

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, September 15, 2021 - 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks Training Conference Room/Zoom Meeting**

CALL TO ORDER

Jeannie Mock, Chairperson, called the September 15, 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, Marc DeMers, Ken Vein, and Jeannie Mock.

Absent: None.

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

Mock declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 18TH, 2021, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY ROST, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 18TH, 2021, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON FUTURE BRIDGE TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY

Haugen reported that this is really just an update, you saw most of this material last month, and rather than showing what is in the agenda packet, the Tech Memo itself, which is on the website at: www.forks2forksbridge.com/info, has the same material along with some additional information he wants to highlight.

Haugen referred to the Tech Memo, a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request, and stated that the maps that show the change in traffic volume between the two bridge alternatives, also now shows instead of just the width of change it shows the actual numbers. He said that, for instance, because there is no Elks Bridge existing today the top number shows zero

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 15, 2021

traffic, the middle number shows what the 2030 traffic would be if that bridge is built, and the bottom number is the change that is between the existing traffic and the bridge traffic in 2030. Haugen stated that one of the things to note is that you will notice that in the 2030 Build Elks Drive Bridge location we are already forecasting that 6,800 vehicles a day will use that bridge, and that in 2040 it goes up to about 7,800, so only an additional 1,000 vehicles in that 15-year time span, so that is really kind of indicating to us, from a forecast point of view, that there is traffic on that bridge it will get used quickly and then by 2045 all of the additional traffic that is added to it is just the result of the growth that is occurring in both communities, so that is some indication that it has a useful life right away. He added that a lot of times people tend to think of traffic forecasting as being that straight trend line, in this case we are showing that there would be a steep increase right away once that facility is available, and then the increase after that initial availability is more traditional straight line.

Haugen said that that is the same forecast, as you will notice, on 32nd Avenue, the only difference is 32nd Avenue has a slightly higher traffic volume both in 2030 and 2045, and again, as we've stated in the past, that difference really is that 32nd Avenue captures a little bit more of the US#2, US Business2 area traffic volumes, however both 32nd Avenue and Elks, still the majority of the traffic using those, in our forecasts, are city to city traffic volumes.

Haugen commented that since the last time you saw this, we have also done some refinement to the table as to what mitigation could be done. He explained that in the past this table was combined with other information, we've now separated it out to show why we are doing the mitigation, there are many options for these intersections to mitigate the level of service, but in order for us to do that cost comparison, we are trying to create common mitigation throughout the different scenarios to come up with a common cost, however we are noting that there are different alternatives and there are also some restrictions or other issues to keep in mind with all of these mitigation options.

Haugen stated that if you look and vet some of these mitigations, for those of us that deal with this on a regular basis; signal with WBL-EBL, most people might not quite understand what is being conceptualized there, so we've added new diagrams just to give people some sense of what we are saying, adding a southbound right turn lane at Belmont and 32nd, and this is the concept, right now this does not exist, nor does this technically exist up at the intersection of Belmont and 32nd, but you get some idea of what those acronyms, westbound left, mean; these drawings give some sense. He added that he thought he put it in the packet that was mailed out to you, but it is on the Tech Memo that is available for the public on the www.forks2forksbridge.com/info website.

Haugen said that they are holding the next Ad Hoc Group meeting this coming Friday in the East Grand Forks Council Chambers. He added that the materials that you saw last month, and what is included in the packet this month is essentially what is being discussed with the group. He stated that the meeting will be live on Facebook and also on both City's Websites and Facebook sites.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 15, 2021

Haugen referred to the information in the packet on the Public Open House and stated that we did go over some of this information at the last meeting; this is just some updated information. He pointed out that there were a lot of users, unique users, continuously growing on the website. He added that one of the things that, perhaps, is a bit interesting is that on the Open House we had a survey and on that survey we had the Purpose and Needs statement that we drafted, that we asked people to strongly disagree or strongly agree with that Purpose and Needs statement and you can see that we had 156 people indicate they strongly agree versus only 46 people indicating they strongly disagree. He said that they are basically saying there is a need for another bridge to serve that city to city traffic.

Haugen commented that we did have an online mapping tool available on-site; compared to all the people that took the survey, most people didn't really respond too much on the map, they tended to just go into the like/dislike mode that the map provided with previous comments that were made on it. He said that a lot of the focus was on the 32nd Avenue corridor comments, and most of those talked about the school setting, people feel there is an issue with traffic around the schools that exists today, and that a bridge at 32nd that traffic doesn't get better.

Haugen stated that that is really the update that we have as staff for you, you saw a lot of this last month, it has been tweaked by the Technical Advisory Committee between then and now, and this is the information that we will be sharing with the Ad Hoc Group this coming Friday starting at 12:30 p.m. in the East Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers.

Vein said that he thinks the main question is how this will impact the schools, and what are we doing to specifically address that issue; he knows you have the intersections themselves, potentially, but are there other or better definitions of the problem with the schools than students getting to school themselves and how this might impact them. Haugen responded that not only us, but Safe Kids is principally a part of the solution, and next week they will be doing what they are terming "walk surveys", so it is a two-part thing that they do on a regular basis. He said that the first thing part is that they will ask teachers to ask all of the elementary students how they got to school today, and they will do that for two days next week, and then the second part is a survey that is sent to every parent of all registered students to ask them similar questions about the issue of how they get to school and why or why not, so that is going to be a data source that will line perfectly in our study area and that data is going to be gathered for all of the school in both cities, so it will be useful elsewhere as well.

Haugen commented that in this study we are able to talk about concepts but what everybody wants us to do is talk about precisely how this will be an improved intersection or an improved corridor and tell them precisely what project taking place, but we can only talk about concepts that could help but we can't say that this is what will happen. Vein said that he understands, but what type of concepts would you be considering. Haugen responded that we are ranking some of these, intersection controls are trying to address some of the school issues, you have seen that we are introducing some things such as either a full roundabout or a compact or mini roundabout. He said that they are addressing the level of service, but they are also being talked about or discussed in relationship because we have a lot of people commenting about the speed of traffic, and those are options to slow down traffic going through the intersection whereas with a traffic

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 15, 2021

signal, if you have the green you typically aren't slowing down as you go through that corridor, so that is one way. He added that at some of the intersections you will see things such as extended curbs, like is being done downtown in Grand Forks; there are concepts of the actuated crossing, which kind of exists at many locations already with Belmont and 4th probably being the best example of where all four stop signs have flashing lights when ped actuated; concepts of trying to beef up the crossing guard patrol program in Grand Forks in particular, most schools in fact don't have a crossing guard anymore, so trying to promote that as well; so there would be a range of things or conflicts that we will have identified, but we won't be able to say that for sure this intersection x, y, and z will be done this way.

Vein said that what he thought about, again, on the Grand Forks side, would be of the potential of some type of pedestrian separated crossing, that might be there, and he knows that we did one on South Washington Street where we had an underpass, that was kind of built that way, and so he would think that there could be something like that that could be considered, and he has also thought that from a Grand Forks perspective if the bridge is on 32nd there might potentially be buyouts that would be available too, because there is no doubt impacts with this traffic on 32nd for some of those homes, he thinks there are some things that we could do beyond what you've spoken about, talk again, in concept that could potentially pass. He added that he used the example of Gateway Drive as one, and that was were homes all along both sides, and now you couldn't imagine there being a home there and that same type of concept could happen on 32nd, but the school would still would be, so if you look many years down the road at some of the mitigation things he just would like to make sure we are aware of all options. Haugen responded that they will try to provide them and conceptualize versions.

Haugen stated that he thinks some of us have been here quite a while and we still have a lot of memories of some of the concept drawings that were fairly detailed like Engineering used to provide all the time, but we got called out with our I-29 Study, in fact that was put on hold for a while, and so we had to scale back or draw back on what we display as being purely a concept and not try to show detail anymore, so he hopes you are all understanding that that is what we used to see but we probably can't produce anymore with these things. Vein said, though, that as a policy maker we may need that information, if you can't then maybe we can figure out a way to get it so we can take a look at that and that might be through our Engineering Department, to look at taking that to another level because, for him, some of those are critical; the traffic counts are important, but safety is also important.

Grasser said, tying on to that, again we've got conceptual mitigation techniques for intersection improvements, and for some of those even with mitigation it looked like some of those were operating at a Level of Service D or less, and he is struggling with the idea that we would build a facility that now all of sudden causes a bunch of congestion that otherwise wasn't there, yet we are knowingly building at a Level of Service D, and he thinks that was talked about at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting, that we should make sure that our corridors that are operating, without mitigation techniques, at a Level of Service C, and he thinks the discussion was similar to what the discussion was just before this that if you can't delve into the level of detail to kind of get to that, but building on with what Mr. Vein is talking about, he thinks we need that. He added that he understands the planning level, but this, as a community facility and

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 15, 2021

impact he thinks we need to have some assurance that, you know, will the technique work and what are the challenges to implementation; do we have to buy property to add lanes and different things like that, he thinks we need to know that that is his opinion. Haugen responded that we are only limited to the Level of Service D because that is what our plan says that we are trying to achieve. He added that if you want to know what it takes to get a Level of Service C that is something that we can still do from a planning level, we just can't show you a map that shows any detail of what amount property we would need to do that, we could show you in one of the concept things that he showed, that we can provide as that isn't a limitation on the planning funds, to say that we need to be at a Level of Service C. He said that we go with a Level of Service D because, again, that is what our minimum level of service to achieve is in our planning documents because that is the level of service both States strive to achieve with their projects. Grasser said that he want to address that; the State basically came to us and said "here, you have your choice of what you want to do, you can pick D or D or D" and so when the MPO says we selected Level of Service D he doesn't think that capture the entire picture of really what our range of choices really were in the plan. He stated that another thing is that that decision was made, he thinks, based on one of those Highway Bills, the FAST-ACT or whichever one preceded that, in which all of the funding was really targeted towards the repair/rehab where you have so many constraints you probably can't get to a higher level of service but if you are building a new facility, had we known when we made the decision we should have maybe said, except for maybe when we build a bridge, we could have maybe added that into our policy, so he is just saying that he thinks our policy didn't address and envision this kind of new facility that is going, in his mind, so he doesn't feel like we are constrained to a Level of Service D because when we made the decision we didn't cover all of contingencies of new bridges, so he is just not accepting that argument. He said that he thinks if we made a choice, we have the ability to make another choice and he would have a hard time going into a neighborhood and saying we decided that we are going to just build to a Level of Service D – he doesn't want to do that. Vein added that that doesn't even exist now, it would make it worse. Grasser commented that traffic is going to reroute and there is going to be impacts, but if it is at least, and he doesn't know how you define reasonable, but to him at least a Level of Service C is at least a reasonable level of service, the road functions pretty well, the intersection functions pretty well, but you get into a Level of Service D or E, those are the problems we are trying to solve; he doesn't know how we can knowingly create them, he thinks we have to have a solution for that and that is why he goes back to maybe look at these intersections to kind of figure out what it would take to get to a Level of Service C and see if it is at least feasible.

Mock asked if she can clarify something, and maybe piggyback off what Mr. Grasser said, because like, so when you look at 32nd, what she is trying to understand is, if we do nothing, and if we don't put a bridge at either location, and we don't do another bridge, reasonably what would we expect 32nd to go to by 2030 and 2045, is that like the no-build 2030 to 32nd Avenue, because she would expect we would still expect some level of increase in traffic on 32nd. Haugen responded that that is correct. He added that you have to change the intersection traffic control at both 32nd and Belmont and 32nd and Cherry without a bridge, and the way this study is framing this is that if we put a signal at Cherry and 32nd under the no-build mitigation scenario, that signal would still likely work well under the Elks or 32nd Avenue Bridge scenario; the traffic increase is from the ability of a signal to serve that increase in traffic without a bridge and it is

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 15, 2021

significant enough to make that simple traffic signal not a failure with a bridge. Mock said that she would imagine there is a certain level of planning regardless of any bridge that we need to do as a City and MPO for 32nd, so, with these comparisons, with the no-build with Elks Drive in 2030 has 32nd increasing 1,400 to 1,900 cars and by 2045 it is 1,400 to 1,700 cars, so does that no build, with Elks, does that assume a bridge at 32nd not a bridge at Elks. Haugen responded that the numbers he believes you are referring to are just comparing no-build with a bridge at Elks. Mock asked, then, if that is a bridge at Elks and the anticipated impacts. Haugen responded that it is. Mock said, then, 32nd Avenue, looking at the 2030 to Elks Drive bridge, that assumes a bridge at Elks and that still assumes 1,400 to 1,900 cars increasing on 32nd even if we put a bridge at Elks Drive. Haugen responded that that is correct. Mock said that that is still, regardless, we would still have planning, and then do we know what, if we didn't build a bridge at either location, do we know what we would anticipate 32nd traffic to increase to. Haugen responded that that information is in Tech Memo 3-B; but he used the number 5,000, it is around 3,000 cars now so by 2045, without a bridge it would be at 5,000, with a bridge at Elks Drive it would be at 6,500 and with a bridge at 32nd Avenue it would be at 8,000 to 8,500; you are increasing it is just a matter of if you are going to increase it more with either of the bridge alternatives.

Mock said that it seems like part of the point is that if we already have complaints about school traffic and getting kids to school currently even if there is no bridge, there is a certain level of mitigation that needs to be done just to serve that area, so she thinks that that is a level of planning that needs to be happening regardless, and that would maybe help people in the public feel that that is an issue that is being addressed regardless because to her that seems like something Safe Kids and the MPO need to be actively planning for and then perhaps that helps mitigate if there is a bridge, but regardless that needs to be happening and she thinks people need constructive, maybe it is an underpass, maybe it is a roundabout, but if it is something they can see it might help. Grasser commented that he thinks that that is where the benefit would be to, again, analyze how to get to a Level of Service C to see what happens, some of that may be needed with or without a bridge. He said that part of the concern is, the psychology of the whole thing is that without a bridge these increases will be incremental over time, and it is the frog on the stove, but when we build a bridge it will be very sudden and very dramatic and very instantaneously traced back to that event, so in his mind that triggers that we need to do a higher level to make sure that we can justify and not create a bunch of sudden bottlenecks. He stated that ultimately you get to a similar state, but it is the tracing back to that significant single event that he is concerned about. Mock said that if we already have recognizable issues, we need to serve that population from a planning perspective and then we need to understand as decision makers if making a decision has a substantial impact, however you define that, even if it can impact beyond that or if these are mitigations that need to be put into place regardless, if that helps manage it to prevent larger issues, maybe. Grasser stated that he thinks the bridge helps trigger the timing of when these mitigations really need to be put into place.

Vein asked for a reminder of the schedule for this study. He said that he knows there is an Ad Hoc Group meeting on Friday, when is it going to come back, how many more Ad Hoc meetings are there and when will this be back here. Haugen responded that there are two more Ad Hoc meetings scheduled. He added that it is scheduled to be back here as a final draft in December.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 15, 2021

Vein said, then, what we will get is a recommendation from the Ad Hoc Group and we have the choice of following their recommendation or tweaking it or whatever we want. Haugen responded that that is correct. He added that, again, we have to think differently than recommending and such and instead we will be ranking the alternatives; it will be the highest ranking alternative, we can't really call it the recommended alternative yet, we can rank them and show which one is the highest ranked. Vein asked if we have a deadline for making a decision, the MPO. Haugen responded that the deadline we have is that we conclude all our resources for this study at the end of 2021, our 2022 budget doesn't really show any resources to carry this forward, but that doesn't mean that the MPO Board can't decide that we want to carry it beyond 2021, we would just have to reallocate some of those resources, that would be the only hang-up, that we don't really have anything to charge against this study in 2022, but we could easily do that. Vein said that the study would be complete, it is now that we have to take that study to the next level and decide, we could ask more questions, or maybe not, but we all want to get a decision. Haugen responded that in 2022 we are engaged in the mandatory update of our Street and Highway Plan, and so whatever the outcome of this study is will be plugged into that effort. Vein said, though, that we still don't have an identified funding source or a timeline either. Haugen responded that that is correct. Haugen commented that one thing we know is that Congress is wrapping up a significant increase in transportation funds.

Grasser asked if there is a way to somehow get these two corridors into a classified street system. He said that the one thing we've heard from the DOT is that they aren't even classified streets so you don't qualify for funds, so is there a way that we can get those corridors; Elks and 32nd and their connection in East Grand Forks classified to increase our potential funding options. Haugen responded that we have gone as far as we can with them. He said that 32nd is already identified in our Future Functional Class as the bridge corridor. Grasser commented that the last couple of blocks aren't. Haugen responded that the last couple of blocks on the Minnesota side are and the last couple blocks on the North Dakota side, in our Future Functional Class Map, 32nd Avenue is already identified on that map as a future Principal Arterial. He said that Elks is not because Elks is not identified in our planning documents as a bridge corridor. He stated that we could almost show a lot of things in our Future Functional Class Map, we don't have quite the same constraints we do with it as we do with our actual Functional Class Map. He said that if we had a known funding source for either of those two bridge corridors, we could go ahead and we would have them programmed in our TIP document and with then programmed in our TIP document we could then amend the Functional Class Map to show that, but there is a little dance that has to take place between the funding secured and the functional class, they are married, yet which comes first, almost simultaneously they will have to come in some cases. He said that, again, this was a recent change, five years ago functional class could have a lot of things identified like if there was still gravel on approved roads, but those days are gone, for the most part.

Haugen reported that we can go back and do the traffic operations to show what Level of Service would be, what it would require conceptually, that isn't a funding question on our end, but the eligibility of being done you would have to ask the consultants and our budget would be an issue. Grasser said, then, that the fact that we are doing a study, could that be a trigger to help get those two corridor options both qualified as classified. He stated that he is looking for an excuse, in

his mind that is going to be a significant problem, at least on the North Dakota side, at some point if we don't have a corridor that is eligible for any federal dollars, but State dollars in a project doesn't matter, but this federal at least, he keeps thinking is going to be a hang-up for us. He added that you don't have to answer this right now but if we can figure a way he thinks it will help us. Haugen responded that right now 32nd is currently covered, but the option of Elks is not technically covered; if this study shows that perhaps Elks is something that we were going to consider instead of 32nd, then we could go through the process of either amending our transportation plan or identifying that, yes, Elks as good an option as 32nd and having both identified in all of our planning documents. Vein commented that it could be a contributing feature in the selection of one of the alternatives. Haugen agreed. Grasser asked if we could just review those maps at our next Executive Policy Board meeting. Haugen responded we can.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON EAST GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN

Kouba reported that this is just information to keep you updated on the progress of the East Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update and added that we are getting close to the end of the process.

Kouba referred to slides of the project schedule and went over it briefly.

Kouba stated that the Draft Plan is available on the www.efgplan.org website for comments and a virtual open house is scheduled at 6:00 p.m. tonight. You can register for the open house at <https://bit.ly/egfnewplan>. She added that they will be submitting the Draft Plan to the Steering Committee, the Planning Commission and the City Council at their next meetings in order to get input on the Draft itself, and then will incorporate the comments/input into the Draft Plan. She stated that the final plan should be presented to the MPO Executive Policy Board in December.

Kouba referred to the population table and commented that now that they have the actual 2020 Census numbers, we can refine the population information, based on the 2020 counts. She pointed out that they are staying with the recommended .7% rate increase, so there was a little change to the population numbers.

Kouba commented that some of the questions were about the populating of jobs and how we are going to accomplish it, it is kind of based on population and the number of jobs per 1,000 people, so we show commercial, industrial, and kind of a combination of commercial and industrial type jobs in the table.

Kouba referred to a map of our current Future Land Use Plan for the 2045 Plan and compared it to the proposed Future Land Use Plan for the 2050 Plan and stated that there are a few changes. She went over them briefly, commenting that you will notice that some of the residential growth that we had is no longer shown, mostly because of the fact that we are looking strictly at the 2050 growth and not anything beyond 2050 for growth outside city limits.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 15, 2021

Kouba commented that the largest focus has been on what the goals and policies are, adding that they mainly have certain focused areas for our goals and policies: housing/residential; economic development; urban expansion (which is mostly that area outside city limits); parks, recreation and open space; and transportation. She added that there can be more than one goal for each area and each goal can have a few objectives that we need to meet.

Kouba stated that for all our State and Federal partners that were concerned about how our land use and transportation are connected, so she put together some tables about federal principles of livability and related which goals and policies are connected to these specific principals, as well as our Ladders of Opportunity and how those goals and polices connect to that. She stated that she also did this for our Transportation Planning Factors that we have always had within our own Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

Vein asked if a bridge is built would that change anything you are looking into. Kouba responded that it would not. She explained that they have taken into account the Elks Drive bridge as well as the 32nd Avenue bridge. She pointed out that on the East Grand Forks side there have been plans and ideas to get it closer to Bygland, as well as getting it over to Highway #2 for more of a connection.

Vein asked where East Grand Forks major growth is occurring, north or south. Kouba responded that it is kind of even right now. She said that right now most of the area within the southern part of East Grand Forks city limits is filling in quite quickly, and so there will start to be some development south of the city limits, which is one of the reasons we are looking at urban extension, those areas there will need to have some requirements looked at and planned for before developers can start building, but in the northend there is still plenty of open space, but they are developing there as well.

Powers commented, then, that any improvements to Rhinehart Drive won't happen until a bridge is decided, is that correct. Kouba responded that it would depend upon whether or not it becomes a classified road, right now it is still Township road, so it is maintained by the Township and she doesn't believe the County goes in there and does any cleaning or things like that otherwise it would have to be brought in as a County Road for improvements, and we haven't heard anything about that happening from the County, but that is something that we will need to talk to the County about, more of that road that comes into city limits.

DeMers said, then, that the 2050 map; he doesn't know if he is seeing it correctly, but on the east side of the Central Middle School site, is that low density. Kouba responded it is. DeMers stated that he knows there has been talk about the potential to develop that property. Kouba said that it is hard to tell the actual distance, but it is probably twice the size of the depth, so around a single-family house. DeMers agreed, adding, however, that it will probably be two parcels with a road, eventually. Kouba said that she believes the road is being built currently on the backside of the school because the school is doing some improvements for traffic flow for drop-off and pick-up. DeMers added that there is no plan to build a road back there right now, but there is the potential to build a road back there but the school can't afford to do it so the only way they can afford to do it is to build houses back there and you aren't going to build a road with houses only

on one side so there will have to be houses on both side, but at least it is showing that there could potentially be something there.

Kouba stated that the only other change would be in the area of where Sacred Heart had purchased a bunch of land around 4th.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN

Haugen reported that Grand Forks is about six to eight months behind East Grand Forks in the process.

Haugen said that he has two thoughts he is going to share; the first one is population forecasts and the second is that there are some thoughts about alternative land use for 2050.

Haugen referred to a slide and stated that they had some information about population at the last meeting and this slide is just showing that these are annual estimates, so they come in at different rates. He said that, as you can see the Census produces two different estimates, one is an annual estimate that is just based on one year of activity and the other is based on their five-year rolling of ACS data. He added that when the MPO produces our annual estimate of population we have similar type of growth trends until we get to the outer years, then we have versions where both census numbers are showing a loss of population whereas we were showing a slowing down of growth but still showing growth.

Haugen stated that they also identified where the City was growing versus where we actually have some loss of population between 2010 and 2020. He said that with this information City Staff wanted the MPO to consider whether UND was undercounted and whether we should make that a factor in our forecast, so what you are going to see on the next slide is they put these three census tracks, observed them as being neutral in the 2010 to 2020 population.

Haugen commented that because of what happened during the 2020 census with the pandemic, this is the result of UND basically telling everybody to leave campus and to not come to campus, so we think maybe there was an undercount. He said that if that was the case this would have been the 2020 population for Grand Forks, with those three census tracks zeroed out instead of having a loss, so that equated to about a 1.5% annual growth over the 2010-2020 period. He stated that City Staff is asking us to use our forecasted population.

Haugen pointed out that, just for comparison, if we look over a longer time-span, .9% is what the growth has been since 1960 to 2020. He said that the actual growth between 2010 and 2020 is 1.2%, so at the Land Use Subcommittee meeting held earlier this month they adopted, and are moving forward with utilizing the 1.5% and what that means to the total number of population coming into the community, it was roughly about 9,000 more than what we had possibly anticipated in our 2045 Plan, so that's a compoundment of .3% over that 30 year span and it adds up to more people that we were planning for.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 15, 2021

Grasser commented that some of those other that show a decline in population in the out-years, what is the basic premise that would generate that. Haugen responded that these aren't out-years. Grasser asked him to scroll up; he noted that they are actual, and stated then, that they aren't projections, those are actual estimated numbers, he thought they were projected.

Haugen referred to slides showing information from the on-line survey that was done as part of an open house back in May and said that this is a lot of the information that they were hearing, as well as some of the previous documents that were being looked at to see what type of alternative land uses there might be.

Haugen referred to the current 2045 Land Use Map and explained that the asterisks are indicating areas that, if we reached a limit beyond our 2045 population, would be the areas of growth to serve more population. He said that the two alternatives that were displayed at the Land Use meeting; Alternative 1 would be a concept of continued growth, with not utilizing a lot of the infill opportunities, and so you see these big spans of residential to the south and west, that is primarily the differences between these two documents.

Haugen stated that the next one is identifying that there are probably lots of opportunities for infill growth in the community; and they identified some of the corridors and some of the key activation points which could spur some internal growth instead of external growth and you can see there is less yellow on the western part of the map.

Haugen commented that since these two maps were produced, SRF and staff have been going back and forth with iterations of how to sort of reconcile the two maps into one to be able to present it to the public.

Haugen stated that there is a community engagement scheduled for Thursday, September 16. He explained that they will have a booth at the French Fry Feed (which was changed to hot dogs and chips) at University Park from 4:00 to 7:00 p.m. to try to capture some of the public that will be attending the event. He added that there is also an on-line opportunity that is an interactive map where you can make comments on land use for the Grand Forks area, and they also provided feedback on the Minnesota side as well.

Grasser asked if there was a question someplace, relative to where you would desire to live, in a higher density neighborhood versus a lower density neighborhood; to try to gauge those thresholds were people might want to do that. He said that he doesn't know if we have proportion measurements for that. Haugen responded that in the survey he doesn't see it. Grasser said that it is different between what do you think you want versus what would you want. DeMers stated that you can't predict that out 30 years from now because 30 years ago nobody wanted to live downtown either; whether it is multi-family or whatever. Grasser said that he is just curious how many people would answer those two, because estimating the future is going to be a lot of crystal ball no matter what happens, but people's perception today would be something he thinks would be valuable. Haugen referred to the survey and went over some of the questions on it.

Haugen commented that the one thing the maps aren't showing, and we have had some discussion at the Land Use Subcommittee level on, is do we get more definitive in the type of residential growth; single family versus multiple family, where in past plans you just hadn't made the distinction of whether there should be residential single family showed or if it should be multi-family showed on the land use maps, and if we did start to show that that is probably where we get a lot of feedback.

Information only.

MATTER OF POTENTIAL AMENDMENT TO METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN (MTP)

Haugen reported that he is just bringing you up to date on where they are at with this process. He stated that you did hear this a couple of months ago, and you did table the one request from the City of East Grand Forks; the other amendments were moved forward and the staff report identifies one in Minnesota and several on the North Dakota side. He said that they did formally submit a request to each City to see how they wanted to handle this, as far as whether or not it met their threshold for an amendment to their City document, and both Cities responded back that it did not so we don't have to wait on City actions so in October we are expecting to present to the board, then, the formal request and final action on whether or not we amend the Transportation Plan. He said that that is where they are at with that process.

Information only.

MATTER OF T.I.P. SOLICITATION

Haugen reported that this is just highlighting that we just got done with a TIP document, and we start right now soliciting candidate projects. He said that right now, because Congress has to take some sort of action by the end of this month; continuing authorizing transportation and appropriate; we are just assuming that all the things are the same as they were with this last TIP cycle; we are just identifying projects in the new year of the TIP, 2026. He added that fiscal constraint has been in place for several years for all the other years of the TIPs and right now we can't formally say there will be more money on the table, so we aren't looking for more projects in those current years, however if Congress acts by the end of the month, next month we might be singing a different tune as to candidate projects, but we should start releasing to staff, that solicitation into the public saying, okay, what projects should we be trying to program, principally in 2026 for most projects. That is where we are at right now with the TIP; we have to start soliciting for the next go around but right now we can't bank on there being more dollars available, but we might get more dollars available to us because Congress has to do something by the end of the month, and they are scheduling and negotiating to have either some major votes done by the end of September or the votes that will be done at the end of September will tell us that we have to temporarily kick the can down the road or another month or so, it just depends on what the results are in September.

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. Transit Development – Is under contract and the kick off meeting with staff has taken place. He said that there are data transfers occurring to get the consultants all the information they are going to need for the project.
2. Aerial Photo – The Lidar was distributed to both of our City staff so they have access to the Lidar image itself.

B. Approval Of Bill/Check List For 8/14/21 to 9/10/21 Period

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE BILLS/CHECKS FOR THE 8/14/21 TO 9/10/21 PERIOD.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY ROST, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO ADJOURN THE SEPTEMBER 15, 2021, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:05 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager

Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO
Transaction List by Vendor
August 14 through September 10, 2021

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
AFLAC.							
Liability Check	08/20/2021	AFLAC	501	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-517.90
Alerus Financial							
Liability Check	08/20/2021	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-2,569.20
Liability Check	09/03/2021	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,569.12
Alliant Engineering							
Bill	08/19/2021	Inv. #...	Work On Brid...	206 · Accounts Pay...		565 · Special ...	-9,616.90
Bill Pmt -Check	08/19/2021	7103	Work On Brid...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-9,616.90
Ayres Associates, Inc.							
Bill	08/17/2021	Inv. #...	Work On Lida...	206 · Accounts Pay...		-SPLIT-	-5,439.59
Bill Pmt -Check	08/17/2021	7101	Work On Lida...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-5,439.59
CitiBusiness Card							
Bill	08/25/2021	Acct #...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-160.85
Bill Pmt -Check	08/25/2021	7104	Charges For ...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-160.85
Fidelity Security Life.							
Liability Check	08/20/2021	AVESIS	50790-1043	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-8.44
GoodPointe Technology							
Bill	08/31/2021	Inv. #...	Work On 202...	206 · Accounts Pay...		565 · Special ...	-17,686.74
Bill Pmt -Check	08/31/2021	7105	Work On 202...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-17,686.74
Liberty Business Systems, Inc.							
Bill	09/08/2021	Inv. #...	Contract Bas...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-178.93
Bill Pmt -Check	09/08/2021	7106	Contract Bas...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-178.93
LSNB as Trustee for PEHP							
Liability Check	08/20/2021	NWR...		104 · Checking	X	216 · Post-Hea...	-123.75
Madison Nat'l Life							
Liability Check	08/20/2021	7098		104 · Checking		215 · Disability...	-67.34
Mike's							
Bill	08/18/2021		MPO Lunche...	206 · Accounts Pay...		711 · Miscellan...	-103.00
Bill Pmt -Check	08/18/2021	7102	MPO Lunche...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-103.00
Minnesota Department of Revenue							
Liability Check	08/20/2021	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-200.00
Liability Check	09/03/2021	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-200.00
Minnesota Life Insurance Company							
Liability Check	08/20/2021	7099		104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-111.72
Nationwide Retirement Solutions							
Liability Check	08/20/2021	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-495.89
Liability Check	09/03/2021	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-495.89
NDPERS							
Liability Check	08/20/2021	NDPE...	D88	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-3,059.28
Liability Check	09/07/2021	NDPE...		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,535.92
QuickBooks Payroll Service							
Liability Check	08/19/2021		Created by P...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-6,383.85
Liability Check	09/02/2021		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-6,383.89
Standard Insurance Company							
Liability Check	08/20/2021	7100		104 · Checking		217 · Dental P...	-118.88