets. He pointed out that originally Minnesota, for the percentage of bridges in good condition, had it set at 50% but they have since lowered that target to 35% because that is what the data is really suggesting, otherwise for the PM2, all of the condition targets there were no other adjustments made so we do have a resolution, separately, for just addressing those PM2 targets.

b. Reliability (PM3) 2-Year Adjustment

Haugen reported that PM3, Reliability, there were two adjustments noted, one in each City. He stated that the first one is for Minnesota; for the reliable person miles on Non-Interstate National Highway System, previously they had 75% as being good but they have since received data that shows that 90% is the appropriate target so they are adjusting theirs to 90%.

Haugen stated that on the North Dakota side it is related to Truck Travel Time Reliability; previously it was at 3% and they have adjusted that to 1.5%.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 18, 2020

Haugen commented that we have supporting data from both States indicating what is going on. He pointed out that in the Resolution for PM2 we used to just have the word “State” listed there but from feedback we received it does not inform anybody what the actual target is so you will now see that we are identifying for each respective State what the State target is when we adopt the State target. He pointed out that for four (4) of the six (6) measures we are adopting the State targets; for the Interstate Pavement Good and Pavement Poor, since Minnesota has no interstate we are in essence using the North Dakota target, however it is an MPO target that we are establishing, so even though we don’t have interstate on the Minnesota side our only option really is to have a target that covers the MPO area. He stated, then, that is the change, the two (2) year adjustment that we are recommending for PM2

Haugen said that for PM3 it is fairly similar; there is one exception here. He referred to a graphic and pointed that there is an area that shows that in Minnesota, originally we had one MPO target, and that was 85%, the motion now is to have each State target in the Non-NHS System. He added that previously we had 1.5% as the MPO target, staff and the Technical Advisory Committee have different recommendations for this target; the Technical Advisory Committee recommendation was to default back to the State however staff feels that that was our target so we should maintain it as our target for the MPO area, it is a bit unique in that it is the same for all three entities, however we would recommend we keep it at 1.5% and not have it stated for each State, so the motion before you is to adopt the resolutions, the one additional decision you need to make is how you want to address the Truck Travel Time Reliability.

***MOVED BY ROST, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE ADJUSTMENT FOR THE PAVEMENT/BRIDGE (PM2) BRIDGE GOOD CONDITION RATE FROM 50% TO 35%.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: None.***

Strandell commented that he will make a motion for the PM3 adjustment, but asked for clarification on the item first. Haugen responded that the number is 1.5 for all three entities, the subtle difference is that it is an MPO target that is specifically for the MPO area, so we are designating what our target will be for our planning and programming purposes, whereas if we revert back to the States they could, again, provide a target that is not necessarily appropriate for the MPO area, this just happens to be a case where they are agreeing, now, that 1.5 is more appropriate than the 3 they previously had, so the staff motion is to keep it at the MPO level instead of relying on the States to try to figure out what the target should be for the MPO area. Strandell said, then, that staff wants to retain the MPOs target.

***MOVED BY STRANDELL, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE PM3 TWO (2) YEAR ADJUSTMENT PER MPO STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE THE ADJUSTMENT SHOWING NORTH DAKOTA AT 85% AND MINNESOTA AT 90% FOR***

***THE RELIABLE PERSON MILES ON THE NON-INTERSTATE SYSTEM, AND TO  
MAKE NO ADJUSTMENT TO OUR TRUCK TRAVEL TIME RELIABILITY RATE.***

DeMers asked what the Technical Advisory Committee's recommendation was exactly. Haugen responded that the summary would be that it would no longer be an MPO target, we would be relying on the State target. Vetter asked if there was a reason they recommended that. Haugen responded that there wasn't actually a reason stated.

Mock asked if the motion is to approve what staff recommended. Haugen responded that that is correct. He explained, again, that in essence this is your opportunity to make an adjustment to your targets; your current target for Truck Travel Time Reliability is 1.5, the NDDOT took this opportunity to adjust their target from 3 down to 1.5, and Minnesota also has theirs set at 1.5, so we are just suggesting that we maintain it as an MPO target so we have the ability to make adjustments to it and not have to rely on the States to make an adjustment, so it stays; per our planning area, it stays within our approval process, we aren't relying on the States to determine what takes place in the MPO area.

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

***Voting Nay: Grasser.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FUTURE BRIDGE TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY RFP**

Haugen reported that last month this body asked staff to give the Technical Advisory Committee two questions; the first question was whether or not we should include the 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue Corridor in the study, the second question was how the public engagement/participation should be scoped.

Haugen stated that included in the staff summary report were the response we received from the Technical Advisory Committee on those two questions. He added that attached is the full RFP draft; last month you received just the basic scope of work, but this one includes all of the verbiage necessary for an RFP to go out.

Haugen said that if the Board grants approval today the RFP would be placed on the NDDOT Qualification Base Website, most likely in a couple of days, so we would have a due date for proposals to be submitted at the end of December, and then at your January meeting you will have the opportunity to execute a contract and the study would last the entire 2021 calendar year.

Haugen commented that the scope of work is, again, just looking at the Elks and 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Corridors. He said that for the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Corridor it will be looking at what the northern alignment is. He added that for both sites we are assuming that the bridge height will be at a medium height, similar to the Kennedy Bridge height.

Haugen stated that in terms of the public engagement process, we do have to provide some basic framework for the consultants to be base their response on; based on the feedback that we got

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 18, 2020

there are a couple of things the Technical Advisory Committee expressed that we should do, and one was to do a mailing directly to the properties that would be impacted, which would be a fairly significant mailing, in the thousands, to all of the properties impacted, so that is included as a possibility. He said that a Steering Committee was also mentioned as something they would like to see be established; this is still open throughout the process to make a final determination that may not be necessary today, but the steering committee membership basically is asking for, we have to have Federal Highway and North Dakota Local Government, so they are on there, and we are asking for the City Council people who representative the Wards most affected, and there are two on each side, and then we are also asking that the six neighborhoods impacted by this have someone sit on the Steering Committee as well and he tried to list out what those six neighborhoods are. He stated that the last one is the uniqueness of, a portion of the traffic that is being attracted near the bridge are going to be using the Township road that is just outside the flood protection system in East Grand Forks and so it felt that that township road authority should have representation on the Steering Committee as well. He added that also for the engagement process we need to have things advanced to us ahead of time prior to them needing to go out, and we also have the possibility that the consultant and other staff, perhaps the Steering Committee, would do a walk-about, which is something that was done on the Minnesota/4<sup>th</sup> Avenue Study for the Granitoid, where we actually started at one end of the corridor and walked down the corridor and invited anyone that wanted to talk to us along the way to do that; that is something that is suggested not required.

Haugen said that that is how staff tried to incorporate the feedback they received from the Technical Advisory Committee. He added that they are still exploring and working on a hybrid of public engagement where, if we were to do it today we would probably have everything virtual, but assuming that things might be coming back a bit by spring we hope that we may have the potential for some in-person and virtual, so they wrote the RFP so it is a little flexible so that not everything has to be virtual, that some of it can be virtual and some of it can be in-person.

Vein asked about the membership on the Steering Committee, asking if Mr. Haugen could explain what responsibility, authority would they have and who would they report to, not only who is going to be on it but how the people on the Steering Committee would be seeing their role, he thinks that that can be both really done well or it could really have some negative impacts as we move forward, so could you describe that more thoroughly.

Haugen referred to a graphic, explaining that we have it in our basic MPO decision making brochure. He pointed out that we typically do have a Steering Committee, that then is an advisory board or a sounding board to the MPO staff, the Technical Advisory Committee, and the Consultant to help guide the process, to give feedback directly from those users that are more directly impacted by it, but ultimately they are just a recommendation or an advisory body formed just for that particular study and then dismissed once the study is done. He added that they would directly report to the Technical Advisory Committee and then the Technical Advisory Committee directly reports to the MPO Executive Policy Board.

Haugen commented that the membership; we do have to have the NDDOT and Federal Highway membership on it, and then in addition to those basic members we are looking at having the City

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 18, 2020

Council people, if they wish, or, and he has an error here, it should be five ward members, or if they want someone from the ward itself to represent them it would be up to the ward person to identify how they want to handle it, and then we would have six people from the major neighborhoods, and he has identified them as 32<sup>nd</sup>, Elks, 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue, the Near Southside Neighborhood, Rhinehart, Bygland, and the Township Authority. He stated that that is the membership as drafted in this RFP, but is isn't by any means the final membership, there could be changes made if desired.

Vein said that maybe the question is what is the difference between the ward representatives and the neighborhood representatives. Haugen responded that the ward representative might actually be the elected person whose ward is impacted and the neighborhood would be someone appointed from the neighborhood groups, there could be different people.

Vein stated that one of the important areas, at least for himself, as you said are the impacts of a bridge often times goes beyond just the wards, and so he is wondering does this cover the project well, are we getting the right representation, and because a bridge is a city-wide impact, not just those wards, and those neighborhoods, although they have the highest impact, are we getting everyone covered having a Steering Committee like this is maybe the concern he would have, and are we going to create neighborhood against neighborhood in the Steering Committee. He said that he is afraid of what we ask for here. Haugen responded that the alternative discussed at the Technical Advisory Committee was just using how we do these bigger metropolitan item studies, and that is to use our public engagement process and then trying to get everyone and everybody to attend and participate, but then just to rely on our typical MPO structure of the Technical Advisory Committee and the MPO Executive Policy Board and then relying on each individual City Structure of their Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council.

Vein commented that he just isn't sure; he doesn't mind necessarily having a Steering Committee, he just isn't sure we have the right make-up of the Steering Committee, he wishes he could say yes for sure or no for sure but he still has questions as to how well this Steering Committee would work, and if we don't follow what this Steering Committee says as we go down the road, what type of dilemma do we create for our decision makers. He added that if the Steering Committee itself isn't more or less city-wide, because he knows in his own ward the benefits of a southend bridge, how can it determine how that might impact traffic as far as DeMers Avenue and South Washington, as an example.

Vetter apologized that he hasn't read through the whole RFP, but does it leave the leeway in there to adjust the makeup of that Steering Committee, does it require a Steering Committee. Mock asked if when talking to the Technical Advisory Committee, was there any discussion of potentially just sending letters to the 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue neighborhood just to gather what their thoughts to add 17<sup>th</sup> Ave would be. Haugen responded that at the Technical Advisory Committee they did not discuss an individual letter to the 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue neighborhood only; the only discussion was that once the study gets underway for all the meetings we have that a mass mailing go out to all properties affected within the area shown within the blue box on the graphic.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 18, 2020

Haugen commented that Mr. Vetter asked whether this RFP has the final determination of what the membership of the Steering Committee would be, and from staff's perspective we are just identifying how it could be, and once we do have the consultant on board, and also have their response to how they will approach the public engagement process, that is when we would finalize the representation on the Steering Committee. He said that from the consultant's point of view, they are just being advised that there will be a Steering Committee that they will have to engage with in addition to the Technical Advisory Committee and the MPO Executive Policy Board, so the RFP itself doesn't nail down the absolute membership, it just identifies for the consultant that they are responding to a public engagement framework that require that they have a set of meetings with this group called the Steering Committee. He said that this will give them some kind of idea of whom might be those people on the Steering Committee.

Grasser stated that he agrees with Mr. Vein, and maybe others, relative to the exact participation level and the makeup of representatives, but as long as we have time to sort out, he thinks we need a further discussion on this, but he doesn't think he sees any harm going along at this point in the RFP that is going out, but he agrees it is going to be hard with that, and we can probably come up with a consensus of several opinions, so he thinks we do need to talk about that more.

Vein said that maybe one of the other questions he has, you call it a Steering Committee, maybe that is a little concerning that they will be steering this, as far as getting feedback. He is just a little concerned with that this type of a structure is going to be a set up for having a large crowd of people in there saying we aren't listening, if in fact we are going to be trying to look across the whole community when we look at the benefits. Haugen commented that we could call it an Ad Hoc group, that is straight out of this document, typically creates an Ad Hoc Group, usually called the Steering Committee, but we could default to just Ad Hoc Group if you want, or an Advisory Group. Vein responded that he would like, as a minimum, that it be an Ad Hoc Group because he thinks that clarification would be helpful, and then if we could still look at the makeup of that group before it is finalized, he would be satisfied with that himself personally. Grasser said that he kind of likes the idea of a Steering Committee; again he thinks it is good to have a touch stone, maybe that meets more often and has a little more input than even the Technical Advisory Committee, and he thinks Federal Highway and the DOT Government; questions that come up he thinks that would be beneficial to have some guidance before they end up at the Technical Advisory or Executive Policy Board, so he generally likes the idea of a Steering Committee, per se, but again he just isn't sure about the neighborhood representation at this point.

Haugen said that the motion could be "as submitted by staff", or if you want, from what he heard, was perhaps changing the vernacular of the group from Steering Committee to Ad Hoc Group and perhaps making a stronger statement that the membership is yet to be determined and what is listed here are just potential members.

***MOVED BY STRANDELL, SECONDED BY ROST, TO APPROVE THE RFP FOR THE FUTURE BRIDGE TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY SUBJECT TO CHANGING THE NAME OF THE GROUP FROM STEERING COMMITTEE TO AD HOCK, AND THEN TO REWITE THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE AD HOC GROUP TO SAY THAT IT COULD***

***INCLUDE REPRESENTATION FROM AND MAKE A STRONGER STATEMENT THAT THERE WILL BE AN AD HOC GROUP CREATED, BUT WHAT THE MAKEUP OF THE GROUP WILL BE IS STILL TO BE DETERMINED, AND THE LIST PROVIDED IS JUST AN EXAMPLE OF POSSIBLE MEMBERS.***

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

***Voting Nay: Grasser.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: None.***

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

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

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

a. **2020 Annual Work Program Project Update**

Haugen stated that this is the monthly update of the tasks that are in our 2020 Work Program. He said that we talked about the latter three; the Grand Forks Land Use Plan, as noted, the RFP is due at the end of November so we hope that there is a possibility to have a contract for your consideration of our final scope of work at your December meeting. He added that the East Grand Forks Land Use Plan is progressing along; you should have received notice of the dedicated website, and if you were to click on that now you would see that there is a Wiki Mapping tool asking the public to inform us of where they feel there are issues or opportunities, etc., that we should be aware of.

Information only.

b. **NDDOT Statewide Long Range Transportation Plan**

Haugen reported that we did not ask for a formal presentation. He said that the material that North Dakota provided to us, they are in the mid-stream of their massive financial survey that you saw last month, so you have at your leisure a copy of their update that they provided to us in regard to where they are at with the Statewide Long Range Transportation Plan update.

Information only.

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

***MOVED BY ROST, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE BILLS/CHECKS FOR THE 10/17/20 TO 11/13/20 PERIOD.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 18, 2020

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY STRANDELL, SECONDED BY ROST, TO ADJOURN THE NOVEMBER 18,  
2020 MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:52 P.M.***

Respectfully Submitted,  
Peggy McNelis, Office Manager

**Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO**  
**Transaction List by Vendor**  
 October 17 through November 13, 2020

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
<b>AFLAC.</b>							
Liability Check	10/30/2020	AFLAC	501	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-776.85
<b>Alerus Financial</b>							
Liability Check	10/30/2020	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,581.42
Liability Check	11/13/2020	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,538.50
<b>CitiBusiness Card</b>							
Bill	10/28/2020	Acct. ...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		-SPLIT-	-192.08
Bill Pmt -Check	10/28/2020	6980	Charges For ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-192.08
<b>East Grand Forks Water and Light</b>							
Bill	11/10/2020	Inv. #...	3rd Quarter 2...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-472.95
Bill Pmt -Check	11/10/2020	6984	3rd Quarter 2...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-472.95
<b>Forum Communications Company</b>							
Bill	11/06/2020	Inv. #...	Public Notice ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		555 · TIP	-186.07
Bill Pmt -Check	11/06/2020	6983	Public Notice ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-186.07
<b>Intrado Interactive Services Corporation</b>							
Bill	11/05/2020	Inv. #...	Acct. #33403...	206 · Accounts Pay...		525 · Citizens ...	-4,260.00
Bill Pmt -Check	11/05/2020	6982	Acct. #33403...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-4,260.00
<b>KLJ Engineering, LLC</b>							
Bill	11/10/2020	Inv. #...	Work Done O...	206 · Accounts Pay...		550 · Corridor ...	-231.61
Bill Pmt -Check	11/10/2020	6985	Work Done O...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-231.61
<b>Liberty Business Systems, Inc.</b>							
Bill	10/22/2020	Inv. #...	Contract Bas...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-162.66
Bill Pmt -Check	10/22/2020	6979	Contract Bas...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-162.66
<b>Minnesota Department of Revenue</b>							
Liability Check	10/30/2020	MNST...	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-199.00
Liability Check	11/13/2020	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-189.00
<b>Nationwide Retirement Solutions</b>							
Liability Check	10/30/2020	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-433.07
Liability Check	11/13/2020	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-433.07
<b>NDPERS</b>							
Liability Check	10/30/2020	NDPE...	D88	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-4,536.12
Liability Check	11/13/2020	NDPE...		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,532.36
<b>QuickBooks Payroll Service</b>							
Liability Check	10/29/2020		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-6,513.13
Liability Check	11/12/2020		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-6,372.67
<b>WSB &amp; Associates, Inc.</b>							
Bill	10/30/2020	Inv. #...		206 · Accounts Pay...		560 · Land Us...	-2,987.32
Bill Pmt -Check	10/30/2020	6981		104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-2,987.32