

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, August 18, 2021 - 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks Training Conference Room/Zoom Meeting**

CALL TO ORDER

Warren Strandell, Secretary, called the August 18, 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, Bob Rost, Al Grasser, Mike Powers, Clarence Vetter, Ken Vein, and Jeannie Mock.

Absent: Marc DeMers.

Staff present: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF Senior Planner; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Strandell declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JULY 21ST, 2021, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY ROST, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO APPROVE THE JULY 21ST, 2021, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

SUSPEND AGENDA

Haugen asked to suspend the agenda to talk about Population information.

MATTER OF 2020 CENSUS POPULATION UPDATE

Haugen commented that, as many of you are aware, the latest census results are now out. He stated that as a whole Grand Forks/East Grand Forks grew; Grand Forks grew around 6,300 people and East Grand Forks grew close to 600 people.

Haugen said that a couple of interesting things, when you take the City of Grand Forks out of Grand Forks County, the County actually lost population, and in Polk County, even with the East

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 18, 2021

Grand Forks increase, Polk County as a whole lost a number of people as well, so that rural to urban trend is strengthening if anything in the 2020 Census results.

Haugen referred to a slide that illustrates areas where the population declined in both cities and went over it briefly.

Haugen pointed out that the census tracts were reconfigured between 2010 and 2020, so you can see on South Washington, both sides, had a decrease in population, and then adjacent to Columbia Road between 17th and 32nd also shows a loss in population.

Haugen stated that both downtowns, and he thinks of East Grand Forks' Central Part as being primarily the downtown area for East Grand Forks, but both downtowns saw an increase, and that reflective of the increase in housing in the downtowns that has been built since 2010.

Haugen said that another odd thing is even though they did a lot of reconfigurations of census tracts, they still are leaving a huge chunk of the City of Grand Forks strongest growth areas connected to all of Southeast Grand Forks County, so that census tract can't really be tracked well until we get the block level data to know exactly how much growth is occurring within the City in that area.

Grasser asked if those numbers we have for Grand Forks still include that even though that tract is more in the County tract. Haugen responded that it does; the City's population of just under 60,000 is the City's Corporate Limits. He said that he is just trying to break it down to show where the growth is occurring and what is happening where growth isn't occurring, and we have to use census tract levels for now, but eventually we will figure out how to use block level and then we are working on this to sort of show the change from 2000 to 2010 and 2010 to 2020. He added that were people are shifting we will also be comparing that to how the traffic has been changing as well, so people can see the correlation.

Vein asked when will redistricting happen. Haugen responded that the legislatures are doing it starting as soon as they got the data, and as far as the Cities, the MPO is no longer involved in the Cities redistricting of their wards, and he isn't sure what the law says that it has to be done by. Grasser asked isn't the legislature going into special session in August. Haugen stated that the data that was released is the redistricting data, so they now have the data to do the redistricting.

Strandell said that you mentioned that Polk County population was down. Haugen responded that that is correct. Strandell stated, though that it is still above that 30,000 magic number for some kind of grant money.

Haugen commented that the MSA issue is that they are no longer changing the population threshold and so that is not going to change, we are still an MSA and will still be an MPO unless congress does something with their reauthorization that they haven't identified yet.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 18, 2021

Haugen reported that Minot may become an MPO; the City itself is just over 48,000 people, and they don't use the City population to determine that, they use what they term "urbanized area" population. He explained how this process works, adding that when you get around Minot, they have considerably more "sprawl", if that is the term you want to use, of land uses around them so it will be interesting to see how the geography is shaped to see if they are going to become an urbanized area. He added that the communities of Burlington, Sawyer are relatively close to Minot, and then there is a lot of growth that has sprung along the roads connecting so there is still a possibility that Minot might reach that threshold, and then our MPO funding will be split by 4 instead of 3; we should know the result of this more likely in 2023.

Vein asked, you said that Grand Forks MPO no longer determines the ward boundaries; who does that then. Haugen responded that we are thinking that City staff does, Ryan Brooks. Vein asked when that changed. Haugen responded that he believes it changed with the 2010 Census results. Vein asked who made the decision about who does it. Haugen responded that he doesn't know, he thinks it just happened that Mr. Brooks was on your staff and was asked to do it. Kouba added that she thinks it was a matter of staff bringing information to the council as to whether or not any kind of changes needed to happen, and he was directed to do it at that time. She said that they also work with the State as well because they follow State and Federal boundaries.

Haugen stated that lastly, once again the annual estimates coming out were not favorable to Grand Forks/East Grand Forks' narrative, to say the least, and the results show that we were actually performing much better than what they estimate us to be performing at, particularly as we get to the later years of the Census itself. He said it would be something to try to work with both State demographers. Vein asked if other cities say the same thing as you just did. Haugen responded he doesn't know; he thinks that for the most part, on the North Dakota side, the big ones, Fargo and West Fargo, they know they are growing so are they going to argue whether it is 10,000 or 11,000; in our case the argument is usually that they are estimating that we are actually losing population, not gaining population, as we get past into the outer years of the census.

Information only.

RESUME AGENDA

MATTER OF UPDATE ON FUTURE BRIDGE TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY

Haugen reported that this is the monthly update on the Future Bridge Traffic Impact Study. He stated that included in the packet, we did have an open house on July 27th, with an on-line presentation and it was open until Monday. He said that he has some updated numbers to present to you, but we have actually doubled-plus some of these numbers so our site visits are now double at 6,200 from people going on to the www.forks2forksbridge.com site. He added that Unique Users is now 1,700; Survey Responses are now 275; and the On-line Map is now at 48; and all of these closed on Monday so those should be the final numbers.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 18, 2021

Haugen reported that most of the comments they heard, again trying to understand how we do traffic forecasting and such, but a lot of it is concern about the school traffic on 32nd, increase in traffic around the schools. He said that they aren't hearing a lot about concern of increased traffic on Minnesota/4th, in front of that school, more on the East Grand Forks side. He added that what they are hearing, and even on the on-line comments that they are getting is 32nd Avenue increases the school traffic concern.

Haugen stated that at the next meeting they should have a more thorough presentation on what the on-line open house information has given us.

Haugen commented that that was the result of the open house, as part of that we are also working on Purpose and Need. He stated that we have been doing this type of study going on six years, almost every one of our more recent studies that we have done we've termed them a PEL (Planning and Environmental Linkage); recently Minnesota has formally and officially adopted a PEL process on the Minnesota side and their process is different than our process, since North Dakota is our lead agency, so we have had some conversation among the two states and two federal highway divisions about the differences and how to manage that, and we are managing that by allowing all of our Minnesota side agencies that we have to send out letters to, just identifying that this is a North Dakota led process and is not following the Minnesota PEL formal process, so we are going to still get a lot of the same benefits, just not complete total sign off by our federal agencies at the end of the study.

Grasser asked if that will, not following Minnesota PEL, will that hurt us when the request goes to the state for grant funding, particularly on the East Grand Forks side because you ask for dollars from the state legislature. Haugen responded that there will be an explanation that has to be added. Grasser said, then, that you don't think that will hurt the process. Haugen responded he doesn't think it will.

Haugen commented that the big thing is that we are now presenting the traffic impacts if we put a bridge at Elks versus no-build or a bridge at 32nd versus no-build, and that is what a lot of the information that you have in the packet is covering. He referred to slides illustrating the differences between 2030 no-build and an Elks bridge built in 2030 and you can see in the red where we are decreasing traffic flow and in blue you see where we are increasing traffic flow, and this is substantiated by the origin destination data that we have and the ground counts that we have that there is still a big pull for traffic to get to and from over here from Grand Forks, and there is a lot of pull here in the Point but there is also a lot of pull to get into Minnesota itself.

Grasser stated that in terms of the headings of the maps, he struggles a little bit when they say no-build, to him that suggests no bridge and you show a bridge on this one. Haugen responded that this was discussed this and will be making changes to the headings to make them clearer before it is sent out to the public. He said that the no-build is no building of a fourth bridge and then the Elks bridge; 2045 there are some more change that we notice out here on U.S.2 is where we get a big red change between 2030 and 2045 at an Elks bridge site.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 18, 2021

Haugen commented that on 32nd Avenue we see similar results, the one big change is, initially 32nd Avenue is pulling traffic out on the regional basis, traffic coming in and out of the metro area from western Minnesota that equalizes by 2045 where there is still traffic coming from the City itself. He pointed out that you can still see the decrease, though, that it provides to the neighborhood of East Grand Forks. He added that they have said this many times, but just to reiterated again, the difference between Elks Drive and 32nd Avenue is that regional traffic, both bridges would attract more traffic that is local traffic, city to city traffic; however 32nd draws, and that is why it has more forecasted total volume, more of that internal to external or external to internal traffic that is heading to western Minnesota, whether it is to Crookston or lake county or even to the Thief River Falls area, so that is the real difference between the two bridges, they both perform to relieve that city to city traffic, but 32nd adds about 1,000 more people across the river and most of those are coming from U.S. 2, east of the metro.

Grasser asked what we have for interchanges. Haugen responded that there is nothing yet. Grasser said that it would be interesting to see what a scenario with an interchange on 47th might draw. Haugen responded that we have that, and the interstate is not connected well to these traffic movements that these bridges are serving on the intercity to city. He added that most people aren't using I-29 to get to western Minnesota and Crookston and such, people from western Minnesota are coming through our metro area to get south to I-29.

Mock asked if there was a map that doesn't have a bridge, no bridge at Elks or 32nd to show the traffic. Haugen responded there is. He referred to maps and stated that they were shown last month; they are maps that show a decrease in traffic without any additional bridge, and these are the same maps that are showing traffic with a bridge. He stated that the initial benefit is, to the Point Bridge area and Minnesota 4th, you can see a significant benefit to Washington Street. He said that the difference between the two river crossings is really how much traffic is taking 24th or continuing on 32nd on Elks, where at 32nd it is staying on 32nd.

Vein asked if 24th getting any additional traffic. Haugen responded that with Elks Drive it is; with an Elks bridge 24th Avenue will get additional traffic, with the 32nd Avenue Bridge 24th Avenue won't see much change, but then you get more of a decrease along Belmont and along Washington with 32nd. Vein commented that, looking at the North Dakota side, this is why he thought if you looked at a lot of the residents say north of 32nd they may not have understood that a 32nd Avenue Bridge actually decreases the traffic through their neighborhood, right. Haugen responded that that is correct. He stated that it is fair to say that without a bridge, Belmont and 32nd are forecasted to have increased traffic; with a bridge at Elks south of Elks on Belmont will have increased traffic and 32nd will have even more increased traffic than they would without a bridge at Elks, but everything north of that would have less traffic and at 32nd it is just right at 32nd so everything north of 32nd would have less traffic. Vein said it might be that you now concentrated the increased on just that corridor, as negative as it is, because it's negative, but it's concentrated. Haugen agreed, adding that without a bridge 32nd Avenue is going to have 5,000 cars a day forecasted in 2045, with Elks Bridge it is going to be at 6,500 or so and with 32nd Avenue it is going to be at 8,500 a day, so it is a question of how much of an increase are they going to plan for.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 18, 2021

Haugen commented that they have also looked at, then, for each of these bridge options, where are we at with our level of service from segment point of view and then at intersection point of view and one of the big differences you will see is that we no longer have reds showing up on our segment intersections and a lot of the same intersections are still having some level of service concerns with bridge options, and we add a couple of more where the bridge lands at Elks, in this particular case, but we are also seeing that the level of services volumes become much more manageable from a mitigation point of view, because when you think of DeMers and Washington and you start taking away thousands of cars away your alternatives start to grow because some of the less complex alternatives start to solve the traffic problem, the same with Belmont and 4th, when you start taking a thousand cars a day away from that intersection you start actually implementing some changes. He said that, conversely, when we look at 32nd, we are already know that without a bridge we have intersection level of service concerns at Belmont and 32nd, if we put a bridge at Belmont and 32nd we still have level of service concerns but the traffic volumes are still within that range that what would do without a bridge you probably are capable of doing and solving with bridge traffic, so we aren't really opening up a whole can of worms of alternatives to solve this increased traffic and the level of service.

Haugen stated that they were trying to identify, as they looked at what type of mitigation we can do, whether they met warrants since there are warrants for signals and warrants for all the stop signs, we mapped out what do and do not meet those warrants. He said they then looked at, okay, what would be the least costly mitigation we can do to make sure that we are reaching a level of service that is within our standards using a mitigation hierarchy that is as follows:

1. Add turn lanes without changes in traffic control
2. Convert to all-way stop-control with minimum turn lane additions
3. Convert to signalized control with minimum turn lane additions
4. Convert to single-lane roundabout.

Haugen referred to a table that shows the results of the mitigation process they did and went over it briefly. He stated that for the most part it is showing that of all the intersections that have issues on segments, there is a mitigation strategy that could be achieved to get us to a level of service that is acceptable, per our standards. He said that the one area that we don't quite meet that is at DeMers and Washington with the no build situation, and our current concept is a continuous flow intersection shows promise, but we aren't doing a traffic analysis to prove that at that intersection.

Haugen stated that these are the benefits that the river crossings have; we have some intersections that if we don't build a bridge we have to address, once we build a bridge, if it is at 32nd, we still have those same intersections but a lot of them we made the solution easier to implement then and the traffic volumes are more manageable.

Haugen said that that is where they are at with the study and, again, the next time you get an update you will start seeing some mitigations, some displays of 2D or 3D concepts, at some point we will have a rendering of what a bridge might look like as a crossing at these different sights, that type of stuff.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 18, 2021

Vein said, the comments we've received so far, you said, had a lot to do with school safety, that was also an issue that he personally probably has too; where are we with mitigation at this time for school safety. Haugen responded that that will be part of what we also see next month, is if we a bridge here what can we do at the key intersections to assist with school safety. He added that we do have a school representative on our Ad Hoc Group, and they are also wrestling with an internal site circulation at many of these schools, so they are looking at solutions that would help mitigate current problems that they are having with school drop-off, so hopefully the two will go hand-in-hand. Vetter asked if there would be some discussion on the Phoenix location, such as what we are anticipating to do now without a bridge, and if we do a bridge we won't have to do this, this and this at Phoenix. Haugen responded there will.

Haugen commented that the other thing; we talk about school safety, and what he keeps in his mind is that ever since 2010 or so we have been doing a lot of work with Safe Kids Grand Forks and the School Districts in both Cities on Safe Routes To School, and when you look our crash data there is very little if any data that indicates that we have a safety problem with kids going to and from school with vehicle traffic conflicts. He added that when you look at Wilder School on Gateway Drive, again there is no crashes, and when you look at any of the schools, we really can't find crashes that suggests that we've had a lot of kids, or many kids being harmed while going to and from school.

Vein said that on Gateway Drive, not during school, there was a child killed there, and that instigated building the underpass, and now that that underpass is there that has eliminated a lot of concern. He added that if you think back long ago, before there was even a bridge across the Red River there were a lot of homes that fronted Skidmore, and so he just wonders if a 32nd Avenue Bridge is put in, could there be a potential buyout program for homes that front 32nd Avenue South. Haugen responded that that would be a City decision. Vein agreed, adding that if we want this, over time you don't remember what was there, you just know what you are used to, right, and there could be some City implemented procedures or whatever to expedite that process, he thinks some of the last ones to go on Gateway Drive are where Simonson's Gas Station is today. Haugen said, though, just to add that the traffic volumes on 32nd, 8,500 cars a day, there are residential neighborhoods that have similar traffic in front of them today, and whether we think they are as good a neighborhoods or not, 17th Avenue South west of Grand Cities Mall is one example where it is a residential neighborhood with driveways and the traffic volume is on par with what we would forecast 32nd to be; Minnesota/4th is also about the same right now. Mock asked what that traffic is projected to go if there is no bridge, what is Minnesota/4th projected to go to without a bridge. Haugen responded it is projected to go to around 12,000. Mock asked when we would start talking about how many would have to be bought out if we have to extend Belmont to three or four lanes, is that part of this. Haugen responded that he doesn't believe that we would be identifying buyouts, we would be identifying potential right-of-way impacts, and then we would have to do a broad blush thing instead of some of our past studies where we were showing some right-of-way buyouts in a little more detail but we can't do that anymore.

Grasser asked if the Ad Hoc Committee is kind of getting into the details, pretty substantially, and understanding this, hopefully not biases but openness to concepts. Haugen responded he

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 18, 2021

thinks so. He said that it is an eleven-member group so there are some that are more deeply involved than others.

Vein asks what is the timeline as we move forward. Haugen responded that we are hoping to have this study wrapped up by the end of the year so we will start having, in November, some of those early “this is what we think” and get reaction to what we think the higher priority recommendation would be and then in December we would have the Final Report. Vein asked when we, as the MPO, will be making a decision. Haugen responded that it would be that December timeframe. He added that this one has to finalize their study. Vein said that we would take into account the Ad Hoc Committee’s recommendations and does it go back to the Cities and the County Commissions. Haugen responded that it is a question of how you want to process that, typically we wouldn’t be going through them before the MPO makes its final decision, but we can change that process if you wish. He added that the issue might be that right away we start in January with our Street and Highway Plan Update process and so that is where the result of this study will really play into that process and how we finalize our new five-year transportation plan, and we do go through the councils and commissions for that.

Information only.

MATTER OF APPROVAL FINAL FY2022-2025 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that this is that time of year when we are asked to finalize our next T.I.P. document, again this is a working four-year document, and this one will cover FY 2022-2025.

Haugen commented that, essentially, in the T.I.P. process there is a possibility of changes in those common years between T.I.P. to T.I.P., so new projects the focus should be on the new year that is coming on the document.

Haugen stated that a public hearing was advertised for last Wednesday, we didn’t receive any public comment, but we did have some good communications from MnDOT, in particular, that we discussed at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting, and we had to have subsequent follow-up with MnDOT on those comments and they were centered around the transit dollars. He said that they did get those ironed out and what is in the packet today is a result of that.

Haugen commented that there were a couple of other little minor modifications done at the Technical Advisory Committee, but one thing to note is that we know we are going to have to amend this document soon, and we are scheduling in November to do a major amendment to this document, and the NDDOT has identified a couple of projects since we went out for public comment, but the main reason is, if you recall, last year we were asked to start identifying what we call “group projects” or phases of project development in the federal process, and because the NDDOT principally uses federal funds for these project development phases, our T.I.P. document now has to show those, but the NDDOT was not in a position to give us those numbers yet, but they do have projects that they are proceeding through their project development and Federal Highway will be asked to sign off on them, and they will want to see our T.I.P. document reflect these costs so we are scheduling a major amendment in November to update

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 18, 2021

the document primarily because of these tables, and again, we are doing it for the preliminary engineering costs, the right-of-way and utilities that have with each federal project, and North Dakota, again, is primarily the only agency of our four major agencies that use federal funds for those phases.

Haugen said that the only other thing to note is just to explain that the transit; he pulled up the table that shows the final total on the North Dakota side; \$19,000,000, \$11,000,000, \$21,000,000 and \$17,000,000, so it is a substantial investment in transportation on the North Dakota side, and that number will only increase with the group projects. He stated that on the Minnesota side what they ran into was, you approved the draft back in April, and what happened between April and now is because Cities Area Transit has changed how it operates its Demand Response Services, in the past they used to hire an outside firm to provide the drivers, they now brought them in-house, so their cost allocation model between Grand Forks and East Grand Forks had to reflect that change in cost and that model wasn't ironed out until after the draft was done, so these numbers are reflecting the new way that both cities are agreeing with their annual contract to split the cost for those things. He added that what is happening is there are more costs being added onto the Demand Response side, that are now being paid out to Grand Forks from East Grand Forks, and with MnDOT, they were still using the old costs, so we had to have a conversation about why we were changing our costs and they are comfortable with the number we are showing now on the Minnesota side. He explained that now we just take these numbers for fixed route and these numbers for demand response, and then for the out years we inflate them to 3% for year of expenditure costs.

Haugen stated that if you actually took the opportunity to look at it, the T.I.P. document itself, you will have noticed it is substantially different than past T.I.P. documents. He pointed out what changes have been implemented and explained that it has been a project between MnDOT, NDDOT and the MPO staff to use this new format process, but there are still some kinks that we are working out so the action that we will ask you to take today is to approve this, but also to allow us to make modifications to the text document that our federal agencies might require to make it kosher with what they want, and they said that they hope to have that by the end of this week to us.

Vein asked if the DeMers and 42nd Interchange are in here. Haugen responded that it is not. Vein said that he knows there is some discussion on that plus the 47th Avenue I-29 Interchange is a future project, so that wouldn't show up here either. Haugen responded that the EA is in last year's T.I.P., for the interchange, so it wouldn't show up in here because it is 2021 dollars, and we are doing 2022. He added that 42nd Street is in here as an illustrative project and it is showing up in the Draft S.T.I.P. as an illustrative project, so he thinks it is physically showing up in the S.T.I.P. which is not their norm to show illustrative projects in the State.

MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY POWER, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT FINAL FY2022-2025 T.I.P. BUT TO ALLOW FOR ANY ADDITIONAL MODIFICATIONS THAT MAY BE NECESSARY TO THE DOCUMENT PER FEDERAL HIGHWAY AND FEDERAL TRANSIT.

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

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FTA 5310 ND SIDE CANDIDATE PROJECT

Kouba reported that this is kind of a mid-year addition request for projects from North Dakota Transit. She explained that it is because of all the federal funding that has been coming in from the Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act (CRRSAA)/American Rescue Plan (ARP). She stated that they are flooding transit systems with some much-needed dollars and so the State has released a mid-year application for funding; all of this funding is 100% federal funding, there is no State or Local funding in it, so we have one project from the Cities Area Transit for the Mobility Manager position. She pointed out that it will cover both wages and benefits for the position. She explained that this position was included in the normal 5310 request for funding from the State, and it was only partially funded through the State, so that creates some changing over of where funding is going to be used, so it will still be 2022 funds that were awarded for the 5310, but it will be pushed off to use the emergency funding sources right away, especially since it is 100% federally funded. She said that the Grand Forks City Council approved the application and give it priority ranking.

MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE FY2022 5310 MID-YEAR GRANT APPLICATION FROM CITIES AREA TRANSIT AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH OUR PLAN AND TO GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING.

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

MATTER OF WORK PROGRAM DISCUSSION (POSSIBLE AMENDMENTS TO FY2022 WORK PROGRAM)

Haugen reported that last month you accepted additional money from the State of Minnesota, roughly \$25,000, and at that time, because of the timing crunch, we placed it all into our Bike/Ped Plan Update Consultant costs, but since then there has been some discussion of whether or not we can use that money elsewhere, and so this was primarily to bring the Technical Advisory Committee up to speed about the increase in money, but also to give a rough idea of the timeline that it takes to do a work program amendment.

Haugen stated that it takes roughly two months; we have to identify all of the potential studies we want done and then scope them out to get a cost estimate of what we want done and how much it will cost, then we have to formally adopt it at the MPO level, so it takes about a month for us to figure out what study we will pursue, then a month to process the cost estimate through the approval processes, then we have to make a change to our work program, and then from that

point we have to request proposals. He said that in a case where it is under \$100,000 we can do a Request for Quotes, but we still have to have a minimum of 21 days for the request to be out, but we could then make cost a factor in our selection, but that will add a couple of months before we get a consultant on board, so now we are at around five months before we can even start the study, and depending on the detail of the study, it can take a few months to complete, so he knows that one of the things that has been discussed, and he had this discussion with East Grand Forks staff is on this Industrial Park Study, do they really want the MPO involved in it if it is going to take five months before we can actually even start it, and we probably wouldn't have enough at \$25,000 to carry a lot of the cost of the study.

Haugen said that he just wanted to make everyone aware of the bureaucracy and red tape involved with the Federal Government to use their money in studies, it is not a quick turn-around, and in this case, it would probably be five months before we could start. He added that the big thing being discussed was that the use of 2022 funds now, whether we will have enough time if we study Industrial Park to be comfortable when we have to make a T.I.P. decision of whether we have the answer or not, and there might be some other studies that people are interested in using the money for, so to kind of make it fair we are saying that if you have any studies you would like considered for these monies let us know but realize that it is a process to get started, but if you have any other thoughts of what to do with these funds, you need to start having conversations with us and your staff.

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 one-page report shows the updated activities for each of the agenda items. He said that all of our projects are underway:

1. Pavement Management – They just drove the streets earlier this month, so they captured all the pictures of our pavement and now they are in the process of coming up with a scoring.
2. Transit Development – Just under contract and just getting started and he is sure there will be a website soon.
3. Future Bridge Impact Study – We just had an update.
4. Grand Forks/East Grand Forks Land Use Plans – Both Cities have individual websites that you can look at and get information.
5. Aerial Photo – We have received all of the LIDAR data, but we are still waiting for the Aerial Photo

B. Congressional Reauthorization Update

Haugen reported that the Congressional Reauthorization process, if you have been following this; both Chambers of Congress have passed Reauthorization Bills. He said that there are substantial differences between the two bills, both from a financial perspective and how they are going to approach how they are going to solve the Nations Transportation issues, so we will have to see if they can come to an agreement.

Haugen stated that the current reauthorization has been extended out to the end of September, so they have to take action by the end of September, whether it is to continue the current authorization or actually coming up with a new bill, but by the end of September we will either know if it will be continued or there is some other action.

Haugen commented that even though there are substantial differences, both bills have substantial increase in dollars, the House has more dollars, but we don't know if that is lead into the budget resolution from the Senate side or not, so that is still unknown, but more dollars is kind of the commonality between the two bills.

Information only.

C. Approval Of Bill/Check List For 7/13/21 to 8/13/21 Period

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY ROST, TO APPROVE THE BILLS/CHECKS FOR THE 7/13/21 TO 8/13/21 PERIOD.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY ROST, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO ADJOURN THE AUGUST 18, 2021, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:00 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager

Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO
Transaction List by Vendor
 July 17 through August 13, 2021

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
AFLAC.							
Liability Check	07/23/2021	AFLAC	501	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-517.90
Alerus Financial							
Liability Check	07/23/2021	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-2,569.14
Liability Check	08/06/2021	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,569.14
Alliant Engineering							
Bill	07/27/2021	Inv. #...	Work On Futu...	206 · Accounts Pay...		565 · Special ...	-14,642.22
Bill Pmt -Check	07/27/2021	7094	Work On Futu...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-14,642.22
CitiBusiness Card							
Bill	07/23/2021	Acct #...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		-SPLIT-	-234.38
Bill Pmt -Check	07/23/2021	7092	Charges For ...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-234.38
City of East Grand Forks							
Bill	07/21/2021	Inv. #...	2021 3rd Qua...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-2,513.58
Bill Pmt -Check	07/21/2021	7089	2021 3rd Qua...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-2,513.58
East Grand Forks Water and Light							
Bill	07/21/2021	Inv. # ...	2nd Quarter 2...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-406.45
Bill Pmt -Check	07/21/2021	7090	2nd Quarter 2...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-406.45
Fidelity Security Life.							
Liability Check	07/23/2021	Avesis	50790-1043	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-8.43
Forum Communications Company							
Bill	08/09/2021	Inv. #...	Public Notice ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		565 · Special ...	-248.20
Bill Pmt -Check	08/09/2021	7096	Public Notice ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-248.20
Liberty Business Systems, Inc.							
Bill	08/06/2021	Inv. #...	Contract Bas...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-178.93
Bill Pmt -Check	08/06/2021	7095	Contract Bas...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-178.93
LSNB as Trustee for PEHP							
Liability Check	07/23/2021	PEHP		104 · Checking	X	216 · Post-Hea...	-123.75
Madison Nat'l Life							
Liability Check	07/23/2021	7085		104 · Checking	X	215 · Disability...	-67.34
Mike's							
Bill	07/21/2021		MPO Lunche...	206 · Accounts Pay...		711 · Miscellan...	-95.00
Bill Pmt -Check	07/21/2021	7091	MPO Lunche...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-95.00
Minnesota Department of Revenue							
Liability Check	07/23/2021	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-200.00
Liability Check	08/06/2021	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-200.00
Minnesota Life Insurance Company							
Liability Check	07/23/2021	7086		104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-111.72
Nationwide Retirement Solutions							
Liability Check	07/23/2021	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-495.89
Liability Check	08/06/2021	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-495.89
NDPERS							
Liability Check	07/23/2021	NDPE...	D88	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-3,059.28
Liability Check	08/06/2021	NDPE...		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,535.92
QuickBooks Payroll Service							
Liability Check	07/22/2021		Created by P...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-6,383.88
Liability Check	08/05/2021		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-6,383.88
SRF Consulting Group, Inc.							
Bill	07/21/2021	Inv. #...	Remaining A...	206 · Accounts Pay...		560 · Land Us...	-599.00
Bill Pmt -Check	07/21/2021	7088	Remaining A...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-599.00
Bill	08/10/2021	Inv. #...	Work On GF ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		560 · Land Us...	-12,137.99
Bill Pmt -Check	08/10/2021	7097	Work On GF ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-12,137.99
Standard Insurance Company							
Liability Check	07/23/2021	7087		104 · Checking		217 · Dental P...	-118.88
WSB & Associates, Inc.							
Bill	07/26/2021	Inv. #...	Work On EG...	206 · Accounts Pay...		560 · Land Us...	-6,040.30
Bill Pmt -Check	07/26/2021	7093	Work On EG...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-6,040.30