

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, March 17, 2021 - 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks Training Conference Room/Zoom Meeting**

CALL TO ORDER

Jeannie Mock, Chairwoman, called the March 17, 2021, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:00 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

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

Absent: Ken Vein.

Guest(s): Stewart Milakovic, NDDOT and Baird Bream, Cambridge Systematics, Inc. (Via Zoom)

Staff present: 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

Mock declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 17TH, 2021, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 17TH, 2021, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF NDDOT TRANSPORTATION CONNECTIONS UPDATE

Haugen stated that he would like to highlight that this has been our almost monthly update on the NDDOT Long Range Transportation Plan. He said that they are getting near the end and will now turn the screen over to Stewart Milakovic, who is with the NDDOT, who will introduce his consultant who will do the presentation.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 17, 2021

Milakovic reported that they have entered their public comment period on the Transportation Connection Plan and they have both the Draft Plan and the Appendices on-line and he will now have Baird Bream provide the update to you.

Bream reported that this is just a brief update to announce the release of the draft document for Transportation Connection; adding that it is available on their website at: www.transportationconnection.org. He stated that you will be able to access the pdf of the draft plan itself for your review; they have a separate survey where you will be able to fill out to provide your comments, reactions, thoughts, areas of improvement or suggestions; additionally they have several appendices that provide some information on how the plan was developed, what sort of analysis was conducted to kind of inform the plan, what they heard from the public; its been really great to get all the input, they are very pleased to be able to share it all with you.

Bream commented that they also had two public meetings on March 9th; one in the afternoon and one in the evening, and they posted a recording of the afternoon session on-line for you to review. He added that the public meeting will be very similar, in terms of content to the draft plan and the appendices; just, obviously, they are a more streamlined version that explains what the plan is designed to do, how they put the plan together, and what some of the major components are of the plan. He said that there was also a brief Q&A comment session during the public meeting as well.

Bream stated that their public comment period is open now through April 12th, so during that time all of these materials will be available and the survey will be open so we encourage everyone to check it out. He added that you can also submit comments directly to Mr. Haugen or to Mr. Milakovic (smilakovic@nd.gov). He said that he knows it says on the slide to submit comments by the April MPO meeting date, but if you could actually get them to them a week prior to that meeting it would give them time to be able to review them and respond to them, that would be great.

Haugen commented that they had asked the Technical Advisory Committee to submit any comments by April 8th if you are going to submit them through the MPO staff so that they can forward them on to the Team in Bismarck.

Bream thanked everyone and said that they are really looking forward to hearing what you have to say on this and they really appreciate your input throughout this entire process and they are in the homestretch and, again are really looking forward to what you have to say.

Information only.

MATTER OF PROPOSED DEFINITION OF “REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT” FOR T.I.P. PURPOSES

Haugen reported that this is connected to the next agenda item as well. He explained that right before the first of the year the NDDOT contacted the three MPOs and said that Federal Highway

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 17, 2021

wants to change how we define regionally significant projects in our T.I.P. document; and it would be a substantial change to how we had previously defined regionally significant.

Haugen stated that the previous way that we have defined it for a considerable amount of years was to, he believes that the term “regionally significant” implied it were the projects that typically wouldn’t show up in the T.I.P., but would need to have federal action, or were using federal funds from a different entity than the DOT, or were large enough that they affected our regional traffic, so we were looking, previously, that “regionally significant” meant mostly projects that were not the norm, not those that were already being federally funded, etc.

Haugen said that what Federal Highway instead wants us to do is to only use the word “significantly significant” for those projects that get the full federal involvement, so it is almost a 180-degree shift from what we previously thought, from looking at projects that weren’t typically federally involved to now looking at projects that should only be having the full federal involvement.

Haugen commented that the full federal involvement goes into more of what is already in our T.I.P. but rarely used; but each project has a development process that if follows, once it gets programmed into the T.I.P. then the project development starts, and that usually is the preliminary engineering that usually proceeds by a year or so the actual construction, and so for now these regionally significant projects will have to have all of these individual phases shown in the T.I.P. document. He added that in the past we typically would have just one listing for that project, that would be the construction year, and then sometimes we would also show how much funding is set aside for preliminary engineering, right of way purchase if there is any right-of-way that is being anticipated, those would all show up in the same year.

Now for the ones that we define as regionally significant, each year that that activity or phase is being done on that project it will show separately so for projects that are defined now as regionally significant we might have up to four years of phasing shown for that project, the fourth year being construction, and because that places a lot of added administrative emphasis to these projects we were encouraged, and we worked with the other two MPOs to try to very narrowly define the types of projects that would get this full package, and so we’ve come up with the following proposed definition; one is projects involving the interstate that add capacity either by an interchange or by through lanes on the interstate, and there aren’t many of those in any given year in North Dakota; the second one is, when we are using federal funds to finance a completely new roadway that includes the purchase of right-of-way, that also would trigger this, and there aren’t a lot of those in North Dakota either; and the last one is because our T.I.P. document isn’t just about streets, we identified what would potentially be a transit project that would be involved.

Haugen stated that where they are at now is bringing this to you - there is still a meeting that is going to be held with the NDDOT; this is the definition that we might come out of the meeting with, this is the definition they are going into the meeting with, so sometime in April or May, sometime in the near future, the Board will be asked to adopt this definition as what we will use as “regionally significant”. He added that there is still a possibility that we could, if this is the

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 17, 2021

result that you are asked to look at, we could tweak it just a little bit to reflect our unique MPO issues, so it is not absolute that we have to adopt this definition, we could still have the opportunity to tweak it.

Haugen commented that another thing to note is that this is being pushed primarily on the North Dakota side because they finance a lot of these phases with federal funds, whereas in Minnesota, their policy is that typically they only use federal funds for the construction phase, so we don't anticipate this having any impact on Minnesota that we don't already have going on in Minnesota, so it is really a North Dakota item, although this definition will encompass both sides of the river in our Metropolitan area.

Haugen stated that this is really just an informational item for you now; we were tasked to change how we define "regionally significant" so that Federal Highway could get all of the accurate phasing of projects in the T.I.P., and we are purposely trying to provide a narrow definition so that it is infrequent and is really only for projects that are of real high significance taking place.

DeMers said that Mr. Haugen's last set of comments about Minnesota kind of led into his question; you said that the Minnesota side shouldn't be affected but has MnDOT representatives on the Technical Advisory Committee made any comments about it or do we need to run it by them anyway just to get their blessing on this too or do we anticipate that they wouldn't oppose any changes whether it would affect them or not. Haugen responded that they have engaged MnDOT throughout this process, had several meetings with them, first to introduce what is going on on the North Dakota side to make sure they understood what we are doing and then to see if it had any impact on them, and as he stated, the Minnesota policy is to not use federal funds except on construction; the reason we are doing this is because North Dakota does fund with federal funds a lot of the PE, if there is right-of-way to be purchased they use federal funds, and each time they use those funds Federal Highway has to take an action on it, and they need to have it in a T.I.P. or S.T.I.P. document in order for them to take that action.

Vetter asked if North Dakota was gathering input from all the MPOs so that it will be one definition for the entire State or is each MPO throughout the State going to have a different definition. Haugen responded that they are trying to come up with a common definition, but then each MPO can make a decision that if unique circumstances arise in an MPO area they can tweak them further if they wish, but it would be a unique situation to that MPO, so it is a one common definition, however it still allows the ability of each individual MPO to tweak it to what fits their unique situation.

Strandell asked if there will be more than one MPO in North Dakota. Haugen responded that there will. Strandell said that he thought both Grand Forks and Bismarck were in danger of losing their status. Haugen responded that that wouldn't be in the future, or anytime soon. Strandell stated that he thought he saw a news release story on that, some federal action that was taking place. Haugen responded that there is something proposed but it doesn't directly affect the issue that you are asking about, there has to be several more actions taking place, and so the question is will those actions take place. He stated that what is being discussed right now is, the

Trump Administration, one of their last acts was to release a proposal to change the definition of Metropolitan Statistical Areas, which is out of the office of Management and Budget in the White House; Metropolitan Statistical Area is a completely separate term from what we are, which is a Metropolitan Planning Organization, so there isn't a direct correlation between how one is defined and how we are defined. Strandell said that the story he read had the population number changed from 50,000 to 100,000, and that would eliminate both Bismarck and Grand Forks. Haugen said it would do so as a Metropolitan Statistical Area designation, and that is just a statistical designation by the office of OMB; Metropolitan Planning Organizations are defined differently and they are established by a different federal agency, and operate under different federal rules and regulations, so the article, and he is aware of them as well, tend to say that it might lead to a domino effect, and if you think of a simple domino row in a straight line that is spaced correctly, yes there is a domino effect, but he would hope you would think of this as one of those more complex domino designs in which after the first domino there are many branches, and unless all of those branches are set exactly the dominos might not fall for all of the branches, and so that is how he would ask you to look at this issue; the issue of whether the MPO exists or not is one of those branches and those dominos are going to be more tricky to topple.

Information only.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO FY2021 ANNUAL ELEMENT OF 2021-2024 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that one of the amendments that is proposed here is a direct reflection of this term "regionally significant"; and what we have to do to satisfy Federal Highway for the immediate 2021 Fiscal Year, and referring to the last page of the tables, he stated it shows up here. He said that for those projects that aren't regionally significant, and the bulk of our projects in our T.I.P. on the North Dakota side are federally financed, we are able to group those individual phases for those projects, so this listing that shows that we are going to allocate \$620,000 for preliminary engineering, that is going to cover all of the preliminary engineering that will be financed with federal funds that are not regionally significant on the North Dakota side, so, again, because we kind of defined the term "regionally significant" most of these projects are on the NDDOTs State System, and so they were able to use the definition as defined as it is and come up for the rest of the projects, then, this is what they already have basically scoped for those three phases, preliminary engineering, right-of-way, and utilities. He commented that he hadn't mentioned utilities before but some for some projects there are some utility costs that have to be done with the project.

Haugen stated that in our future T.I.P.s, for the non-regionally significant projects we will have an annual listing of these groups of PE, Right-of-way and Utilities, and again most of those projects will involve NDDOT State Highways.

Haugen said that this is the first results of this process; in order for Federal Highways to approve projects in 2021 we had to amend our T.I.P. to show these phases for those non-regionally significant projects.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 17, 2021

Haugen reported that the second project that is being amended into the T.I.P. is a statewide project is a statewide signing for the State Park system to guide tourists and others to, in our case, turn off at the U.S. #2 exit to go to the Turtle River State Park, and so this is the federal portion of that project that is assigned to our I-29, within our study area, so there is a sign for the northbound traffic to turn off at U.S.#2 and also one for the southbound to turn off at U.S.#2. He said that this is a completely new project that came in after we adopted our T.I.P. and after the S.T.I.P., so it is bringing in a new project and new money so it is fiscally neutral.

Haugen stated that the third thing we are doing is called an Administrative Modification; with the transit service taking over the UND Shuttle, it added service hours so we are just accurately reflecting that instead of 62 ½ hours per week they are performing 133 hours of service.

Haugen said that these are the three things we are changing to our T.I.P., two are amendments that go through the formal process and the other is an Administrative Modification. He added that we did hold a public hearing last Wednesday at our Technical Advisory Committee meeting and there were no written or oral comments submitted, and both the Technical Advisory Committee and MPO Staff are recommending approval of the T.I.P. amendment to the 2021 Annual Element.

MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY ROST, TO APPROVE THE FY2021 T.I.P. AMENDMENTS, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Vein.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF A.T.A.C. COUNT STUDY AMENDMENT

Haugen reported that, as you know, in our work program we have a line item to have A.T.A.C. help us with our turning counts. He said that this amendment is adding three signal locations to the program; one is actually a new signal location at Oxford and University, and the other two are existing signals that we are now able to start capturing count data with them, so this is the contract amendment to include those three locations at a cost of just under \$5,000.00.

Haugen state that both the Technical Advisory Committee and MPO Staff are recommending approval of this contract.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE AMENDMENT #9 TO THE GF-EGF MPO PLANNING SUPPORT PROGRAM MASTER AGREEMENT WITH A.T.A.C., AND TO AUTHORIZE THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIGN THE CONTRACT AT A COST OF \$4,948.00.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.
Absent: Vein.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

Haugen reported that this is a requirement that the State DOT, Transit Operator, and the MPO; or in our case, because we are a Bi-State MPO, both State DOTs, both Transit Operators, and the MPO enter into an agreement. He said that this has been a long-standing requirement, and our current agreement was agreed to in 2010, and a lot has changed since then, particularly the federal laws, and we have gone into performance based planning and programming so the agreement needed to be updated. He said that it has been close to 2 ½ years in the works, off and on, not that it was difficult to do it was just one of those paper busy works that needed to be accomplished but wasn't at the top of the priority list, but ultimately it was crafted and has been agreed to by both State DOTs and both Transit Operators, with the Transit Operators already signing it.

Haugen commented that, although this is a requirement, the basic understanding is that the agreement is not a legally binding document, although that was never written in the past agreements, this agreement, as he noted in the staff report, did put that in black and white. He stated that this was discussed at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting and both the Technical Advisory Committee and MPO Staff are recommending that the MPO also sign the agreement as well.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY ROST, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIGN THE MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT, AS PRESENTED.

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

Haugen reported that, if the Chair will allow, there is a separate agreement that is referenced in here that he just wanted to remind everyone of; it is this Performance Based Planning, there is a separate agreement that we have that identifies the roles and responsibilities specific to performance based planning and programming. He said that with this agreement being adopted on the North Dakota side you will see, soon hopefully, a new agreement on Performance Based Planning and Programming; not to confuse you but there are two separate agreements so you will see another one soon, hopefully, on the Performance Based Planning and Programming as well.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FY2020 ANNUAL LISTING OF OBLIGATIONS

Haugen reported that the Annual Listing of Obligations is another requirement MPOs must produce annually. He referred to the second table in the packet and pointed out that it shows what projects we had in 2020 that were programmed, and what was actually obligated to those

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 17, 2021

projects, which doesn't necessarily mean that that was the exact amount spent. He added that some of these projects aren't completely closed out, but this is primarily the amount of federal funds that were set aside for each specific project; so we are showing how the projects were in the current T.I.P., and that is the bottom line you see highlighted in yellow. He specifically referred to the GF Project #3 and pointed out that it is regarding some capital purchases for the bus system that we had programmed, or estimated that we would spend just under a million dollars, but what was actually obligated to date has been just under \$700,000.00, and over on the far right we identified that the reason it is less than what was programmed was because there are some bus shelters that are still waiting to be processed through the government granting process.

Haugen stated that, for the most part you can see that what was estimated for the projects and what was obligated was fairly close, and most projects have moved forward in 2020, but it was noted that there were a couple of projects on the North Dakota side that were delayed into 2021 for one reason or another.

Haugen said that on the Minnesota side the only projects that were programmed in 2020 were all transit related.

Haugen commented that the last thing we are supposed to do for each project is to identify if there were any specific ped or bike facilities were included in the project, and in most cases the only thing that was added were either ADA curb ramps at intersections, or there were a couple of enhancement projects in which the bike path was the actual project itself.

Haugen stated that in the end we had close to \$40 million dollars that we were programming, we ended up obligating \$25 million dollars; again because of couple of those big projects were delayed, the biggest being the safety improvements on 32nd Avenue, which will now be done this year, originally it was to be done in 2020.

Haugen commented that the other thing to note is that on the transit side; the CARES ACT, as a result of Covid, preempted all of the programming that we had done previously and they got a lot of money to pay for the increased sanitation that had to take place to keep those transit services in operation, so it really skewed any of our transit financial planning that took place.

Haugen stated that this is, again, that report that we are required to do annually; it does highlight what each project was estimated to cost when we programmed it; many of these we programmed originally almost four years prior to the actual obligation date, so this is a test of our financial planning to see how close we are tracking with our financial plans and to see whether we are indeed creating a multi-modal system when we implement these projects by identifying whether a bike/ped facility was resulting from the project.

Haugen said that this is a pretty straight forward draft, and both the Technical Advisory Committee and MPO Staff are recommending you adopt it as your 2020 Annual Listing of Obligations.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE FY2020 ANNUAL LISTING OF OBLIGATIONS, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Vein.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Haugen reported that there were no public comments submitted, and there is no one from the public in attendance either in person or online for comments.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2021 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that this is our monthly project update.

- 1) Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update – Haugen stated that the Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update is up and running, there is a website you can go visit when you have the opportunity, the link is: www.gf2050plan.com. He said that the Steering Committee, or Land Use Subcommittee, met earlier this month, so it is off and running.
- 2) East Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update – Haugen reported that East Grand Forks is further along with their Land Use Plan Update, as you are all aware; there was a survey/Wiki-Mapping that closed earlier this week so we will start getting the results together from that. He added that they did have pretty good participation, and have had some great opportunities with other agencies to help promote the surveys. He asked if Ms. Kouba had an update on what the number of participants was. Kouba responded that they updated the number of participants to 83 for the survey but they still have some comments from the Wiki-maps to input, so they will be getting a full rundown of how well both surveys and Wiki-map did, then will move on to their next steps on Monday so she will have a full understanding of how well those efforts did moving forward. She said that they will be starting to look at goals and objectives, that will be the next task in this process.
- 3) Future Bridge Traffic Impact Study – Haugen commented that last month this body had a lot of discussion on the Ad Hoc Group, since then we have completed the membership of that group and he did distribute a copy of that list to all of you, so we have eleven people confirmed to participate in that group. He stated that there is about a 95% confidence that the first meeting will be Tuesday, April 6th at 9:30 a.m. He said that there will be an option for both in-person or virtual

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 17, 2021

participation, the in-person will be at the Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers, and it will also be live on both City's TV Channels, and on both City's Facebooks Accounts and the MPO's Facebook Account.

Haugen reported that they are also utilizing the Technical Advisory Committee as the Project Management Team for the study as well and they have a Special Technical Advisory Committee meeting on Friday morning, so in the sequence of things, prior to things being distributed and discussed by the Ad Hoc Group, we will first vet it through the Technical Advisory Committee to make sure it is technically sound, and then it will go through the Ad Group, and then, as with most things, it will go back to the Technical Advisory Committee for their reaction, and then to the MPO Board for that sequence of the study process. He explained that we are utilizing the full Technical Advisory Committee because, as we started to look at all of the agencies that might be involved in just a smaller project team it ended up being almost the membership of the Technical Advisory Committee so we just asked the Technical Advisory Committee to fill that role, and from this point forward it might not be a special meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee but just at their regular meeting each month as a regular agenda item.

Haugen commented that the Future Bridge Traffic Impact Study is about to start in earnest; our consulting firm, Alliant, has been in town gathering data, they had some equipment set up to do turning movement counts at some of the intersections that don't have traffic signals, and so we have been working hard. He said that the first public event will be this Ad Hoc Group meeting on April 6th, and we will continue moving forward from there.

Strandell asked where the meeting was being held. Haugen responded that the physical in-person option will be at the Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers. He added that if we have all eleven Ad Hoc members in attendance, he hasn't gotten the exact number of how many more people can attend in person, but there is a limited number of people that can attend due to physical distance guidelines, and we are assuming the 6-foot distance however that may be changing soon, so if you aren't an Ad Hoc Group member, we are inviting you to participate or watch via the Zoom Webinar or the Facebook feed or TV. He said that there will also be playback opportunities as well.

Strandell commented that on the bridge subject he had a meeting with Rhinehart Township Board members maybe two weeks ago, and he just wanted to make sure that they were on board with what is going on, that they knew what was going on, and they of course had lots of concerns. He stated that Rich Sanders, one of their Ad Hoc Members and the Polk County Engineer, said that basically Rhinehart would have Aye or Nay powers on a bridge location, so we need to keep them informed and included in the process; he doesn't think there is a division here, but if something is totally against their wishes they could stop the

project. DeMers responded that we could get nuclear if we wanted if it comes inside the levy, he thinks the City can annex property for the bridge. Strandell said that we would have to have the bridge come into East Grand Forks city limits. DeMers responded that that could happen. He added that he is just saying; we want to have a good relationship with everybody, but if there is a chance of anything happening like that. Strandell said that he doesn't think there is a problem there but their big concern is traffic on Rhinehart Drive, it isn't built for more traffic. He said that a new east/west route extended over to the Hartsville Road and come in there, that would work out well because they would turn north and come to 13th Street which is where the school traffic goes in. He said, again, that he doesn't think there is a big problem but if there is something they are totally opposed to; we need to keep them in the loop.

Powers asked what the future of the Rhinehart drive is. Strandell responded that that road was built by the neighborhood themselves, and it is built for local traffic, it really has no shoulders and some of the houses are way too close to the road, so it would be a real problem to try to rebuild that area. Powers said, though, that sooner or later it is going to annexed isn't it. Vetter responded that if the City grows south maybe. Strandell said, though, that they have to agree to the annexation, you can't just take it. Vetter responded that they can take it.

Vetter said that there is someone from the Rhinehart Township on the Ad Hoc Committee. Strandell said that John Zavoral is their representative on the committee. He stated that, ultimately, we need to keep them informed as there could be a problem if we try to ram something down their throats without keeping them in the loop.

- 4) Aerial Photo Update – Haugen reported that the Aerial Photo Imagery is under contract with Aryes Associates. Kouba added that they are waiting for the right conditions to do the fly over; we are mostly looking at the ice on the river right now, which could be gone soon as we are going to have a really nice weekend, so we will probably be looking at having it done very soon.

Haugen commented that after it is flown then there is a lot of post processing that needs to take place so it still be fall before we actually have a product.

DeMers asked, with the frost still in the ground, and with this process doing LiDAR, do we need to wait until the frost comes out or would that be too late. Kouba responded that she doesn't know about constructional wise, but if we wait too long we will have issues with leaves on the trees. DeMers responded that he understands that but his concern is if we have a frost condition we could be 2 to 3 tenths off on our LiDAR, when you are talking bridges it could be an issue.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 17, 2021

- b. Approval Of Bill/Check List For 2/13/21 To 3/12/21 Period

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE BILLS/CHECKS FOR THE 2/13/21 TO 3/12/21 PERIOD.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO ADJOURN THE MARCH 17, 2021 MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:46 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,
Peggy McNelis, Office Manager

Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO
Transaction List by Vendor
 February 13 through March 12, 2021

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
AFLAC.							
Liability Check	02/19/2021	AFLAC	501	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-517.90
Alerus Financial							
Liability Check	02/16/2021	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-4,004.72
Liability Check	03/05/2021	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,569.16
CitiBusiness Card							
Bill	02/24/2021	Acct. ...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-64.32
Bill Pmt -Check	02/25/2021	7028	Charges For ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-64.32
Fidelity Security Life.							
Liability Check	02/19/2021	AVESIS	50790-1043	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-8.43
Liberty Business Systems, Inc.							
Bill	02/17/2021	Inv. #...	Contract Bas...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-162.66
Bill Pmt -Check	02/17/2021	7022	Contract Bas...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-162.66
LSNB as Trustee for PEHP							
Liability Check	02/19/2021	PEHP		104 · Checking	X	216 · Post-Hea...	-123.76
Madison Nat'l Life							
Liability Check	02/19/2021	7025		104 · Checking		215 · Disability...	-67.34
Mike's							
Bill	02/17/2021		MPO Lunche...	206 · Accounts Pay...		711 · Miscellan...	-102.00
Bill Pmt -Check	02/17/2021	7023	MPO Lunche...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-102.00
Minnesota Department of Revenue							
Liability Check	02/19/2021	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-284.00
Liability Check	03/05/2021	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-200.00
Minnesota Life Insurance Company							
Liability Check	02/19/2021	7026		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-111.72
Nationwide Retirement Solutions							
Liability Check	02/19/2021	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-470.89
Liability Check	03/05/2021	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-495.89
NDPERS							
Liability Check	02/19/2021	NDPE...	D88	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-3,059.28
Liability Check	03/05/2021	NDPE...		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,532.36
QuickBooks Payroll Service							
Liability Check	02/18/2021		Created by P...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-6,425.08
Liability Check	03/04/2021		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-6,384.00
Standard Insurance Company							
Liability Check	02/19/2021	7027		104 · Checking		217 · Dental P...	-118.88
WSB & Associates, Inc.							
Bill	02/26/2021	Inv. #...	Work On EG...	206 · Accounts Pay...		560 · Land Us...	-6,884.14
Bill Pmt -Check	02/26/2021	7029	Work On EG...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-6,884.14
WSI							
Bill	02/17/2021	Statel...	Premium Cha...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-250.00
Bill Pmt -Check	02/17/2021	7024	Premium Cha...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-250.00