

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, January 20, 2021 - 12:00 Noon
Zoom Meeting**

CALL TO ORDER

Jeannie Mock, Chairwoman, called the January 20, 2021, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:03 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, and Jeannie Mock (All Via Zoom).

Absent: Ken Vein and Bob Rost.

Guests present were: Scott Schafer, MnDOT; Hally Turner, MnDOT;

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; and Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Mock declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF SELECTION OF SECRETARY

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO NOMINATE WARREN STRANDELL AS SECRETARY OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AND TO CEASE NOMINATIONS.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 16TH, 2020, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 16TH, 2020, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON MNDOT STATEWIDE MULTI-MODAL PLAN

Scott Schafer, MnDOT, was present for a brief presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request).

Presentation ensued.

Schafer explained the Minnesota GO is the Fifty (50) Year Vision for Transportation in Minnesota; it is the fundamental policy guidance. He said that Minnesota has a vision of having a multimodal transportation system that maximizes the health of people, the environment, and the economy, and is the fundamental why of why we have a transportation system, what we are trying to achieve.

Schafer commented that the Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan, the SMTP, fills in how they translate that Fifty (50) Year Vision into more specific policy guidance. He stated that under the SMTP is the umbrella of the family plans, and those include the Modal and System Plans in Minnesota; everything from the State Highway Investment Plan, to the Pedestrian Plan, the Bicycle Plan, Transit Investment Plan, Trains, Planes, and Automobiles, and including Ports & Waterways, so it is truly multimodal. He added that most of these plans are updated every five (5) years.

Schafer said that for the SMTP they develop overarching objectives, strategies, and performance measures for all modes; the last update was adopted in 2017 and the next update is due in early 2022, however because of the pandemic and other events they will be asking the State Legislature for an extension of that deadline.

Schafer pointed out that they are working on the 3rd version of the SMTP, the 2nd Update. He said that the first version of the SMTP was delivered in 2012, soon after they had adopted the Minnesota GO Vision, and it generally focused on all aspects of transportation; there was a lot of engagement using traditional engagement methods, community meetings, etc., and it set a wide range of objectives and performance measures for transportation in the State. He stated that the second version of the plan, adopted in 2017, was a little more focused on specific issues, equity, climate change and the land use context surrounding transportation, and it also focused in on just five of the objectives that were developed in the original SMTP, and they will be using those five objective areas in the update they are working on now, the 3rd version of the SMTP. He added that the other thing that you should know about the 2017 version was that the engagement became a little more innovative; they were using the original methods they used in 2012 but also brought in more of a timeline presence with social media and targeted ads as well as info kiosks, and other more innovative engagement efforts, and they got more than 12,000 comments during their engagement efforts.

Schafer stated that with this third version they will be doing a more in-depth analysis; going even further into details of the focused areas and they will be carrying some of the engagement work over those 12,000 comments they got in 2016 and 2017, they will be bringing them in to help set

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 20, 2021

the context for the work that they do for this update and this will also set them up to update the Minnesota GO Vision as part of the complete planning cycle.

Schafer reiterated that they will be using the engagement that they got for the last update to support their work in this update so he will give a brief overview on what they heard and to check to see if it matches what you are hearing from your communities.

Schafer commented that they asked some questions to determine what they need to plan for Minnesota, in terms of transportation and what is changing with regard to transportation in Minnesota.

Schafer stated that when they surveyed the whole population, and took the raw numbers, the top five trends were: 1) Aging infrastructure – this is a huge system and they need to maintain what they have instead of expanding it and just passing on more liabilities to future generations; 2) Urban and rural population trends – thinking about the context of how they build a transportation system that fits, or a transportation system that fits in a rural context versus an urban context; 3) Climate change – thinking about both greenhouse gas emissions but also thinking about resilience in terms of additional flooding; 4) Environmental quality – making sure that we are passing on and maximizing the health of the environment piece of the Minnesota Go Vision, making sure that our air quality and water quality are all improving for the future generations; and 5) Transportation behavior – looking at transportation behavior and how people are changing the way they are getting from Point A to Point B, and to make sure that we are designing a transportation system that is going to suit the needs of future generations.

Schafer commented that those five trends were for sort of the overall group, the most important topics; when they drilled down and looked at how different groups prioritized these areas they found slightly different patterns, so: 1) Aging population and supporting people with disabilities was ranked higher for American Indian and Alaskan Native people and people over the age of 65; 2) Health was ranked higher for American Indian, Alaskan Native, and Hispanic people; 3) Racial disparities and equity was ranked higher for Black or African American and Hispanic people; 4) Mobility as a service was ranked higher for those under the age of 20; and 5) Employment and economy was ranked higher for multiple races. He added that these topics show that if we are trying to pursue equity and to make sure that everyone has what they need we can't look at just the overall picture, we need to look at a more detailed picture of how different groups prioritize these topics.

Schafer asked if the information he just discussed reflects what everyone is hearing in their communities as well. He stated that if you have any comments, please share them in the chat and Hally will monitor them.

Schafer reported that in 2019 they decided to go back and look at the quality of the answers, the open ended questions that they asked and do an analysis of how different groups responded to the questions that they asked, and what they learned during that process was that they really needed to be asking people about their access to jobs and services, etc., as well as their access to transportation options and their experiences using them, and their access to the public input

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 20, 2021

opportunities, which affect our decision making when setting policies and make investments. He added that they also need to ask about the barriers created by transportation within their communities; we think about transportation connecting people but sometimes a highway can connect one person to something but also disconnect or create a barrier for another person.

Schafer commented that some other things they learned was that they need to plan for several things: 1) safe, convenient and affordable alternatives to driving, and the aging population is a major part of that; 2) plan to minimize environmental impacts of transportation, and 3) plan to meet the transportation needs of low income and communities of color first given the history of transportation in Minnesota. He stated that other notes that they learned are to use a health equity lens in setting SMTP policies and to use a people-first planning approach.

Schafer stated that for the engagement for this round of the update to the SMTP they want to know where they need to hear more, where they need to do more community engagement and listen to the community; where they need to dig deeper in terms of research and analysis; and they also want to think about where the conversation has changed over the last five years. He said that to give an example they will be selecting four to six areas to dig into more detail for this SMTP, and they have a pretty robust process to think about how to identify these focus areas. He went over the process briefly.

Schafer commented that potential areas of focus include: 1) Climate Change – they are including climate change because they are statutorily required by Minnesota law to evaluate greenhouse gas emissions in this plan and it is also an important issue to the public when they have asked them about it and they have seen the effects of changing climate on the infrastructure that MnDOT maintains and builds; 2) Equity – this will be included as a focus area, given the civil unrest due to the George Floyd killing and it is the 100th year anniversary of the trunk highway system and the way that transportation has been planned and built in the past we want to do better this time and considering equity explicitly is an important part of that process; 3) Other potential areas include changing demographics, asset management, mode choice, and safety.

Schafer said that as they are developing these focus areas; they reviewed the background information and will be guiding themselves moving forward and will be setting policy objectives and strategies and performance measures; and then finally developing a work plan to put it all into action. He added that after they are done planning they will then implement the plan until it is time to plan again. He stated that the updated system and modal plans that come after this will be compliant and will match the SMTP.

Schafer referred to a slide illustrating the plan timeline and went over it briefly, adding that they are working with the MnSHIP, the Minnesota State Highway Investment Plan, which is a twenty (20) year plan that will direct how much money should go into the different buckets used for maintaining and building the transportation system. He stated that they need to finish the SMTP; they need to give MnSHIP policy strategies and objectives, so they are working in cooperation with them. He said that they expect to have a work plan by June for their internal committee

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 20, 2021

review and then, as he mentioned, they will plan to have a draft plan in January 2022, and final plan in the following months.

Schafer stated that the next steps are to convene advisory committees, and the Policy Advisory Committee is advising both MnSHIP and SMTP. He added that the Policy Advisory Committee is a mixture of internal and external partners, and will be advising both the SMTP and the MnSHIP Investment Plan. He said that they will be identify up to four more focus areas in addition to equity and climate change, which have already been selected, and they will have work groups organized around those focus areas to help them dig deeper and set those strategies and policies and objectives. Haugen asked if one of the remaining four focus areas would have something to do with the pandemic. Schafer responded that it is up to four more, so up to six total; could one of those other two relate to the pandemic, he thinks that there are a lot of things that relate to the pandemic, so you could pick health or disasters and special events that relate directly to the pandemic or you could just find ties to the pandemic in safety or transportation modes with more people working from home so he thinks there are a couple of ways we can do this, but they are thinking a lot about the pandemic as they are doing the research for the background context.

Hally Turner, MnDOT, said that she stands by Mr. Schafer's statements. She added that she thinks that what they are seeing for early indicators from their survey, which Mr. Haugen shared with everyone at the Technical Advisory Committee via Constant Contact, where they asked people to share their priorities they are seeing perennial considerations like equity, climate change, transportation options, safety, and asset management; and some of the concerns have been exasperated by the pandemic so she feels like the pandemic is highlighting notable points that we can focus on even though these topics seem to transcend the pandemic.

Grasser commented that as a policy maker, there always ends up being tradeoffs with financing and safety and a whole bunch of other things; this survey has done a good job of trying to capture and prioritize items that people feel are important, but he still struggles a little bit trying to separate a want from a need, from a dream sometimes, and financial consideration sometimes helps clarify that if those priorities, and he isn't sure how to bring that into this conversation, and similar conversations, but to him the question is, is he willing to pay whatever, something like \$10.00 a month additional in some way shape or form, and; 1) is he willing to spend those dollars for some of these priorities and if he is where does he assign those dollars, and he isn't sure if we get this same prioritization when that financial component question gets brought into the process; because otherwise we are getting definitely a list and are we willing to pay for it. Schafer responded that that is a really good point; he thinks that would be part of the MnSHIP updates; that is the investment plan where they say things like, for the MnDOT Districts you need to spend 2% of your funds on pedestrian safety and a percent of your funds on maintaining pavement quality, so when they update their plan and do their engagement that sort of financial, more detailed tradeoffs of what does a million dollars get you for this category and which do you want more, those are the sort of questions they will be asking at a little lower level than what the SMTP is working on with just what general areas are most important to you, if that makes sense. Grasser said that he thinks it does, from his perspective, but he isn't sure it still gets quite the same, reallocating existing dollars is one thing, but is he willing to pay something more to get

more is, he thinks, a different form of that financial question, and he isn't sure what you are describing really necessarily gets to and maybe that is just one of his concerns, but, again, as a policy maker and as an employee in government we often see or receive calls where a want that is portrayed as a need goes away when you start talking about the fact that there is a special assessment for it, but we can accomplish that and suddenly the need tends to go away; just using this as an example of how a problem can be communicated to the government. Schafer said that he is hearing; you are talking about the tradeoffs between financing funds and safety and other desires; the difficulty in prioritizing and separating wants from needs, and also not just to talk about relative funding levels between two competing areas but also to say, well what is the overall funds and where are they coming from. Grasser said that he thinks that is a fair enough summary.

Schafer stated that, just to wrap this up, there are some input opportunities open to the public, and definitely open to this body at www.minnesotago.org; and if you are interested in serving on a focus area work group please let them know; and if there are any other groups or agencies that you are a part of where you would like to have a presentation on the SMTP update given, please let them know that as well. Haugen commented that Ms. Kouba, as part of the Minnesota MPO Director's Group is serving on one of the focus groups, Equity he believes. Kouba responded that is correct.

Hally reported that she would like to add that when Mr. Schafer was sharing the family of plans it should be noted that the investment considerations extend beyond and into all plans except the SMTP so the SMTP by design is a high level policy consideration that helps to at least communicate based on public feedback where we hope the transportation system can go and then each of these plans have the fiscally constraint consideration for how best to do that, it is notable when you have conversations about policy in absence of financial constraints that it does give you a different list or maybe a different range of options, so that feedback was duly noted and summarized by Mr. Schafer, but she just wanted to make sure that matching Mr. Haugen's comments at the top of the presentation that this whole suite of plans that Mr. Schafer is showing on the slide help to deliver their Long Range Transportation Planning processes that include financial considerations.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON NDDOT TRANSPORTATION CONNECTIONS

Haugen reported that with MnDOT introducing us to their planning process he asked the NDDOT if he could just briefly highlight where they are at with their planning process. He said that, as stated earlier, we have been, on almost a monthly basis, getting information from them.

Haugen commented that included in the packet is a brief presentation of them basically telling us that they are drafting the actual plan document, and they hope to release it sometime later this month or early next month. He added that they have identified some of their overarching goals that they will be using as the framework for the plan; those goals are these five: 1) Keeping you safe; 2) Caring for what we have; 3) Connecting North Dakota; 4) Helping you get there, and 5) Investing for the future. He pointed out that underneath the list of goals they have statements where they are using the term "strategies" for each of the five goals.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 20, 2021

Haugen stated that they are writing a document that, as you can tell, their intent is to be less technical and more public facing. He added that all of the meat and potato stuff that we would run to and look at first will be in the appendices. He stated that, again, the timeline; sometime in March, assuming they are able to hold on to this timeline, they plan on having the document out for public consumption and comment, and hope to have it wrapped up by the end of April or Early May.

Haugen reported that we hope to have a more complete draft next month to present to this body, and to start the review and comment period.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FY 2020 BUDGET AMENDMENTS

Haugen reported that periodically at the end of the year we do have to come before the Board and get approval of some adjustments for budget items. He said that today staff is seeking to get approval to move just under \$20,000 up into out Program Administration Category. He explained that, again, our budget is basically formed in the three categories: 1) Program Administration; 2) Program Support and Coordination; and 3) Planning and Implementation. He said that because of primarily COVID, for the General Administration, and then if you will recall this time last year we were correcting an issue with our Inflated Rate costs, and that took a lot of Financial Management effort to get us squared away with the NDDOT and Federal Highway on what we were charging against the grants, so we are proposing to move some funds from Special Studies and Plan Monitoring up to General Administration and Financial Management so they are able to be solvent at the end of the year. He said that, again, this doesn't happen most years, but every once in a while we do have to come before the Board and ask for these types of adjustments, and that is what we are doing today.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE FY2020 BUDGET AMENDMENTS, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF PROPOSED T.I.P. AMENDMENTS

Haugen reported that today staff is asking the MPO Executive Policy Board to essentially reconcile our T.I.P. document to the published S.T.I.P. document on the North Dakota side. He stated that, unfortunately we put a lot of effort into making sure that there is no need to do such an amendment but inevitably in the end there is a need to make adjustments to our T.I.P. to reflect changes that occurred in the S.T.I.P.

Haugen commented that notification was sent out, however it wasn't done in time for action at the Technical Advisory Committee so one of your first actions today is to open the public hearing and to take any public comment.

Haugen stated that the changes focus on a couple of things; first we have a couple of projects here that were not included in our current T.I.P. at all but they ended up being included in the

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 20, 2021

final S.T.I.P., thus we have to come back and introduce them into our T.I.P. document; one is they are implementing a Statewide ITS improvements with the Dynamic Message Signs and there will be one of them in our MPO study are that will be impacted so we have to add that project into our T.I.P. document. He said that the other project is the environmental documentation for the 32nd Avenue Congestion, or otherwise known as the potential 47th Avenue Interchange. He added that in order for this environmental documentation to get any kind of sign-off from Federal Highway it needs to show up in our T.I.P. so we are amending our T.I.P. to include it.

Haugen reported that the other ones are dealing with significant cost changes that occurred between the T.I.P. and the S.T.I.P.; the first one is an increase in the cost of a Mill and Overlay on Gateway Drive out by the new Walmart; the cost increased significantly enough that it required an amendment to the T.I.P., and that policy is an increase of 25% or more, and this did meet that threshold. Haugen stated that the other project is for the multi-use path along South Columbia Road, but in this case there is a significant enough decrease in the cost that it required an amendment to the T.I.P. He explained that the actual bid awards came in considerably less than what was in the T.I.P., thus we need to reflect it in our T.I.P. document to match the S.T.I.P.

Haugen pointed out that the project shown in green on the table is actually what is termed an administrative modification as the increase in cost does not cross that 25% threshold but we do have to make sure that the T.I.P. and S.T.I.P. are reconciled so we are reflecting the change in our T.I.P. now through this administrative modification what those changes are so really the public hearing would just be for those four items that are identified in yellow on the tables, the administrative modification is not subject to the public hearing.

Mock opened the public hearing.

There was no one present for discussion and no written comments were submitted prior to the meeting.

Mock closed the public hearing.

MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE FY2021 T.I.P. AMENDMENTS AS PRESENTED.

Voting Aye: Vetter, Mock, DeMers, Powers, and Grasser.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Strandell, Rost and Vein.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY RFQ

Kouba reported that this is a project that the MPO has been doing on a three year rotation, with the last being done in 2018. She commented that the costs then were lower for the simple reason that we did a level of accuracy for the imagery at a 6-inch pixel rate throughout the entire MPO

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 20, 2021

area, but this time we were asked to do a 3-inch pixel rate within both City limits and 6-inch pixel rate outside both City limits.

Kouba stated that there was conversation about a desire to add an optional cost for acquisition and processing of LiDAR data to produce a Bare Earth Model (BEM) dataset as well. She said that while this would be beneficial, the MPO does not have the funding available to do it so the cost would need to be covered with 100% local funding from both Cities, but there is the benefit that the Cities wouldn't be paying 100% of the aerial photography, so that cost wouldn't be an issue. She said that there was some language that the Cities wanted included in the RFQ that wasn't included when this went to the Technical Advisory Committee, but it is include now and was pointed out in the Staff Report.

Kouba said that both the Technical Advisory Committee and MPO Staff are requesting approval of the Aerial Photography RFQ as submitted.

DeMers asked what the process would be, then, afterwards for each City to retain that LiDAR data or would that have to be decided before the process. Kouba responded that basically the Cities can work through the MPO on all of that and then the MPO would bill each City individually for their portion of the cost of the LiDAR.

Haugen commented that the first thing we would do would be to get the quotes, and then as we come before the Board for approval, we would be looking for the Aerial Photo, but at that time we would also have, then, the option identified as to what the cost would be for the LiDAR. He added that we would be working with both Cities and the Consultant selected on how to further that endeavor if it is wished to be exercised, so at some point, in March or April; probably March is when both Cities would, if they wanted to be part of the start of the process to exercise the LiDAR, would need to work with the Consultant chosen to see how long available after the flight is made that each of these two Cities, individually or together could pick up the options, so that is something that they will continue to work on with the Consultant chosen.

MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE REQUEST FOR QUOTES (RFQ) FOR THE AERIAL IMAGERY COLLECTION WITH THE AGREED UPON LANGUAGE FOR SECTION VIII, BACKGROUND AND SCOPE OF WORK PART D, ADDITIONAL OPTIONS, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Rost and Vein.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF CANDIDATE T.I.P. PROJECTS – MINNESOTA SIDE

a. Transportation Alternative Candidate Project

Haugen reported that last month we looked at the North Dakota side candidate projects, this month we are focusing on the Minnesota side.

Haugen stated that due to funding and program differences between the two States there aren't quite as many projects for us to consider this time on the Minnesota side.

Haugen said that other than those other knowns that we went through last month, fiscal constraint is a little different on the Minnesota side as well. He stated that one of the main differences is that North Dakota uses the term "Pending", where a project that won't proceed unless in a given year there is fiscal availability for the project to be constructed, but Minnesota uses a technique called "Advanced Construction"; so whereas North Dakota would say "Pending" and not proceed with the project, Minnesota uses this technique where they actually construct the project and then the following year, when the federal funds are appropriated they would then pay back the project costs, so their fiscal constraint is a little different.

Haugen stated, then, that on the Minnesota side we do have just two programs that we are being asked to consider any changes on; the first one is the Transportation Alternatives Program.

Haugen said that for the Transportation Alternatives Program we did receive a request from the City of East Grand Forks for Safe Kids Grand Forks. He added that perhaps most of you know, but he will just mention that, in part due to the pandemic, Altru has asked Safe Kids, one of its affiliate agencies to seek ways to augment their funding so East Grand Forks and Safe Kids are currently working on a project; they were successful in getting some transportation alternatives funds a few years ago for Safe Kids to do some educational encouragement activities in East Grand Forks and they will have that funding in place for the next couple of years so in that vein they are continuing to focus on receiving more transportation alternative funds so they can continue that program.

Haugen commented that the current funding from the Minnesota side is a small amount available for 2024 but the bulk of it is in 2025, so while this is a future funding request, just to highlight it, they currently have TAP dollars coming in for the next three years to sustain the program they are doing as part of the East Grand Forks shared use trail that will be going in this year.

Haugen stated that this is consistent with our plan. He said that we are also noting that in order to perhaps make this more palatable to the rest of the Northwest Minnesota they are expanding their program to not just be in East Grand Forks, but also to include Crookston, Thief River Falls, and Fisher, Minnesota and they do have letters of support from those school districts indicating that they are anxious and open to having Safe Kids come to their communities, so we are recommending that it be considered consistent with our plan and provide it as our highest ranking transportation alternative program candidate project on the Minnesota side.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVE CANDIDATE PROJECT FOR THE FY2022-2025 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING.

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

b. HSIP-Railroad Crossing Candidate Project

Haugen reported that this is something that came to our attention late last week, and it is regarding the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) set aside for railroad crossing safety. He stated that the only details we have is the letter that was attached, and he is aware that in East Grand Forks they have been working on establishing a quiet zone in their downtown area.

Haugen commented that the Downtown Transportation Study that we just completed makes note of that quiet zone work, so this is potential funding to upgrade the traffic signal at 2nd Avenue in East Grand Forks and then the other would be closure of 3rd Street N.W., the one that is closest to the Red River, and it would be a complete closure of vehicle traffic.

Haugen stated that through e-mail exchanges the cost estimate, which is a working one, would be \$350,000, with a 90/10 split. He said that right now, as of today, there is really no other project details that they are willing to share with us on the Minnesota side. He added that what is going to happen is that at some point in 2022 the City, the State, and BNSF will finalize what all activities will take place at these two crossings, and at a possible 3rd crossing, so between now and 2023 when construction happens we might have one or two opportunities to do a cost adjustment based on what that final scoping is, so unfortunately we don't have a lot of good detail or information, not even an application, but what we do have is MnDOT saying they want to put some federal funds towards East Grand Forks railroad crossings; it is two essentially complete signal upgrades; at one of the crossings they might participate with some federal funds at the closure of another crossing and right now the total cost is \$350,000 with a 90/10 split, and based on the information we have we are saying it is consistent with our long range plan, and we recommend giving it priority ranking.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE HSIP – RAILROAD CROSSING PROJECTS FOR THE FY2022-2025 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AS PRESENTED, AND TO GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING.

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

Haugen commented that before we move on to the next item, just as this program came to us kind of at the last minute, overall on the Minnesota side there is great effort being done to better engage the MPOs in all of these federal programs and also our coordination of T.I.P. solicitation projects so hopefully a year from now it is a much more improved process and we aren't getting sort of these up in the air detail things at the last minute asking for action as quickly as possible, so this was hopefully more of an unusual thing that happened today, and we are working hard with all of our partners on the Minnesota side to make it a much more improved process.

Al Grasser dropped out of the Zoom meeting at this time.

MATTER OF AUTHORIZING A CONTRACT WITH ALLIANT ENGINEERING FOR FUTURE BRIDGE TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY

Haugen reported that we did release an RFP, and was quite excited that we were able to get five (5) proposals; it has been quite a while since we have gotten this many responses to an RFP. He stated that they did have the Selection Committee review, as indicated in the RFP that we would only interview the top three (3) proposals, interviews were held on Monday the 11th and the Selection Committee is recommending that we execute a contract with Prime Firm Alliant Engineering, with the subconsultant Widseth.

Haugen commented that included in the packet was the Scope of Work that was included in the proposal. He said that he did ask the Selection Committee members to review this scope of work and provide any feedback they might have in terms of things they might want changed, added, etc., and we did not receive any feedback from them, but as the staff report indicated there were some minor tweaks we were making particularly to when we get to review things prior to it being released to the public, and those tweaks have been negotiated with Alliant so staff is recommending the MPO Executive Policy Board authorize the Chair and Executive Director execute a contract with Alliant at a cost not to exceed \$125,000.

MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING THE CHAIR AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR EXECUTE THE CONTRACT FOR THE FUTURE BRIDGE TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY WITH ALLIANT AT A COST NOT TO EXCEED \$125,000.

Voting Aye: Vetter, Mock, Strandell, DeMers, and Powers.

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Grasser, Rost and Vein.

Haugen referred to the scope of work and pointed out that he is highlighting the section regarding the Ad Hoc Group. He explained that, as you will recall, when we released the RFP we spent some time discussing who should really make up this group membership, and so on; so the first 30 days the primary work will be developing and finalizing the public engagement and public improvement involvement plan so one of the things they would ask of each of you is that you spend some time discussing with them, or between yourselves, who should make up the Ad

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 20, 2021

Hoc Group. He pointed out that the consultant is recommending no more than fifteen (15) members, just for logistics sake on their side, but we aren't bound by that recommendation. He said that they are also, instead of trying to identify exact individuals that we focus on agencies, etc., so if you can do a little homework, and if you haven't already been discussing this please start talking about how we should have this Ad Hoc Group formulated, what are expectations are of them as they help guide this study effort forward. Mock asked if people should e-mail their suggestions to Mr. Haugen. Haugen responded that that would be one way of doing it. He added that he is sure that everyone will go back to the agency they are representing and have discussions with them as well. He said that some of you might represent the wards these are in, some of you are not the representatives of those wards so you might want to touch base with them to get some feedback as to how they want to have this Ad Hoc Group formulated, and what their expectations are.

Haugen said that he would expect that at our March meeting we will have that final public engagement/public involvement plan before you with that Ad Hoc Group kind of fleshed out for your consideration.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Haugen reported that no public comments were received prior to the meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2020 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that an updated copy of the 2020 Annual Work Program Update was included in the packet. He pointed out that East Grand Forks has a website to which you should have received a Constant Contact e-mail with the web address. He stated that on the North Dakota side they are just starting the Grand Forks Land Use Plan. He added that the website for it is not up and running yet; they just got the consultant on board a week ago.

b. Approval Of Bill/Check List For 12/12/20 To 1/15/21 Period

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE BILLS/CHECKS FOR THE 12/12/20 TO 1/15/21 PERIOD.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO ADJOURN THE JANUARY 20, 2021 MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:06 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,
Peggy McNelis, Office Manager

Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO
Transaction List by Vendor
 December 12, 2020 through January 15, 2021

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
AFLAC.							
Liability Check	12/24/2020	AFLAC	501	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-517.90
Alerus Financial							
Liability Check	12/24/2020	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,538.52
Liability Check	01/08/2021	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,562.18
Business Essentials							
Bill	12/14/2020	Inv. #...	Office Supplie...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-28.90
Bill Pmt -Check	12/14/2020	6995	Office Supplie...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-28.90
Bill	12/14/2020	Inv. #...	Office Supplie...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-29.79
Bill Pmt -Check	12/14/2020	6996	Office Supplie...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-29.79
CitiBusiness Card							
Bill	12/22/2020	Acct #...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-246.62
Bill Pmt -Check	12/22/2020	7005	Charges For ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-246.62
Fidelity Security Life.							
Liability Check	12/24/2020	7000	50790-1043	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-8.44
Liberty Business Systems, Inc.							
Bill	12/17/2020	Inv. #...	Contract Bas...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-162.66
Bill Pmt -Check	12/17/2020	6999	Contract Bas...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-162.66
LSNB as Trustee for PEHP							
Liability Check	12/24/2020	PEHP		104 · Checking		216 · Post-Hea...	-123.75
Madison Nat'l Life							
Liability Check	12/22/2020	7004		104 · Checking		215 · Disability...	-1.54
Liability Check	12/24/2020	7001		104 · Checking		215 · Disability...	-66.56
Mike's							
Bill	12/16/2020		MPO Lunche...	206 · Accounts Pay...		711 · Miscellan...	-88.00
Bill Pmt -Check	12/16/2020	6998	MPO Lunche...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-88.00
Minnesota Department of Revenue							
Liability Check	12/24/2020	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-189.00
Liability Check	01/08/2021	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-192.00
Minnesota Life Insurance Company							
Liability Check	12/24/2020	7002		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-111.72
Nationwide Retirement Solutions							
Liability Check	12/24/2020	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-433.07
Liability Check	01/08/2021	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-470.89
NDPERS							
Liability Check	12/24/2020	NDPE...	D88	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-3,024.08
Liability Check	01/06/2021	NDPE...		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,532.36
North Dakota State University							
Bill	12/15/2020	Inv. #...	546 - Yr 6 Ba...	206 · Accounts Pay...		-SPLIT-	-37,844.00
Bill Pmt -Check	12/15/2020	6997	546 - Yr 6 Ba...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-37,844.00
QuickBooks Payroll Service							
Liability Check	12/22/2020		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-6,372.66
Liability Check	01/07/2021		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-6,423.99
Standard Insurance Company							
Liability Check	12/24/2020	7003		104 · Checking		217 · Dental P...	-118.88
State Tax Commissioner							
Liability Check	01/05/2021	NDST...	45038827301	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-427.00
Vaaler Insurance, Inc.							
Bill	01/12/2021	Inv. #...	Insurance Co...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-1,355.31
Bill Pmt -Check	01/12/2021	7007	Insurance Co...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-1,355.31
WSB & Associates, Inc.							
Bill	01/04/2021	R-016...	Work On EG...	206 · Accounts Pay...		560 · Land Us...	-2,713.37
Bill Pmt -Check	01/04/2021	7006	Work On EG...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-2,713.37
Bill	01/12/2021	Inv. #...	Work On 205...	206 · Accounts Pay...		560 · Land Us...	-7,157.56
Bill Pmt -Check	01/12/2021	7008	Work On 205...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-7,157.56