

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, April 21, 2021 - 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks Training Conference Room/Zoom Meeting**

CALL TO ORDER

Jeannie Mock, Chairwoman, called the April 21, 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: Marc DeMers, Warren Strandell, Mike Powers, Bob Rost, Jeannie Mock, Al Grasser, and Ken Vein (Via Zoom).

Absent: Clarence Vetter.

Guest(s): Brian Opsahl, Brady Martz.

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 MARCH 17TH, 2021, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

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

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF 2020 MPO AUDIT REPORT

Haugen introduced Brian Opsahl from Brady Martz, who is present to give a brief overview of the Final MPO 2020 Audit Report.

Opsahl stated that there should be no surprises looking at the audit report this year. He referred to the 2020 Audit Report, and accompanying letters, and went over the information briefly.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 21, 2021

Opsahl commented that there were no new accounting policies adopted in 2020, so there aren't any major changes to what you saw from last year to this year in terms of how the numbers were arrived at. He added, however, that within the financial statements on a government wide level there will be a couple of estimates that are subject to change from year to year; those are related to the pension liability and NDPERS OPEB; and your involvement in those entities has an estimate that is put together by an actuary and that actuary can change from year to year based off changes in their assumptions, and he just wanted to point that out as it will help explain the financials a little bit.

Opsahl said that there were no difficulties performing the audit, no disagreements with management, so the audit process went very smoothly, as it usually does, and they appreciate all the help they got with it.

Opsahl referred to the Management Report, which is a two-page handout, and stated that as they go through the audit process from year to year they look at different things each year, and take different samples, and if they come across anything they feel that may be operating okay, but could be done better, this is where they put those items that need to be considered best practices. He stated that there was nothing major found at this time, and it is up to the Board or Management to decide if there is a benefit or cost benefit to put the suggestions in place.

Opsahl referred to the 2020 Audit Report and went over the information briefly (a copy of the report is included in the file and available upon request).

Opsahl referred to Pages 34 and 35, and commented that this is the Government Audition Standards letter, which is basically an overview of your income control structure as a whole of the entity and they had two findings, that virtually all entities this size are going to have, related to their preparation of the financial statements, and then also separation of duties. He said that what they were looking for, as far as mitigating control over that, would be extra approvals on checks to make sure it isn't the same person writing the checks that approve them, and then also a review and approval of the financial statements after they prepare them, and they feel that both of those controls are operating as intended, so that helps mitigate some of the risks that you have, so no changes there.

Grasser stated that it generally sounds like a very good audit report, but he has a question, and it is more of a planning activity, but what pension program is the staff is actually operating as a part of, is it NDPERS. Haugen responded that it is. Grasser commented that NDPERS is talking about making some changes at the State level; it is his understanding that they want to move to more of a Defined Contribution Plan instead of a Defined Benefit Plan, but where that ends up nobody really knows right now, but there might be some changes in that program coming up. Opsahl said that he did just hear about that issue this past week, that they are considering closing that plan. He added that for financial statement purposes the reason you have that liability on your books is because with Defined Benefits they are trying to project out the cost of those as opposed to a Defined Contribution Plan which is easier in that you put in your percentage and you're done, so that would definitely make your financial statements probably easier to read; he doesn't know the cost of closing down that plan, he can't imagine it would be very cheap, but

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 21, 2021

right now it seems that the rates for both the employer and the employee keeps on creeping up, so he is guessing they are trying to figure out something.

MOVED BY ROST, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO RECEIVE AND FILE THE FINAL MPO 2020 AUDIT REPORT, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Vein and Vetter.

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

Haugen reported that we are being asked to make some changes to our existing T.I.P. document; all of the changes being presented today are on the North Dakota side. He stated that there are a total of four changes.

Haugen said that the first one is the Washington Street Underpass project; the major underpass of the railroad just north of DeMers. He explained that the original scope of work was for a complete reconstruction of the underpass, but the scope is now being amended to change that to a reconstruction of the street and a rehab of the actual structure, and some other work; so we have to amend the T.I.P. to reflect that major change in scope and then with that change the cost also had a significant change and our T.I.P. needs to reflect the new cost estimate as well. He stated that this is what is shown on the table that are also part of the information in the packet; what was originally there is stricken out and what is being added is highlighted in yellow and red.

Haugen commented that the next change is to add in a previous unawarded project for the Transportation Alternative Program. He explained that a couple of years ago we solicited, and received some Candidate Projects, but one that was submitted from our area to the Statewide competition was not awarded funding at that time, but since then some additional Transportation Alternative funds have been released and this Grand Forks project was next on the list to receive funds if funds became available, and that is to convert a gravel trail along 32nd Avenue, west of the Interstate, and so we are adding that project to the T.I.P. now that it has been awarded funding and the City has approved doing the project.

Vein joined the meeting at 12:18 p.m.

Haugen reported that the next two projects are the result of inspections that have taken place on some structures. He stated that the first one is on South Washington Street, the Bike/Ped Underpass down by 24th Avenue. He explained that an inspection was done, and it was discovered that some work needed to be done so in 2022 we are now programming a small amount of dollars, \$50,000, to do some maintenance work on the structure. He said that at the same time they did inspection work on the DeMers Overpass as well; and we have a project in

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 21, 2021

the T.I.P. already for that structure, however because of the inspection findings they want to move that project up a year, and by moving it up they loss some of the inflation increase so the dollar amounts decreased.

Haugen stated that these are the proposed T.I.P. amendments. He said that we did hold a public hearing at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting last Wednesday, and no written or oral comments were received, so both the Technical Advisory Committee and Staff are recommending approval of the amendments.

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

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Vetter.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT MINNESOTA SIDE FY2022-2025 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that this agenda item is preparing us to adopt, later this summer or early fall, the next T.I.P. document. He added that normally we would be adopting one that covers the full metropolitan area, however this year North Dakota is not prepared quite yet at the same level as Minnesota, so we are adopting the Minnesota only side of the Draft T.I.P. document at this time.

Haugen stated that a couple of things to point out are that we have a lot fewer projects on the Minnesota side, some years it is just our East Grand Forks Transit Operator, so you will see that the new year on this document is 2025 and the only projects programmed are transit projects. He said that the other thing to note is that we do have traffic signal replacement in 2024 on DeMers Avenue, and the cost estimate for that project changed a little, by \$100,000, however the way MnDOT separates out and cost shares with the local unit of government, they did a more defined cost estimate and that raised the local share by about \$130,000, but it is following the formal agreements that the City and MnDOT have, where it is a 50/50 cost share on the signals themselves, and the other costs that they don't share with are related to ADA improvements.

Haugen said that the last thing, MnDOT's Office of Transit seems to like to really jumble around our Capital purchases, so this is the third year that we have two vehicles being purchased, but this is also a third year that we have them set in different years and also different vehicle types and cost estimates.

Haugen stated that, again, this is the draft document, and we did hold a public hearing for it at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting last Wednesday and received no written or oral comments, and both the Technical Advisory Committee and staff are recommending adoption of this Draft T.I.P. for the Minnesota side.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 21, 2021

Grasser asked, you said that they are not participating in the ADA. Haugen responded that the local City is not. Grasser said then that the State of Minnesota is, just not the local entity, because he was thinking how could the State not participate in ADA.

DeMers said that it shows that for the Highway 2 project that the west bound lanes are being done, is there anything further outside FY2025 that addresses the east bound lanes. Haugen responded that they annually do what is called their CHIP (Capital Highway Investment Program), and that is a ten-year document. He said that he will have to revisit that, but he doesn't believe there is anything in the current ten-year document but they will be coming with a new one soon. He added that the next big project in East Grand Forks is going to be the reconstruction of the River Road/4th Street Bridge structure, just off the Kennedy Bridge, and that is going to be done in about 2026.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT MINNESOTA SIDE FY2022-2025 T.I.P., AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Vetter.

MATTER OF DRAFT RFQ FOR PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM UPDATE

Kouba reported that this project is one that we haven't seen done in a while. She explained that both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks have had their pavement management updated every five years but the last time it was updated was in 2013 at which time we were told that we could no longer do this type of project on the Minnesota side, but in 2020 we were told that we can now do it again so both cities requested that an update be done.

Kouba stated that we have a scope of work that includes an option for the cities to be able to do local roadways as well.

Kouba referred to the scope of work included in the packet and commented that the Technical Advisory Committee recommended some changes be made to the option wording. She pointed out that the change is shown in red, with a portion being struck out and highlighted in yellow.

Grasser stated that it he was under the impression that the Technical Advisory Committee also talked about how to present the potential cost share; we are still going to get quotes for the alternative options later, they aren't under the RFP process, so there will be a base bid and then a couple of alternatives. Kouba responded that that is correct. She added that with the option written in the way it is, they will have both cities with different costs. Grasser said that he just wanted to make sure that they include the alternative options for those costs.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY ROST, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT RFQ FOR PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM UPDATE, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Vetter.

MATTER OF DRAFT AGREEMENT WITH EAST GRAND FORKS FOR 5307 FUNDS

Haugen reported that if you recall when we adopted our work program one of our series of plan updates will have to do with the Transit Development; and also if you recall our work program finances are fairly tight compared to previous years so we approached our Transit Operators to see if they had any funds available to assist us and they agreed that there were some funds available so our work program does show that we are going to be utilizing these 5307 funds from FTA coming through the East Grand Forks Transit. He explained that as part of our accessing those funds we had to reach an agreement with the Transit Operator and that is what this agreement does; it says that East Grand Forks will provide us the funds and we will do the Transit Development Plan Update with these funds.

Haugen stated that both the Technical Advisory Committee and staff are recommending that the Executive Policy Board adopt this agreement and authorize signatures.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT AGREEMENT WITH EAST GRAND FORKS FOR USE OF 5307 FUNDS, AND TO AUTHORIZE THE CHAIR AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO SIGN THE AGREEMENT.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Vetter.

MATTER OF FUTURE BRIDGE TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY UPDATE

Haugen reported that as you know we do have Alliant Engineering assisting us with the Future Bridge Traffic Impact Study. He stated that we did hold our first Ad Hoc Group meeting earlier this month and included in the packet is a report on that meeting; hopefully you had a chance to view the video option that was provided to you.

Haugen stated that the second thing in the packet is what is sort of doing a baseline report of what exists out there for transportation. He said that it is a document that is in draft form and it has been requested that the Technical Advisory Committee critically review it and provide feedback on it.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 21, 2021

Haugen commented that the other things that the staff report talks about are, as part of the concern expressed on the study, is pedestrian and bicycle safety, particularly relating to schools. He stated that they have been working with Safe Kids Grand Forks group, and regularly they do what they call walk surveys at the schools, and normally they would have done them last year however with Covid they didn't do any so they are scheduled to do them this year and we asked them if we could maybe beef up what they normally do with this survey and they agreed to do that.

Haugen said that every three years they do these surveys, and every other third set, so one time when they do them they do a simple survey of asking the first class of the day at all the schools, the teacher will ask all the kids to raise their hands if they walked, raise their hand if they rode a bike, etc., and they do that tally and that is what is reported; and the other time they will also do a follow-up parent survey that is distributed to parents. He stated that they weren't going to do the parent survey this time, but they will do so now and so we are going to be getting the information for all the schools across Grand Forks, particularly those in the study area, from the surveys from both the teachers asking the kids how they got to school and from the parents as to how they get their kids to school and some of the reasons why they do it the way they do and some of the concerns they have, so we will be getting some extra value or work out of Safe Kids and their group with the School District to have a better handle on the type of kids and the amount of kids at each of the schools on the North Dakota side.

Haugen commented that on the Minnesota side; a couple reasons why we aren't doing it there are because the schools are further away from our study area, plus the network that is in place there really aren't any sidewalks in much of the Point area, so we are going to be augmenting whatever alternative roadway designs recommending the separation of bikes/peds off the street.

Haugen stated that the last thing; historically, and the RFP scope of work was anticipating both Cities doing their land use plans, and that historically there has been a significant shift in how the City of Grand Forks has been planning its growth every five years, so this scope of work was anticipating that we might be getting another major shift in the land use growth for Grand Forks, but talking with their Planning staff, while we aren't at that level in the plan, they aren't anticipating a major shift, so we have it in the scope of work to do some travel demand model runs, and what we are suggesting be done instead is to try to answer the question "how much growth has to occur before the bridge has to be expanded from the two lane that is expected to a wider capacity", and so that is the scope of work we are working with the Travel Demand Model, we are just adding more of the housing and jobs that are existing around the periphery, and as we identify that they are going to build out by 2045, we will just go to the next level of growth ring, load them up and test the model to see if that raises the river crossing traffic to that tipping point ADT, and if it does we will know and if it doesn't then we know we have to have more growth, and eventually we will come to a point in the iterations that the travel demand model will tell us that at this level of growth in Grand Forks/East Grand Forks, our model is telling us that a two lane structure of a bridge and its approaches would be at capacity and we would need to build something else.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 21, 2021

Haugen commented that, overall, the Ad Hoc Group had what we hear was a positive meeting, and we had all eleven members participate. He added that they are trying to schedule another meeting of that group in May, but it is proving to be a lot more challenging to get them all together, so it still may not occur, which is the challenge we have with an Ad Hoc Group.

Grasser said he has a couple of things; on the school's pedestrian survey asking children to raise their hands, are we trying to capture the peak pedestrian school day or what because pedestrian traffic can vary a lot, if you are asking that question on January 7th or June 7th the results would be very different, so for our purposes are we just trying to capture one of the peak days to find out what the max impact might be. Haugen responded that we are working through the Safe Kids calendar, and their calendar is also working with the School Districts calendar as to when they will allow this to happen, and it is going to happen the third week of May, and it isn't exactly set which day of the week, but they will do the tally twice that week. He added that that is historically when they do this survey, in that May period just before the end of school, so we have historical data along that same time.

Grasser said that he has another question, if he can continue on the bridge; at some point in that growth are you plugging in the Merrifield Bridge into that; quite frankly it makes him a little uncomfortable that we are already talking about expanding a bridge that we haven't even gotten going on yet, it is kind of a scary conversation to be having with the public, but if we had a Merrifield Bridge, in his mind maybe that would help, and maybe we would never get to the point that your describing. Haugen responded that we do have the Merrifield Bridge plugged in. He added that at some point we are going to outgrow it even if we add two more bridges, so we are just trying to give some sense of, if we build it and it gets put in place how soon after that are we going to be back saying that we have to widen it. He stated that they are already hearing those kinds of questions, so this is trying to utilize the scope that we have since Grand Forks is so far not indicating a major change to their land use, to try to come up with an answer to that question of how soon after it is built might it need to be widened.

DeMers jokingly asked if they were also going to include the Kennedy Bridge and the Point Bridge and all those other ones because at some point are we going to have 3-million people here and then we will need to widen them all. He commented that he doesn't know what Grand Forks is plugging in for their projected growth rate; and he doesn't mind having people look at those numbers but are we talking 100-years or what. Haugen responded that they are utilizing the 2045 data that has already been adopted in all of the Land Use Plans and Transportation Plans, and so they are going beyond 2045, and just trying to find what it is that might tip the forecasted volume on a Elks Bridge or a 32nd Avenue Bridge; we obviously have the other three existing bridges that will have their forecasts as well, and we have the Merrifield Bridge plugged into the analysis to see if it does draw a lot more traffic to Merrifield as we build closer to Merrifield. He stated that so far, as we have been doing these things, we haven't gotten close enough to Merrifield to really peel off a lot of the city-to-city traffic, even with 2045 growth; and because we can't give a year, it'll be 2050 or 2070, we can show through some sort of color scheme that this is how much land would have to build out 100% before our current model tells us we would have to consider something else capacity wise or another bridge location or something.

Grasser commented that this is response to a request from this Ad Hoc Group then. Haugen responded that that is correct.

DeMers asked if the thought, then, is if it was a short enough horizon, say it was within our 2045 or 2050 Plan, then do you just pencil in, would it change the up-front costs if we would probably do a four-lane bridge instead of a two lane bridge, then the initial cost would go up, is that kind of the thought process, because if you were going to need a wider bridge in 2045 or 2050 he would think that the lifespan of the bridge is longer so you would want to just build it wider up front, if it is that short of a horizon. Haugen responded that they aren't anticipating it to be that short of a horizon. He added that they are just trying to show how much additional growth during our current assumptions for travel demand models, what additional growth it would take to make a cause for yet another bridge or to widen this current bridge at either of these two locations that we are talking about. Grasser asked if, just off-hand, does he know what level of service you would be plugging into that model that would trigger the need, is it the bridge. Haugen responded that typically the roadways leading up to the bridge, and they haven't finalized those yet, so those are still being worked on and they will be pushed through the Technical Advisory Committee for concurrence. Grasser stated that that will be a really interesting exercise. DeMers agreed, adding that there are a lot of variables there, and a lot of time, but it is what they need.

Information only.

MATTER OF POSSIBLE EARMARK REQUESTS

Haugen reported that as you should all be aware, at least the House of Representatives, on the Congressional side, has reopened the earmark process, although they aren't officially terming it earmarks. He stated that there was a request from the House to have their Congressional representatives identify earmark requests by the end of this week. He said that he knows that on the North Dakota side for sure that Representative Armstrong wanted them to his office by last Monday, and he believes a similar request would be on the Minnesota side, but he isn't sure of the exact day they were due.

Haugen commented that there are two types of earmarks that are in play this year; but they may not be in play in future years. He said that the first one is every year Congress does an Appropriations Bill that basically states that this is our budget to operate for the next Federal Fiscal Year; and in that Appropriations they are allowing some earmarking to take place, so that is one way that they are doing it and that is available for almost all Federal Agencies' Federal Budgets.

Haugen stated that because Surface Transportation also has to be reauthorized, and that is typically a five year bill, there is added opportunity for Surface Transportation to have projects earmarked in the reauthorization. He added that from what he has been involved with, the possible projects that we have been working on with our Member Jurisdictions, as listed, are all going for the reauthorization earmark process and he expects that all of the projects listed in the staff report have been submitted on time.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 21, 2021

Haugen said that what each Congressional person has to do on the House side is to put all of their earmark requests on their website and then they have to identify what their top five projects are. He stated that on the Senate side, the Senate Republicans have not, but he believes they may be voting today, determined if they are going to entertain earmarks. He added that on the House side there are still some Republican House members that are refusing to put in place earmarks; there might be the same thing on the Senate side from the Republican Senators even though the majority of the Republican Senators say they will allow earmarks there still may be some that will not.

Haugen commented that it is anybody's guess as to when they will decide which projects will be put into the Reauthorization Bill or not; it is due at the end of September for renewal, however it was also due at the end of last September for renewal as well so it might not be in September, and the Appropriations earmark and the Reauthorization earmark are all separate from the CARES funding that has been going through, and also the potential Jobs Act that is being proposed as well, and so there are more available funds trying to be pushed through Congress for transportation, but these are the projects that we are aware of on the earmark side:

Joint Polk County and Grand Forks County request for "Merrifield Bridge"

City of Grand Forks requests, in priority order:

42nd Street Grade Separation

47th Avenue Interchange

Neighborhood City-to-City Bridge

City of East Grand Forks request for Neighborhood City-to-City Bridge.

Powers asked what the request is for the Merrifield Bridge, what are they are asking for. Haugen responded that they are asking for around \$35 million. Powers asked what they are going to do with the money, what are they going to do. Strandell responded that they are going to build the bridge. Powers asked what is neighborhood city bridge. Haugen responded it is either Elks or 32nd Avenue. DeMers commented that part of the argument they were making when they had their joint City meeting, one of the arguments was always "there is no reason to go down this path of trying to do this because there is never funds, nobody ever has any money to do this" and his comments back were basically it seems like periodically, it doesn't matter which party is in control, there is always something, someone has an agenda to try to push some money out so the idea that we wouldn't be prepared enough to have; you always hear the term "shovel ready project"; the idea that we wouldn't have something prepared because of things like this that happen to come up, we are looking at this, we are looking at a potential transportation bill that is coming out that may have funding, who knows what it has, but the point is is that he thinks the money is always out there, that isn't the limiting factor on any of these projects, it is always the political will and the cooperation and integration that has to happen between the two parties that is made more difficult, obviously, because we represent different jurisdictions, but he has always said if you have a good plan that you want there is going to be funding, whether you wait five year or ten years, there is going to be federal or state or city, or someone will donate money, so money is very seldom the limiting factor on these things.

Strandell commented that there is another application project moving forward in place; Trail County and Polk County are combining on a request for funding a new bridge at Climax. He

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 21, 2021

added that Rich Sanders, Polk County Engineer, isn't giving up on replacing the Nielsville Bridge either.

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 the only thing to note here is the Aerial Photo. He stated that they have captured both the LIDAR and the ariel imagery and are now in the processing phase. He added that it will still be several months before we get the produce, but at least it has been flown.

b. State Transportation Plan Update

Haugen stated that at the last meeting they did ask both the Technical Advisory Committee and the MPO Executive Policy Board to give staff any comments they had on the Draft North Dakota document, and none have been received, so the comment period closed on the 12th. He said that North Dakota is now digesting the comments they received from other entities.

Haugen said that on the Minnesota side we did have an earlier presentation from them, but they are really just starting their update, so in future months we will get some MnDOT presentations on their Statewide Multi-Modal Plan, and also their Statewide Highway Investment Plan documents.

c. Approval Of Bill/Check List For 3/13/21 to 4/16/21 Period

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY ROST, TO APPROVE THE BILLS/CHECKS FOR THE 3/13/21 TO 4/16/21 PERIOD.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY ROST, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO ADJOURN THE APRIL 21, 2021 MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:55 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager

Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO
Transaction List by Vendor
 March 13 through April 16, 2021

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
AFLAC.							
Liability Check	03/19/2021	AFLAC	501	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-517.90
Alerus Financial							
Liability Check	03/19/2021	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-2,569.18
Liability Check	04/02/2021	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,569.18
Liability Check	04/16/2021	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,569.18
Alliant Engineering							
Bill	03/26/2021	Inv. #...	Work On Futu...	206 · Accounts Pay...		565 · Special ...	-11,228.85
Bill Pmt -Check	03/26/2021	7041	Work On Futu...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-11,228.85
Brady Martz							
Bill	04/09/2021	Inv. #...	2020 MPO Au...	206 · Accounts Pay...		515 · Financial...	-6,450.00
Bill Pmt -Check	04/09/2021	7043	2020 MPO Au...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-6,450.00
CitiBusiness Card							
Bill	03/24/2021	Acct. ...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-464.31
Bill Pmt -Check	03/24/2021	7038	Charges For ...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-464.31
City of East Grand Forks							
Bill	03/24/2021	Inv. #...	2021 2nd Qu...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-2,513.58
Bill Pmt -Check	03/24/2021	7039	2021 2nd Qu...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-2,513.58
ESRI							
Bill	03/22/2021	Acct. ...	Quotation #26...	206 · Accounts Pay...		575 · GIS Dev...	-1,000.00
Bill Pmt -Check	03/22/2021	7037	Quotation #26...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-1,000.00
Fidelity Security Life.							
Liability Check	03/19/2021	7036	50790-1043	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-8.36
Grant and Contract Accounting							
Bill	03/29/2021	Inv. #...	Vision Camer...	206 · Accounts Pay...		550 · Corridor ...	-8,844.00
Bill Pmt -Check	03/29/2021	7042	Vision Camer...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-8,844.00
Knight Printing							
Bill	04/09/2021	Inv. #...	2021 Bike Ma...	206 · Accounts Pay...		550 · Corridor ...	-1,001.00
Bill Pmt -Check	04/09/2021	7044	2021 Bike Ma...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-1,001.00
Liberty Business Systems, Inc.							
Bill	03/17/2021	Inv. #...	Contract Bas...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-162.66
Bill Pmt -Check	03/17/2021	7031	Contract Bas...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-162.66
LSNB as Trustee for PEHP							
Liability Check	03/19/2021	NWR...		104 · Checking	X	216 · Post-Hea...	-123.75
Liability Check	04/16/2021	PEHP		104 · Checking		216 · Post-Hea...	-123.75
Madison Nat'l Life							
Liability Check	03/19/2021	7033		104 · Checking	X	215 · Disability...	-67.34
Mike's							
Bill	03/17/2021		MPO Lunche...	206 · Accounts Pay...		711 · Miscellan...	-77.00
Bill Pmt -Check	03/17/2021	7032	MPO Lunche...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-77.00
Minnesota Department of Revenue							
Liability Check	03/19/2021	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-200.00
Liability Check	04/02/2021	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-200.00
Liability Check	04/16/2021	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-200.00
Minnesota Life Insurance Company							
Liability Check	03/19/2021	7034		104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-111.72
Nationwide Retirement Solutions							
Liability Check	03/19/2021	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-495.89
Liability Check	04/02/2021	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-495.89
Liability Check	04/16/2021	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-495.89
NDPERS							
Liability Check	03/19/2021	NDPE...	D88	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-3,059.28
Liability Check	04/02/2021	NDPE...		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,532.36
QuickBooks Payroll Service							
Liability Check	03/18/2021		Created by P...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-6,383.99
Liability Check	03/31/2021		Created by P...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-6,383.99
Liability Check	04/15/2021		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-6,383.99
SRF Consulting Group, Inc.							
Bill	04/09/2021	Inv. #...	Work On GF ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		560 · Land Us...	-5,722.24
Bill Pmt -Check	04/09/2021	7045	Work On GF ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-5,722.24
Standard Insurance Company							
Liability Check	03/19/2021	7035		104 · Checking	X	217 · Dental P...	-118.88
Liability Check	04/16/2021	7046		104 · Checking		217 · Dental P...	-118.88
State Tax Commissioner							
Liability Check	04/01/2021	NDST...	45038827301	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-414.00

Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO
Transaction List by Vendor
March 13 through April 16, 2021

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
WSB & Associates, Inc.							
Bill	03/24/2021	Inv. #...	Work Done O...	206 · Accounts Pay...		560 · Land Us...	-6,151.36
Bill Pmt -Check	03/24/2021	7040	Work Done O...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-6,151.36