

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, May 19, 2021 - 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Jeannie Mock, Chairwoman, called the May 19, 2021, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:01 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

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

Absent: Bob Rost.

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 APRIL 21<sup>ST</sup>, 2021, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY VEIN, TO APPROVE THE APRIL 21<sup>ST</sup>, 2021, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

DeMers reported present.

**MATTER OF NEW DEFINITION OF T.I.P. REGIONAL SIGNIFICANT**

Haugen reported that we have been discussing this for a couple of months now, and today we are asking the Board to take final action.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 19, 2021

Haugen stated that included in the staff report is the change to our T.I.P. Procedural Manual that is being proposed. He said that, just to recap, the Federal Regulations does have a definition, however Federal Highway North Dakota encouraged the North Dakota DOT and the three MPOs to try to draft a definition that is more specific to only certain projects that would then get what he will call the full federal review, full public participation.

Haugen reported that the NDDOT first drafted a definition that was for them and the three MPOs, and the DOTs definition took a rural perspective, and it didn't really address some uniqueness to the MPO urban setting, so the three MPOs and the NDDOT revised a definition that fits MPOs well. He added that our thought to that process was that we would craft one definition that all four entities, the NDDOT and the three MPOs, would be utilizing.

Haugen referred to the staff report and said that, as you can see in the staff report and the T.I.P. Manual, North Dakota has decided that they want to maintain for the rural area their original definition of regional significant, and the three MPOs are essentially using the same definition, although Bismarck/Mandan might make a slight tweak to it for some unique to their situation, but it doesn't substantially change the definition that North Dakota and the MPOs are adopting.

Haugen commented that, again, the difference with this new definition versus the previous definition, is substantially different. He explained that up till now when we use the word "regionally" significant we were using that in context to a project that did not have any federal funds involved, nor did it need any federal action for approval of the project; and now this definition is flipping that to be projects that are going to get the full federal involvement for them, but the definition is very focused so it won't be very often that we will have a regionally significant project identified for our MPO.

Haugen reiterated that this is the exercise that we were given by our State and Federal Agencies to develop; this is the definition we have crafted, and we have gone through multiple review with the Technical Advisory Committee and the other MPOs to come up with this definition, and both the Technical Advisory Committee and staff are recommending that the Board adopt this change to the T.I.P. Procedural Manual to develop this new definition of Regional Significant.

Grasser asked, federal, is that a project that you are proposing using federal funds or just one that could potentially qualify for federal funds. Haugen responded that if you are going to potentially use federal funds, and it fits the definition, then we should assume that it is going to have full federal involvement from the start, because this is setting up certain things in the T.I.P. document. He added that it is easier to set up a project using all the phases right away then to come back and do it after the fact.

Vein said that he thought he heard him say something to the point that we wouldn't have many projects that would fall under this definition. Haugen responded that that is correct. He explained that we are defining it as something that affects adding capacity to the interstate system; we don't have very many projects in the history of our T.I.P. document where we've added capacity to the interstate system. He said that we also don't have many roadways that are brand new in which the right of way needs to be purchased, and a new roadway installed, we

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 19, 2021

rarely have those. He added that the last one is essentially a brand new transit building on newly acquired property; so these focused definitions are rarely encountered in our T.I.P. document, and we don't foresee anything like this in the future to meet this definition either. Vein asked if the 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Interchange project wouldn't meet these requirements. Haugen responded that that might be one project that could.

Haugen commented that the reason they are doing this is because there are phases to a project; once it gets programmed into the document, there is preliminary engineering, potential right-of-way acquisition, potential utility relocates, and then there is construction, so what this does is to identify for these narrow focused projects all those individual phases in their appropriate T.I.P. year and their appropriate costs, so there is potential that the 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Interchange could be the one project, but that might be a one and done kind of thing, he doesn't foresee other projects in the near future. Vein asked about a southend bridge, if that might qualify. Haugen responded that with a southend bridge, if we are putting in new approaches it would depend on how we are financing right-of-way for them; if federal funds are involved in the right-of-way purchase as well, then it could qualify.

Vein asked, even if it does meet that definition, what is the difference? Haugen responded that we would just separate the phases individually for that project. He said that for all of the other projects that aren't meeting this new definition, we have basically group them for the phasing of all the other projects that are federally involved; so we have rules for right-of-way estimates, rules for preliminary engineering estimates, rules for utility relocate estimates, those phases are grouped, but if it is a regionally significant project it has its own separate listing for each phase.

Grasser asked if this means that we have the flexibility then to adjust our construction or assessment estimates up or down relative to the new information defined in the previous. He said that one of the problems they run into now; the very seldom use preliminary engineering because if they enter into that agreement then their construction costs are fixed, so rather than always risking that they a lot of times locally finance preliminary engineering, so if it is separated out into three phases does that mean they have some flexibility. Haugen responded that you would still have to follow the amendment or modification policy on that line item; if it is a lump sum for individual projects, less impact that one for that group project. He added that most of your projects are going to be regionally insignificant. Grasser said, then, if we've got 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue, if we have preliminary engineering it shows locates and actual interchange construction as to the different phases at three different points in time. Haugen said that in every T.I.P. your construction costs might be changing three years in a row, for each T.I.P. we might have to up or lower those estimates.

***MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE NEW DEFINITION OF REGIONAL SIGNIFICANT IN RELATION TO T.I.P. PROJECTS, AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Rost.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF RFP FOR TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN.**

Kouba reported that this is one of the elements of our Metropolitan Transportation Plan document, so we are getting closer to updating that main document.

Kouba stated that this is a document we update every five years, and it was last adopted in December 2015. She said that we are evaluating the routes, the range of service, and capital and financial alternatives; especially with UND now being involved in the process, we need to evaluate those routes to make sure we are continuing to find any deficiencies, and to determine ways to eliminate those deficiencies to help Cities Area Transit know what they might be looking at in the future. She added that they are looking out ten years instead of five years, which is the usual time span.

Kouba commented that East Grand Forks Transit is contributing an additional \$120,000 to the project budget, bringing the total Consultant Budget of \$225,000.00.

***MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE RFP FOR THE TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN, AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Rost.***

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON FUTURE BRIDGE TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY**

Haugen reported that as noted in the staff report there are four things that we are covering, they are:

A. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ad Hoc Group Meeting

Haugen stated that the 2<sup>nd</sup> Ad Hoc Group meeting was held last week and all eleven members did participate. He added that the meeting was also broadcast live, or streamed live, on both Cities Facebook pages, and a link to the presentation was provided to you so you can look through it; we don't intend to spend much time on it, but we can if you have questions. He said that the topics they basically were bringing up to date were on earmark requests because by then the media had advertised or informed that some earmark requests were submitted, but the media didn't really mention all that were submitted that he recalls, so we wanted to make sure that you understood all the projects that were being requested and how the representative side dealt with the projects in our area, neither house representative formally submitted any projects to the committee for consideration. He stated that the senate is still open and doing business, so if there are any earmarks on the senate side go through the senate office and find out what their requirements are and their due dates, etc. He added that to his knowledge the senate has only opened that appropriation earmarks, and they haven't opened up for reauthorization yet.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 19, 2021

Haugen commented that from the senate side it sounded like a lot of the earmark dollars are coming from what used to be the nationally competitive program, the old TIGER Grants, which are now called RAISE Grants. He said that that kind of contradicts a bit what Representative Armstrong's office is saying, that one of the reasons he didn't submit any projects is because it didn't bring any additional dollars to North Dakota, but if they are, their past practice was earmarking these nationally competitive programs, and North Dakota typically didn't get funds from those programs, so it is hard to understand how North Dakota could get the same amount of dollars with or without earmarks for a lot of the programs that are having earmarks come out of, so that would be something to follow up on if you are considering on the senate side.

Haugen stated that they previously sent you last month this existing transportation facility Tech Memo that Alliant drafted. He said that it was updated based on the Technical Advisory Committee comments we received, and that is now out for review, and again it just lays down the groundwork as to what are the type of roads that we are studying, the intersections, what other facilities are available like sidewalks, bikes, what the transit system is and then some of the environmental documentation.

Haugen commented that the third item is that we are trying to develop a base traffic volume study; and because of the pandemic in particular, we couldn't just go out and get 2020 or 2021 counts, so they kind of went through various data sources to come up with counts, and they also rely quite heavily on our continuous video capture camera counts that are going on on the signalized intersections in Grand Forks, and so what we are trying to accomplish is to normalize all of these levels to 2019, using 2019 as kind of our base counting point of view, so our 2021 counts that we collected at intersections are being adjusted based on what our metropolitan area average traffic was in October 2019 compared to what was going on in March or April of 2021, and adjusting those counts upward. He added that we also had some older counts that we did during the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, and those were counted in October 2019, so these are kind of the adjustments that we are doing to make all of these intersection counts normalized to a safe period. He said that that also goes into play with our Origin Destination, we continuously try to use newer sources of data to inform us where people are coming and going, and what we are using now is something you've heard before, with the STREETLITE platform, and we are using data from 2019 that was collected not just in October of 2019, but starting in May we asked for May through October data so we have more normalization of the Origin Destinations during spring, summer and fall seasons, and that is what the graphics are showing; west to east traffic origins and the east to west traffic origins. He stated that this is really informing us that a southern area, southern bridge will cause more traffic to drop down on the southern side of the metropolitan area and not so much on the external or regional traffic.

Haugen said that using that information we then factor each of the key intersections, the existing turning movements that were observed, and then as we go into 2030 without a bridge what we think the turning movements will be at the key intersections; and then with either an Elks or 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Bridge what they might be and the same with 2045, and that is what this tech memo is trying to inform us, and the full memo is attached to the packet.

Haugen stated that they ask that you review this and provide feedback.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 19, 2021

Haugen commented that the last part of this, and we did go over, we didn't use the Ad Hoc Group to display this information nor this information as we are still waiting for the Technical Advisory Committee to digest it and give us feedback on it, but if you recall, last month we talked about what type of growth would be needed in order to make our new bridge forecast to be at capacity, so we have a couple of graphics that show that information.

Haugen referred to the graphics went over them briefly, commenting that they basically show that there is another 20 years or more of growth would need to occur before we would get to our over capacity forecasted volume on either the Elks or 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue bridges. He added that, again, these are based with and without Merrifield being included, and it shows that Merrifield doesn't really attract traffic from either Elks or 32<sup>nd</sup>.

Vein asked what type of feedback are you generally hearing from the Ad Hoc Group; is it more informing them or are we getting some information back from them, because that is Ad Hoc, obviously, and is only advisory influence, or whatever that you are receiving. Haugen responded that it has mostly been providing them with information. He stated that the first meeting we got each one of them to give us what they think the opportunities are that this study provides, what concerns they have, and then what success would look like, and so each one of the Ad Hoc Group members gave us that information and it is documented on the website. He said that the second meeting was more information that builds a foundation for them to understand our next set of things that will be thrown at them, that would be the traffic analysis, level of service stuff, and the alternatives.

Vein said that he knows that in the past, for many of us, we probably don't understand all the traffic analysis and some of those impacts; are you thinking that you can educate everybody there because they are going to need to make a recommendation to back to us, and their recommendation to us is with some factors. Haugen responded he is. Vein added that you will still have the Technical Advisory Committee recommendations and staff recommendations, and then you will have a recommendation from the Ad Hoc. Haugen responded that that is correct. He added that we are trying to bring as many people as possible up to a better awareness than perhaps we said that we did with the MTP document process. He said that the Facebook views are in the thousands for the meetings, so it appears that we are at least causing more awareness of what it is that we are studying here.

Haugen stated that in the next couple of months we are going to be scheduling our first public event, and that is when we will invite the whole community to give us feedback on what the issues, concerns, opportunities are that are out there. He said that it will be an in-person opportunity and we will also have a mapping tool on-line that people can mark up what their issues are and what their opportunities are. He stated that that is going to be kind of the next big event that we have publicly; and we are also going to have, for the technical side, the traffic operations analysis piece that will take the numbers we just saw and come up with which intersections are going to be at capacity, the level of service that needs to be addressed, etc.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 19, 2021

Vein asked if the intent is to decide between Elks and 32<sup>nd</sup>, or is the “no bridge” option also on the table. Haugen responded that all three are on the table. He added that the intent is to analyze them and show which ones are still feasible. He said that if we find that one; the “no build” probably isn’t going to apply, but one of the two might still prove to be not feasible, we might find something during the limited scope of our environmental work that shows one of the two has a fatal flaw, so it can be eliminated, but the intent is really to identify which one of the two rises to the top, but not to particularly eliminate either one. Vein said that the current Long Range Transportation Plan shows a bridge at 32<sup>nd</sup>. Haugen responded that it does.

Powers asked when they plan to make a recommendation. Haugen responded that we are still scheduled to have this wrapped up by the end of the year, so in the fall is when we will start identifying those pluses and minuses and start to consider how to rank the projects; and whether or not we see any fatal flaws that allow us to eliminate alternatives.

Grasser commented that when they did the Hydraulic Study, that kind of helped narrow the field, so one of the next steps that could potentially impact something might be the Geotechnical Analysis, but he thinks the Corps has most of the actual data so the data collection that it wouldn’t take a lot to do that, so in talking about maybe eliminating alternatives, is it possible to bring that Geotech as part of your environmental analysis into this process that we are doing. Haugen responded that we are exploring that as we speak; trying to communicate with the Corps as to how much they will share with us, it is fully documented information, so they are just now starting that conversation with the Corps of Engineers. He added that they are actually just now starting that conversation with all of the environmental agencies, but the Corps is a key one, in their estimation will be the one we will get the most help from, and hopefully information that helps us make a difference maker.

Mock commented that when you are looking at that “no build” option, are you getting into buyouts to widen the existing bridge or streets leading up to the bridge. Haugen responded that we would be showing a sort of broad stroke of added right of way that may need to be purchased, we would not be identifying individual properties. Mock said, though, that you are getting into what it would take to widen it to let traffic flow. Haugen responded that the “do nothing” will look at, particularly for the Minnesota/4<sup>th</sup> Corridor, as to what that means to accommodate all the future traffic.

Haugen said then, that the intersections is where you have a difference sort of capacity constraint; having turn lanes helps, but having turn lanes means then you have widen intersections to fit turn lanes, so those will all be looked at.

Strandell this says the MPO is not to select a sight, but will recommend sites to a different governing body, is that right; we, as an MPO could not decide where a bridge is going to be. Haugen responded that that is role of the MPO, ultimately. Strandell said that he thought we would just make a recommendation. Haugen responded that part of the process is to recommend to them; this is the information we have, give us your feedback, but once they start to go implementing a project, they want to say, we don’t want either of these two bridges and you as an MPO says we need to have one of the bridges, you have the ability to negotiate with them,

with your powers, that all your federal funds are going to be negotiated until we reach an agreement on something. Strandell said, though, that officially we don't have the absolute decision to make. DeMers commented that we control federal funds, so we do have absolute power. He cited that it is kind of like the State Aid; when the City says they want to do a project, but the State says we don't want to give you the funding for it, so they have the ability to stop something, same thing here, the City says they want to go with a roundabout and this group says they don't want to do a roundabout, then we do have the power to do it, otherwise you wouldn't have this Board. Strandell stated, though, that federal funds aren't going to cover everything; you are going to have all kinds of encroachment on both sides of the river paid for by local government, so he would assume that both city councils will have some yay or nay ability on this. Haugen responded that all five entities have some yay or nay ability.

Information only.

### **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 update that we provide you.

##### 1) Land Use Plans

Haugen stated that the Land Use Plans are both underway in full effort, and he would encourage everyone to check out the websites; on the Grand Forks side there is some surveying taking place right now so there is a great opportunity to have input on the future of Grand Forks. He added that East Grand Forks is months ahead with their update and they had that surveying opportunity already. Kouba commented that the comments from that survey should be available on the website.

##### 2) Pavement Management

Haugen stated that for the Pavement Management we are going to get the RFQ submittals next week, so by June we will have the opportunity to execute a contract on that.

##### 3) Transit Development Plan

Haugen said that they just approved the RFP to go out for the Transit Development Plan.

4) Aerial Photography

Haugen commented that the aerial photos have been collected and are in the process of being analyzed.

Haugen reported that one thing he would add is that, based on some decisions both States are making, and both Cities are making, we are likely going to be processing an amendment to our Metropolitan Transportation Plan. He added that depending on the effort we may have to make an amendment to our Work Program to reallocate some of our resources to address how much of an effort we have to put into the Transportation Plan amendment process.

Haugen stated that East Grand Forks is discussing changing their project list considerably. He added that on the Grand Forks side we are hearing a very strong likelihood that a major project will be dropped for funding out of the State so we will have to amend the Transportation Plan for that as well and then there are some minor clean-up things or adjustments that will need to be processed so that would be the only thing that we might have to bring to this board, to amend this Work Program to allocate some resources to this effort to amend the Transportation Plan.

Grasser commented that when you say dropping a major project at the State, is that an opportunity for us to get funds someplace else or is that suggesting that one of our projects is getting pulled; is that a threat or an opportunity. Haugen responded that you can look at it as an opportunity to get \$45,000,000 for a project that is currently not in our fiscally constrained plan.

DeMers asked how much dollars are you talking about. Haugen responded that again, it depends; the one that will cause the most effort will be the East Grand Forks request to amend, again it substantially changes a project, inserting a project that isn't even an illustrative project in the Transportation Plan, plus it also sets up subsequent projects that were being done on Bygland Road, questioning whether they will still be pursued, so it is kind of a reevaluation of the East Grand Forks projects and priorities. He added that it is a project that East Grand Forks City Council moved on at their meeting last night, and it is a project that doesn't appear at all in our Metropolitan Transportation Plan, so it was never previously identified; all the projects that we have identified were in consideration for being prioritized for receiving the 2022 funds, and then there is a sequence of projects lined up on Bygland Road as part of the Transportation Plan that he would be asking City staff to explain why they are bypassing all of the stuff that is in the plan and inserting something that doesn't appear at all and then how does that adjust then the rest of the plan, so that may be a change you will see in June or July, depending on how we work through that process.

B) State Transportation Plan Updates

Haugen reported that on the Minnesota side there have been some Constant Contact e-mails sent out on Electric Vehicles that they are asking for feedback on, and then for their Multi-Modal Plan you can go on their site and go through an interactive storybook exercise to get informed on what the transportation things are in Minnesota, so we encourage you to participate.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 19, 2021

Haugen commented that on the North Dakota side they have their draft Transportation Connection document; and have finished taking feedback on that, so they are in the process of finalizing the document for release, although a date hasn't been given for that release yet.

C) Approval Of Bill/Check List For 4/17/21 to 5/14/21 Period

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE BILLS/CHECKS FOR THE 4/17/21 TO 5/14/21 PERIOD. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

D) 2050 Long Range Plan

Grasser said that in looking at some of the data on the bridge it infers that obviously 2020 data is going to be corrupted, but it infers that 2021, even if we measured it now might not be correct, but he is wondering if in the 2050 plan do we have any indication, do they assume some of the work at home basically is going to be some sort of a permanent shift in transportation and electric vehicles, do you have any indication how that is all going to be wrapped into the 2050 planning horizon or won't it impact and it will be kind of business as usual the way we project traffic demands. Haugen responded that our 24-hour continuous video capturing counts is informing us through that process; primarily about the work from home, if we start seeing trends, it didn't mention deliveries at home, so as you looked at the traffic, in the next couple of years we will see how that was pre-covid and how it differs or is similar, plus we are tapping into the streetlight data so we are getting a better sense of where that traffic is coming and going and we had that information pre-covid, now we have it during covid, and will get it post-covid; those are the things that are going on. He added that what that affects is our model itself and whether we look at separating mode shares, and typically what isn't shown; the four modes are the ones that are shown, vehicle, transit, walking, biking, and one of growing things we had prior to covid was work at home/stay at home, and that was probably equal to the other three modes together, but we still haven't separated it out in our model so that is where our view is, again, based on this other data we are getting, seeing how much work from home is changing and the Annual American Community Survey will help inform us of that component and how people are saying how they commute, and work at home is one of those things.

Grasser stated that he is just curious because they are getting that streetlight data and does that differentiate the counts, the pedestrians, the bikes, and vehicles for that data. Haugen responded that they do provide counts, how well it is, it is still a work in progress, but yes you can ask them and they will give you data that is specific to those modes.

E) North Dakota T.I.P.

Haugen reported that one thing that is happening in June, we may or may not have a North Dakota Draft T.I.P. He stated that way it is shaking out, upper management of the NDDOT are scheduled to make some final decisions on June 7<sup>th</sup>, but in order for us to have a Draft T.I.P. available for vetting through June we would have to release something by the end of May, so we are kind of in limbo with North Dakota as to what we can release, what we can't release prior to

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 19, 2021

June 7<sup>th</sup>, and how that muddles up our publication hearing process, so be aware we may or may not have a North Dakota Draft T.I.P. He added that we have, in the past skipped that step in the process and we might be doing that again this year because in July and August we will be finalizing the T.I.P., so there is a lot of movement taking place these next several weeks in projects on the North Dakota side.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO ADJOURN THE MAY 19, 2021  
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:49 P.M.***

Respectfully Submitted,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager

**Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO**  
**Transaction List by Vendor**  
 April 17 through May 14, 2021

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
<b>AFLAC.</b>							
Liability Check	04/20/2021	AFLAC	501	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-776.85
<b>Alerus Financial</b>							
Liability Check	04/30/2021	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-2,611.10
Liability Check	05/14/2021	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,569.16
<b>Alliant Engineering</b>							
Bill	04/23/2021	Inv. #...	Work On Futu...	206 · Accounts Pay...		565 · Special ...	-22,227.13
Bill Pmt -Check	04/23/2021	7051	Work On Futu...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-22,227.13
<b>CitiBusiness Card</b>							
Bill	04/23/2021	Acct. ...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-64.32
Bill Pmt -Check	04/23/2021	7052	Charges For ...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-64.32
<b>Fidelity Security Life.</b>							
Liability Check	04/19/2021	AVESIS	50790-1043	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-8.43
<b>Forum Communications Company</b>							
Bill	05/13/2021	Inv. #...	Public Notice...	206 · Accounts Pay...		-SPLIT-	-511.40
Bill Pmt -Check	05/13/2021	7057	Public Notice...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-511.40
<b>Liberty Business Systems, Inc.</b>							
Bill	04/21/2021	Inv. #...	Contract Bas...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-162.66
Bill Pmt -Check	04/21/2021	7049	Contract Bas...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-162.66
Bill	05/07/2021	Inv. #...	Contract Bas...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-397.32
Bill Pmt -Check	05/07/2021	7055	Contract Bas...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-397.32
<b>Madison Nat'l Life</b>							
Liability Check	04/30/2021	7053		104 · Checking		215 · Disability...	-67.32
<b>Mike's</b>							
Bill	04/21/2021		MPO Lunche...	206 · Accounts Pay...		711 · Miscellan...	-93.00
Bill Pmt -Check	04/21/2021	7050	MPO Lunche...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-93.00
<b>Minnesota Department of Revenue</b>							
Liability Check	04/30/2021	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-208.00
Liability Check	05/14/2021	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-200.00
<b>Minnesota Life Insurance Company</b>							
Liability Check	04/21/2021	7048		104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-111.72
<b>Nationwide Retirement Solutions</b>							
Liability Check	04/30/2021	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-495.89
Liability Check	05/14/2021	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-495.89
<b>NDPERS</b>							
Liability Check	04/30/2021	NDPE...	D88	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-4,588.92
Liability Check	05/14/2021	NDPE...		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,532.36
<b>QuickBooks Payroll Service</b>							
Liability Check	04/29/2021		Created by P...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-6,527.45
Liability Check	05/13/2021		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-6,384.00
<b>SRF Consulting Group, Inc.</b>							
Bill	05/11/2021	Inv. #...	Work On GF ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		560 · Land Us...	-5,416.33
Bill Pmt -Check	05/11/2021	7056	Work On GF ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-5,416.33
<b>WSB &amp; Associates, Inc.</b>							
Bill	04/29/2021	Inv. #...	Work On EG...	206 · Accounts Pay...		560 · Land Us...	-4,788.38
Bill Pmt -Check	04/29/2021	7054	Work On EG...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-4,788.38