

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

CALL TO ORDER

Jeannie Mock, Chairperson, called the December 15th, 2021, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:00 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

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

Absent: Al Grasser.

Guest(s): David Kuharenko, Assistant Grand Forks City Engineer and Christian Danielson, Grand Forks City Senior Engineer.

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

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY ROST, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 17TH, 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 we have an Open House scheduled for tomorrow, December 16, 2021 here in East Grand Forks City Hall, there is the in-person portion from 4:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. and then also starting tomorrow there will be an online version available for three weeks, up to January 6th on the website at: www.forks2forksbridge.com/info. He stated that there will be a recorded presentation on the information included in the packets today, and that was presented to the Ad Hoc Group at their meeting last Friday.

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

Haugen commented that the Ad Hoc Group had a good discussion about the information we went over for the evaluation matrix. He said that, just to highlight a couple of items that came from it; the first was a reaction from Kyle Kvamme about the benefit/cost ratios. He explained that normally his experience has been that a benefit/cost ratio of 1 or greater is pretty important when you are doing a competitive selection item, however Mr. Kvamme's take was kind of the opposite in that a benefit/cost ratio of 1 or greater doesn't necessarily mean a positive results, and he kind of downplayed it a bit, which surprised him. He stated that the second would be that from the Ad Hoc Group there hasn't been a very strong opposition about the need for another bridge, whether it be at Elks or 32nd, and he thinks that our understanding, as we've gone through the traffic detail, is that there are a lot of similarities between the two bridge sites; the real differentiation is that benefit/cost area. He said that the conversation with Mr. Kvamme during the meeting was Kvamme thought that Elks provided more of a local bridge option, and Haugen tried to describe that when we look at the traffic forecast between the two bridges, there is a 1,000 cars more a day from 32nd, but those 1,000 cars a day is evenly split between what you would call traffic from East Grand Forks to Grand Forks and back and forth, versus traffic that is coming from US #2, east, to and from the Crookston area, so it is still a lot of local traffic benefiting, just that more regional traffic would be added and it is more the hours saved, and miles saved via the 32nd Avenue site, even for that traffic in-town between the two towns, East Grand Forks and Grand Forks, it is a lot of miles saved and ultimately you will have hours saved and that is why the benefit/cost ratio improves so much more for 32nd Avenue.

DeMers asked for Mr. Haugen to elaborate more on the cost/benefit ratio argument as he is trying to understand what the argument is for a lower cost benefit. Haugen responded that he would invite everyone to watch the video of the meeting, it is available on many sources. He stated that the comments were basically that the Elks Drive Bridge cost is lower than the 32nd Avenue Bridge, so the cost of the structure is lower so that was seen as a bigger benefit than just a benefit/cost ratio, and then the other part was just that conversation he had of viewing Elks as having more local traffic attached to it than 32nd Avenue does. He said that the real difference is that there are 1,000 cars a day and those 1,000 cars a day is split pretty evenly 50/50 with what he would term "local traffic" versus regional traffic. DeMers said, then, that the argument is that we should be looking at benefits versus cost, just on cost; if you are just saying that we are going to take the overall. Haugen responded that Mr. Kvamme is just placing more emphasis on the cost, the difference between the two.

Vein commented that he is glad that this was brought up. He said that he listened online to the last part of the meeting and he heard that conversation and it was confusing for him to try to understand what Mr. Kvamme's rational was, when we talk about the benefit/cost ratio because it is different than what he has ever used before. He stated that the other piece is often times to even get federal funding you have to have a benefit/cost ratio greater than 1, do you not, does that play into the formula. Haugen responded that it is probably not a written criteria in the evaluation of how things would be ranked, but when you are in a competition and you have projects; for instance the last North Dakota Legislative session they had \$9 billion in requests for \$1 billion of funding, so it is one way to easily weed out that ratio of 9 to 1 by only looking at projects with a benefit/cost ratio of 1 or greater, meaning it will give us more benefit for the buck, so many times it isn't explicitly listed as a criteria, but virtually it is always used by the

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

people who review and select projects as one of their easy ways to cut down and narrow the number of projects.

Vein asked what the next step is for the Ad Hoc Group. Haugen responded that they have one more meeting scheduled and that is just to review the final document to make sure we aren't missing any specific piece(s). He said that they are also helping us get the word out for the meeting tomorrow, getting the word out for the online version and then provide a loop back to the residents/businesses that they serve by providing them the information that we have been sharing with them.

Vein asked what will happen with the information you receive at the Open House tomorrow, will you just assemble it and answer any concerns and/or questions that might come forward, is that what you see happening. Haugen responded that that is correct. He said that for the comments they receive they do have to provide a response to all significant comments; some may not be raising to a level of significance, but just not tomorrow, but because we also have the online version we will have to wait until January 6th to assemble all of the comments and feedback that we get and then we do have to provide a written response to any significant comments that are made to identify how we address their comment and depending on the comments, and their significance, and our reaction to them, if it causes us to do a real change on an analysis or anything else then we would have to reopen up the comment period because any significant change that may come about would have to be shared for any additional comments. He stated that typically we don't get significant comments, and at this stage of the process we have pretty much heard everything up to this point so typically we aren't anticipating having to do that.

Vein said, then, that there will not be a recommendation either from the Ad Hoc Group. Haugen responded that that is correct. Vein said that this will be gathered and it will actually come back to the MPO Board for consideration, and we already have identified 32nd Avenue as the preferred location. Haugen responded that that is correct. Vein said, then, what we would be looking for if ever a reason to maybe rethink that location, otherwise that is in the plan to go forward; what plan specifically is that in. Haugen responded that it is, from the MPOs planning products, it is in your Street and Highway Element of our Metropolitan Transportation Plan to the year 2045, and that is the same on both City's planning document as well. Vein said, then, that it isn't intended to be built sooner. Haugen responded that it is, and added that the horizon we have to go 20-years plus out, and because there is no financial constraint component to it, it is floating anytime between now and 2045. Vein said that if, like so many, we hear that they want to make this one shovel ready what next steps would we need to do after we confirm the location it would potentially be put in place. Haugen responded that you would start the NEPA process on the bridge site and go through the NEPA process project development. Vein said that that would have to come from both cities in this case. Haugen responded that it would typically be funded 50/50 between each side of the river. Vein asked when we would start that process. Haugen responded that there is no specific timetable; the sooner you do it the sooner you have a shovel ready project. Vein stated that he would assume it might be best to wait and let this process play out to see if there is any change, and then would that be implanted here with the MPO or would that be done by City Council first. Haugen responded that typically it would go back to each side of the river to the local jurisdiction, the local road authorities; that would typically where it

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

comes from back up to this board, depending on whether or not the NEPA document is being pursued, for the most part it has to show up in our TIP document and so we would have to take action to show that an environmental document is taking place in X year of our current TIP. He said, though, that it is possible for it to be financed with federal funds, there are some pluses and minuses to have federal funds attached to it at this point in time, but it can be locally funded as well.

Strandell said that he assumes that the traffic counts weren't based on the possibility of a Merrifield Bridge being done. Haugen responded that it was factored into the counts.

DeMers said that, just for reference, and he isn't going to hold you to this dollar, but what would you estimate the cost of doing a NEPA study process. Haugen responded that at one time during the earmark requests there was a number of \$1.5 to \$2 million dollars tossed out as the cost. Vein asked how long the NEPA process takes. Haugen responded that he would say, ballpark, 12 to 18 months.

Mock asked, if we did something like that, what would you do for alternatives considered; obviously the no option, but then would we consider Elks and 32nd or do we only consider 32nd because that is the only one in the plan. Haugen responded that that would be up to the project managers of the NEPA process to define what alternatives, they could be very relaxed and include other sites than Elks and 32nd or they could be more precise and say that we have enough information to narrow it down to the 32nd Avenue Corridor and then the alternatives are within whatever many feet of that alignment that you would be looking at, how to connect basically back to 32nd and Belmont intersection, and how you get from there into the Minnesota side alignment within the dike, so it would be the alternatives within that location, but again, the project manager and federal agencies working on agreeing whether there should be sites as far away as Elks or any other site, so that is still a bit up in the air, it can be narrow and focused or it can be very broad and general.

Vein asked, remind me, what was the study that we just did, was that the hydraulic study of this location. Haugen responded that it was. He stated that he told the Ad Hoc Group on Friday that the difference between the two, the hydraulic study looked at more sites and because of the information gathered from the hydraulic study, there was an ability to eliminate some sites. He said that you are looking at just two sites, and there are a ton of similarities between the two sites, probably not enough to clearly state that one is no longer able to perform, but he thinks we are showing that there is enough information, particularly in data based on benefit/cost, where we start seeing the real difference between the two sides, where one is a little bit better than the other. He added that it also shows up when you look at tables that are summarizing where there are differences between the two, again 32nd Avenue has double pluses where Elks has just single pluses.

Mock asked if there was discussion, she thinks there is a little bit of a disconnect between benefit/cost and what components these benefits versus the actual definition for federal transportation projects, in that what goes into the actual calculation. Haugen responded that there are many ways to do cost calculations even within Federal Highway programs. He said

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

that we use the most common one which looks at three components; the first one is miles traveled so the fewer miles the alternative has the more you save, the second is hours that you would spend traveling and the third one is to do a bit of a safety analysis, eye level safety analysis that is based on the statistical analysis of if you have “x” fewer vehicles on a corridor you are likely to have “x” fewer crash occurrences, and each crash has a cost so those are the three components that are involved in this level of benefit/cost that we have done. He commented that if you look at our Glasston Railroad Study that we did, at the time the Mill was looking at also consolidating their rail operation over the Glasston, we used a different benefit/cost ratio there, it got more involved with some of those neighborhood qualitative benefits, that we didn’t get into with this one, but that benefit/cost was following, he believes at the time, if you’re familiar with the TIGER Grant process that were in play back then, that was the benefit/cost evaluation that they asked for in all of the grant applications, and it was a little more intensive and a little more comprehensive.

Hauge stated that lastly are questions about schools, and our basic message is that at each of the schools there are issues that exist today, those issues will be very similar with a bridge at either site, and there is no reason not to address those issues independent of a bridge location because when you address them you are addressing them for today’s traffic; and without a bridge you see increased traffic, it is just a question of how much more increased traffic would be with a bridge, and most of those mitigation, or all of those things we would do would have benefit with today’s traffic, future traffic with either no bridge or with one or the other bridge, and so we are kind of encouraging addressing the school issues separately. He added that we are saying that definitely when the bridge is open, and if these haven’t been addressed, there are ways that the school issue should be addressed, but we are really saying that they should be addressed well before the bridge is addressed. Vein asked how we go about doing that. Haugen responded that there are some recommendations that already exist at each of the school sites for improving safety, we’ve done those studies, they are ten years old or more at most of the schools, those could be revisited; there are opportunities with the school district now, and with the mill levy increase they did, they are going to be doing some safety improvements around the school sites so that would be another opportunity and he believes they are working with City staff on some of those site improvements, that would be another opportunity; and then annually we solicit for candidate projects, which is another thing on our agenda, where there are different pots of money and under the new transportation bill there will be quite a few new programs and more money available.

Vein stated that one of the areas that he has seen problems with is of course Belmont and 4th and 32nd and Belmont. He said that both of those corridors will be impacted, but they both have safety concerns now. Haugen stated that Belmont and 4th would probably have a complete different mitigation without a bridge than it would with a bridge, just because you are dealing with such heavy traffic flow without a bridge that all that traffic will begin to need to have a much broader more footprint, and with a bridge at Belmont and 32nd you will probably be doing that same mitigation with or without a bridge, traffic volumes don’t jump up that much. Vein said that he is thinking more of even crossing Cherry and 32nd; he said he would like to see some kind of a level of grade separated crossings at some locations and not having to cross 32nd and have that conflict, and that would be a long-term solution. He said that he lived through what

happened on Gateway Drive, when a child was killed, and they put the underpass in as a change-order to an existing project.

Mock asked who would initiate looking at those school crossings because the ideas that we have, that wasn't T.I.P. amended and would be revisited, does that go to the cities, does it come to the MPO. Haugen responded that we typically react to what a city would be asking the MPO to do, and we are pretty limited in our funds for the next year or two so it is unlikely we would be able to squeeze anything in. He added that he would say we don't have the dollars, but the School District and the City could cooperatively program, they do work together on a lot of issues already.

Haugen commented that there are a lot of improvements done around the schools that aren't utilizing federal funds and then we have been fortunate to get some federal funds, we will see more improvements, such as all of the school crossing beacons will be replaced and upgraded here, that is with a federal grant, so it is a mixture of local staff working to identify and implement, and then other times we will be seeking federal funds to help augment the cost, particularly for some of those larger things like a grade separation.

Information only.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF HOLIDAY BONUS HOURS

Haugen reported that we follow the City of Grand Forks Personnel policies as much as we can; historically they have granted and will be granting this holiday bonus hours to their employees this year, and we have followed suit in past years, so we are asking you to consider following suit again this year for a four-hour holiday bonus.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VEIN, TO APPROVE FOUR HOLIDAY BONUS HOURS TO BE USED BETWEEN DECEMBER 15TH, 2021 AND JULY 1ST, 2022.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Grasser.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR FY2023-2026 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that included in the agenda packet was information however we just updated it so you can find it on line, not as the full packet but as a separate agenda item.

Haugen referred to the information and explained that historically most TIP cycles, December is the time on the North Dakota where all candidate projects are identified and vetted as being consistent with our plan and also prioritized. He said that, as the presentation shows, this doesn't just include projects inside the city limits, but also includes some area that we call our study area that is located outside city limits.

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

Haugen stated that there aren't just projects that have funds from Federal Highway and/or Federal Transit, but also some that have funds from a variety of sources of funding that show up in our T.I.P.

Haugen commented that some of the big unknowns this time, it was an atypical year primarily because Congress and the President signed a new infrastructure and jobs act, the acronym that now seems to be favored for it is BIL, and that is what is referenced here (Bipartisan Infrastructure Law).

Haugen pointed out that there are a number of new programs, there is a significant increase in funding of the existing programs. He added that the focus does, however, still remains on the state of good repair and on the national highway system. He said that there is a difference between what is appropriated versus what is authorized; the bill that we hear about only, for the most part authorizes funding levels, each year they have to go through appropriations and appropriate those funds and this year they are also dealing with the debt ceiling limit issue and other things so right now even though the bill includes Fiscal Year 2022, so far congress has only appropriated, via a continuing resolution, 2021 funding levels and it only does it through February 18th, so we don't have a full year of funding and the money that is appropriated is at 2021 street levels so it does not include any of the increased money that has been authorized yet.

Haugen said that another thing, and we talked about this at some previous meetings, is Bidon's Justice 40 Initiative; his initiative or executive order, is to try to allocate 40% of these funds into specific geographies; in Grand Forks/East Grand Forks the latest map is based on five year census community survey data which indicated that basically most of the north end of Grand Forks and the central part of East Grand Forks and then one little neighborhood down by the Grand Cities Mall area is going to be five census block groups that were identified as Justice 40 areas, so if we get all this money, we will also need to be aware that now there is an initiative from the federal perspective to focus these funds on certain geographies, and for the most part that focus will be a burden of the urban areas because that is where most of these geographies with these types of populations reside.

Haugen commented that we are doing some things today, but it is likely going to change, and for the most part that change will be a positive change because it means more money for our projects.

Haugen stated that there are a number of programs; under the North Dakota side these programs exist based on past law and there will need to be a change in these programs because the new law identifies new programs that both states have to react to, and so this solicitation began under the old law so it is still framed under the old laws framework, and they are still called the Regional Road Program, the Urban Local Road Program, the Urban Road Program, Transportation Alternatives Program, Highway Safety Program, and they are going to set aside a Highway Safety for railroad crossings, and then there are a couple transit programs. Haugen stated that all of these programs are a local nomenclature from North Dakota, you won't find these first three

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

programs in any federal law, it is only for North Dakota and on the Minnesota side they have a completely different nomenclature for the same basic programs.

Haugen said that because of the new bill, and all of the funds that are going to be authorized, and therefore legally expected to be available our Metropolitan Transportation Plan basically is no longer fiscally constrained, we have too little money identified in it with the money that will be available. He stated that we don't have a federal declaration from either state federal agency that says that we no longer have a fiscally constrained plan, but the reality is is that our plan doesn't account for all of this money and yet we are trying to program the years when all this money is going to be available in, so from a staff level we took the perspective that most any candidate project is within fiscal constraint because it really isn't fiscally constrained anymore

Vein said, if that is the case, we will have probably a fairly large group of projects, will we still have to prioritize them internally. Haugen responded that we will still have to prioritize them. Vein stated, then, that because we are going to start going through that process where is that prioritization with this. Haugen responded that historically what the MPO has relied upon are two things; during our Metropolitan Transportation Planning process, to reach fiscal constraint we prioritize projects through time-bands; short, mid and long term, so that is one priority order and then within that priority order we more or less rely on the road authority to submit to us, in their priority order, projects from these programs and sometimes we only get one project per program so it is easy to rank and prioritize them, other times there are multiple projects and most often the city will submit to us what their priority ranking is, and 99% of the time we follow suit although there have been exceptions to that but they are very rare.

Haugen commented that what we have been advising is, because we already have a four year document that says these are projects that are going to get federal funds, let's look at the last two years, what projects are there and what projects could be advanced earlier into project development so they become shovel ready so when the money hits the state we have projects that are no longer waiting for further work, they are ready to go for construction. Haugen added that there is already indication that North Dakota is taking this approach because we amended our TIP last month to show project development happening earlier on the Regional Traffic Signal Project and also the paving work on 32nd Avenue. He said that they are purposely doing those project developments earlier than they would otherwise because they know there will be dollars pumped into the state that doesn't have projects attached to them and this way they will have projects ready to go so we will likely see a request to amend our TIP document to show these projects, not in 2024 or 2025 but possibly in at least 2023.

Haugen referred to the presentation and went over the information briefly.

Presentation continued.

Haugen explained that one thing that has happened is that 42nd Street did get the District Engineer's signature on it, and so it is now listed in the year 2025 as the top priority for the Regional Program to get funding. He commented that, again, if you recall, our fiscally constrained transportation plan doesn't have any kind of money like this involved in it, but with

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

the new bill there is a potential for this to be funded. He added that the next couple of years our other priority orders, as provided to us from the City of Grand Forks, and we more or less followed the priority that is in our MTP for the Regional Program, which are essentially the State Highways on the North Dakota side.

Vein asked to go back to the corn mill project and stated that at the City Council meeting on Monday he brought up the issue of the impacts to our transportation system, not only on ours but in East Grand Forks as well. He said that all of it is going to be greatly impacted, whether it is the Interstate, Gateway Drive, or Highway 81 North, and he thinks those impacts will expand throughout the community because people may not go up there and they may stay in different locations, but he thinks there is going to be a huge impact and as we've talked before, he thinks that Mr. Haugen personally brought up the issue of Gateway Drive tracks with the at grade crossing that we have problems there right now. He said that he just feels that this has to be understood, and maybe we can't do anything, but how do we go about, or who is going to go about, in what process do we get something like that fully understood. Haugen responded that his understanding is that the City is doing a traffic impact study. Vein said, then, what we are saying is that the MPO is not going to be a part of that process. Haugen responded that we haven't been invited to be part of that process. Vein asked if we could be, or maybe even should we be because he thinks it is going to affect more than just Grand Forks. Haugen responded that he would think that part of that traffic impact study would need to have not just today's traffic, but a reasonable forecast of future traffic, particularly the assumption is that at some point federal funding would be involved and then you have to show that it is at a capacity acceptable from 20 years plus, and that would come from our traffic demand model. Vein said that he thinks that they are talking about having the development agreement soon and a proposal to move forward, how do we make the City without good information and that kind of study is going to take time. Haugen said that as we have gone back and forth with City staff, right now the best that can be done is just to identify it as the memo so when we digest this at this level, and we forward it to the NDDOT at their level, we are trying to keep the message the same that in addition to these candidate projects there is this need that will be identified in the near future for this facility, but we just don't have enough information to say "X" dollars for "X" project right now but we are saying to keep in the back of your mind that this is going to need "X" dollars in the future.

DeMers asked if 27th is approaching classified road, because that is going to have to be rebuilt and that is a giant project in itself isn't it, is it programmed already. Kuharenko responded that it is currently a gravel road and that would be something that we would have to identify, as part of the traffic study is to identify what kind of traffic we will be going to see so we can properly design that roadway to handle that traffic. DeMers said that the project is 300 and some acres, right, will they be able to stage on site. Vein responded that is too be studied. DeMers stated that, as you said, that is going to impact everything along that entire corridor from the Interstate. Vein added that there is also the issue with conflict with rail traffic at the same time, so you can't do one without doing the other and knowing what that will be and how that will impact the traffic flow as well.

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

Haugen said that the traffic study; 27th Avenue is functionally classified and would only fall with the Urban Road Program, under the current NDDOT structure; under the new bill it is that but there are other programs that are brand new that might be the way it is financed, but there will be other potential needs identified that are on the Regional Highway system, like North Washington is, and so which program does that pull from, that is somewhat what is going on here, but at least we are letting it be known that you shouldn't be surprised when a month from now or two months from now or however soon we can get to them that would make an additional request for funds, we are trying to be upfront and say that this is the City's #3 priority, being funded, and so let's try to keep it in play as best we can with the information we have. Mock asked, as we try to develop that does that mean, so then that would shift our priorities so right now whatever is number one in that Urban Road Program might get shifted down if we identify 27th as needing federal funds, is that correct. Haugen responded that that is one possible outcome; if there are no new monies available, you do have the ability to have North Columbia Road programmed right now, you could shift that project out. Mock said, though, that it would shift money from the current project to that. Haugen responded that that is correct, that is one possibility, not probably the preferred or likely outcome, but one possibility.

Mock said that with 42nd, you said it was programmed for 2025. Haugen responded that it is a candidate project for 2025, we can't use the word programmed yet, it is still trying to get money and prioritized within the state. Mock said that most likely if nothing else changes, and there aren't any new pots of money, that is when it would most likely occur. Haugen responded that that is correct.

Haugen stated that because we aren't exactly sure where to place the wet corn facility, it is still not really identified. He said that when he submits the letter to the State saying "here is what the MPO action did" one of those things would be to include a paragraph on the wet corn facility and try to identify the needs, not quite well fleshed out, your district is involved in identifying and doing the traffic study so maybe not be so bold as to reserve "X" dollars for it but to be hinting that the money should be kind of set aside and not spent. Vein said, though, that he would think the DOT is equally concerned for just the impacts and costs, they are going to demand a study of what that means.

Kuharenko commented that as part of that traffic study they have engaged the North Dakota Department of Transportation and they have expressed their concerns, not only for the Interstate but also for US Highway 2, and particularly Washington Street just because of the added traffic, and as you mentioned on Monday night the trucks are going to be the ones causing deterioration of the roadways, so they are particularly concerned for Washington but they are also looking at Gateway and the Interstate as well. DeMers asked if that was just from a maintenance perspective, or are they looking at traffic flow as well. Kuharenko responded they are looking at a little bit of both. He added that they are also looking at what are going to be the turning requirements on Gateway, what are going to be the turning requirements on North Washington, how is the truck traffic going to back up on the Interstate or the Interstate ramps, some of that has been a concern in the past, and part of the reason why they are looking at the 47th Avenue Interchange, and the South Interchange, it is because of traffic on 32nd Avenue potentially backing up on the Interstate because that is a serious safety concern and one that the DOT takes

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

serious. Vein commented that NPN would be another piece that could easily happen, especially with natural gas coming now, that would also have major impacts. Haugen stated that the MPO does have a traffic study on NPN. Kouba commented that the company has asked about transit service out there, they have been asking transit about service and how they can get workers out there, not just for their permanent workers once it is open but also their construction workers as well, and how we are going to facilitate that if we can at all, so there are some things that will be brought up here soon with transit in regard to industrial areas.

Haugen referred to the Urban Roads Program slide in the packet and pointed out that, again, this is a new piece of information that wasn't included in the packet that was provided to you earlier. He said that as part of the packet we ultimately send to the NDDOT, the summary spreadsheet, this is the one the City submitted to the MPO so the two projects are in 2026. He stated that these projects in 2024 and 25 are already programmed and have funds reserved for them so these projects could be the ones that we were saying could be advanced perhaps, the 2024 and/or 2025 ones to try to get project development going earlier. He said that the signals is in 2023, if North Dakota is advancing the regional signals perhaps the local signals could also be advanced. He stated that is one change that he will make, and he did discuss this with City staff; because they were still working under the fiscal constraint issue they felt there wasn't enough money in the urban pot of money to fully fund South 48th Street, so they listed it as an illustrative project so he will change that to Urban Roads, number two priority in 2026.

Haugen commented that right now we are submitting candidate projects; with all the money that could come in the balance sheet North Dakota sent back out in September didn't account for any of this new money. He stated that if nothing else changes within the program on the North Dakota side Grand Forks MPO should get about a million dollars more in 2022 and a little bit more out to 2026, and that is another five million dollars that isn't accounted for. He said that one reason why he doesn't think we should be concerned about whether there is a spreadsheet that is old that doesn't identify that five million dollars versus is there five million dollars possible for these projects so that is why we are changing it, not being something that is seeking funding but within this new reality that is out there that we still don't know all the ins and out of.

Haugen referred to the next slide of the Urban Program and commented that this is the Main Street program and there are two projects being submitted. He said that the one difference in this is that the funds will be available in 2024, so the two projects, and again this is the priority order the City provided to the MPO and what we would suggest as well; the first one is an intersection at the South 5th Street/Belmont/Division intersection where they are proposing to construct as roundabout, and the second one is the continuation of North 4th Street reconstruction that currently has the funds to build from DeMers to 1st Avenue so this would be their second priority to fund the section from 1st Avenue North to 2nd Avenue North. He pointed out that a conceptual drawing is included in the packet as well.

Haugen stated that next is the Transportation Alternative Program, it too is going to get a lot more money than it has gotten in the past and there is also some provisions here where more money has to be spent within our geographies so the City did submit one project and that is on South 48th Street where a gravel path exists and it will be converted to a hard surface.

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

Haugen said that there was only project submitted for Highway Safety Program funds and it is to extend the left turn bay on South Washington at 28th Avenue.

Kouba reported that there are two general programs that CAT submits applications to; they are the 5339 and the 5310 programs. She said that solicitation for these programs was done in October by the NDDOT, with a due date for the MPO of December 1st so we can vet through our process to get to them by their deadline of December 31st. Kouba added that CAT is just now vetting their 5310 projects through the City Council.

Kouba commented that the two projects are the Mobility Manager position and a replacement van. She said that it was heard at the Council's work session, and will now go to the full Council on Monday and we do expect approval at that time, but at the end of the day we don't actually have final approval from the Council but staff is requesting the Board approve the projects pending Council approval.

Kouba stated that we don't have any 5339 projects. She added that we are also in the midst of doing our Transit Development Plan update so that will be looking at a lot of those Capital Projects and other things as well, and there will be some things brought forward that were discovered through that process.

Haugen said that both the Technical Advisory Committee and MPO staff recommend the MPO Executive Policy Board approve all of the projects as being consistent with our Metropolitan Transportation Plan and to give them priority ranking as presented.

MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY DEMERS TO APPROVE THE CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR FY2023-2026 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE MPO METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING AS PRESENTED, AND SUBJECT TO THE COUNCIL APPROVAL OF THE 5310 PROJECTS.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Grasser.

MATTER OF NEW REAUTHORIZATION/INFRASTRUCTURE INFORMATION DISCUSSION

Haugen stated that unless the Board wants him to he doesn't anticipate going into any great detail; the information is available here.

Haugen said that they have available, program by program, what they anticipate could be available in North Dakota, as well as construction dollars or transit operating dollars, there will be increased dollars for what we do as an agency so he estimated, based on current formulas, that

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

we might receive another \$150,000 federal funds, but we would need that local match to access them.

Haugen commented that one of the concerns that we would have is, that won't affect the 2022 dollars but in 2023 there is a likely chance that the Minot area will be designated as an MPO, and therefore the North Dakota pie of funding will be split four ways instead of three ways as it is now; so the pie will be greater but there will be more people accessing it so depending on how it ends up we might be getting back to our current level or lose a few dollars, but ultimately that will be played out through the MPOs and the DOT and Federal Highway signing off on it.

Vein asked what needs to transpire for Minot to become an MPO, just based on population. Haugen responded that it is a density of population. He explained that the City itself is at 48,200+ so they only need to pick up roughly 2,000 more people, and if you look at how Minot has built itself, and what has been allowed in terms of development outside the city limits; and you look at how US #2 connects Surrey and Burlington, there is a lot of development between the two, it just depends on how the Census Bureau defines that population as meeting the density criteria or not. He added that they have some gimmicks on ways they will make the connection by doing hops and jumps and other terminology, that is in the weeds quite a bit, but they conceivably could push that Minot area to be over 50,000 which is the threshold of a densely populated area.

Haugen commented that a couple more things, just on an MPO perspective, there are some things that we will have to include now, officially; housing is the first thing he would point out. He explained that, as you are aware, we have ten factors and our goal statements are the ten factors, and one of the factors now is going to include more direct language about housing. He said that we do the land use plans and have been working with both cities on the land use planning, so it isn't a overly new thing for us here in Grand Forks/East Grand Forks, but across the nation there might be a little more emphasis on the housing connection with transportation.

Haugen stated that another minor thing is that they are changing, within the Federal Regulation, what fiscal constraint really applies to. He said that right now the Federal Regulations says that the first 10 years of our transportation plan, and it is a harsh fiscal constraint, almost a dollar in and a dollar out; this law is now changing and is telling Federal Highways to rewrite the regulations to trim that 10 years down to 4 years. He added that it is easy to say that in the law but in reality when you implement that we are doing a four year TIP annually so you are kind of, by necessity, having a transportation plan that covers more than four years of fiscal constraint just because it has to be constrained every year that we do a TIP, so for practicality you are kind of back to a 10 year process, so it may not have much of an impact but it sounds like it could.

Haugen said that is really the highlights of the MPO planning process that he has deciphered in the law. He added that there are a lot of new programs; for instance in our current TIP we have four bridges that are getting financed from what some would argue are street dollars, the new bill created a whole new program of bridge specific dollars and North Dakota is going to receive \$45 million a year minimum to fund bridges, and so we have \$10 million dollars, not including the North Washington Underpass Bridge, in projects that if funded out of the bridge program would

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

free up another \$10 million somewhere in the State, hopefully us, to finance other things. He said that as these new programs come on board, we will have an opportunity to fund these differently, and that may also cause Minnesota to revamp how they structure their federal programs, they may no longer have a Regional Road Program and the Urban Program may be split into several different programs, so we will have to wait to see but we will be part of the process to help them identify those things and then go after them once they are in play.

Haugen said though that the State of Good Repair is still the main focus; part of the reason we got the money is because of the huge backlog of need for bridges, but it does not eliminate the construction backlog

Haugen stated that there is a whole separate national competitive bridge program on top of the formula funds. He said that most of the increased money was driven through formula, so that is why they could create that \$45 million dollar per year bridge program, it is driven by a formula and the formulas are set in stone, so they must do the calculations and North Dakota is going to get \$45 million. He added that under the competitive bridge program there is billions of dollars available, it comes out in annual solicitations, so there is no guarantee though that North Dakota will get any of that money because it is a national competitive program.

Information only.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Haugen reported that we have not received any public comment. He said that last month we did have a letter from the Chamber about a meeting that was held on December 7th, he was not able to participate so if anyone here participated maybe you would like to give an update on what transpired at the meeting.

Rost said that they just talked about priorities for the City of Grand Forks. He added that Todd Feland talked about the underpass at 42nd and DeMers, and they talked a bit about the Roland Young Memorial Bridge, and they discussed about appointing people to go to the NDDOT and MnDOT to talk about funding for the Merrifield Bridge and see what kind of input there is from the DOTs on that project, but to his knowledge has been appointed at this time.

Vein commented that he thinks it is really important, to be successful, that we are all working together because if we start having different actions he doesn't know what that is going to happen so he just hopes that whatever happens we are united in what we say and what we do. He said that there is no question in his mind that bureaucracy that occurs in all of these processes is huge, it is just about unbelievable and for somebody to come in trying to circumvent that process, he thinks we need to stay firm with that and work within the process to make sure we have that unified voice. He added that even with new money, they aren't changing the processes, so we are still going to have to abide by those so lets work together on the process. He said that if there is something he would like to see happen that it comes through like that, and we come to these meetings and have that discussion, these are the published organized meetings open to the public.

Information only.

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, and that there isn't really much to report this month.

Haugen stated that the only thing would be that as soon as it shifts out that there is more dollars available in 2022 you will likely see a work program amendment from us to capture those dollars and assign them to a project.

Haugen commented that, just so you're also aware, he is trying to push North Dakota extremely hard; one of the other two MPOs is still spending 2020 dollars, and we are at the end of our 2021 dollars and having to open the 2022 dollars. He said that for the last five years they have been trying not to have this happen, but it is happening, so he is trying to get them to finally admit that there is a need to shift some money back to us again a third time.

Information only.

B. Approval Of Bill/Check List For 11/13/21 to 12/10/21 Period

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE BILLS/CHECKS FOR THE 11/13/21 TO 12/10/21 PERIOD.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO ADJOURN THE DECEMBER 15TH, 2021 MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:10 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager

Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO
Transaction List by Vendor
 November 13 through December 10, 2021

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
AFLAC.							
Liability Check	11/26/2021	AFLAC	501	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-517.90
Alerus Financial							
Liability Check	11/26/2021	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-2,569.14
Liability Check	12/10/2021	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,569.14
Alliant Engineering							
Bill	11/22/2021	Inv. #...	Work On Futu...	206 · Accounts Pay...		565 · Special ...	-4,273.54
Bill Pmt -Check	11/22/2021	7145	Work On Futu...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-4,273.54
Ayres Associates, Inc.							
Bill	11/22/2021	Inv. #...	Work On Orth...	206 · Accounts Pay...		-SPLIT-	-3,332.77
Bill Pmt -Check	11/22/2021	7146	Work On Orth...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-3,332.77
Bill	11/22/2021	Inv. #...	Retainage Du...	206 · Accounts Pay...		220 · Retainag...	-9,354.87
Bill Pmt -Check	11/22/2021	7147	Retainage Du...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-9,354.87
Business Essentials							
Bill	12/09/2021	Inv. #...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-12.05
Bill Pmt -Check	12/09/2021	7150	Charges For ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-12.05
CitiBusiness Card							
Check	11/22/2021	CitiBu...	Online CitiBu...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-233.05
Fidelity Security Life.							
Liability Check	11/26/2021	Avesis	50790-1043	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-8.43
Kimley-Horn And Associates, Inc.							
Bill	11/15/2021	Inv. #...	Work On TDP...	206 · Accounts Pay...		548 · EGF FT...	-15,283.38
Bill Pmt -Check	11/15/2021	7139	Work On TDP...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-15,283.38
Liberty Business Systems, Inc.							
Bill	11/15/2021	Inv. #...	Contract Bas...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-178.93
Bill Pmt -Check	11/15/2021	7140	Contract Bas...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-178.93
Bill	12/09/2021	Inv. #...	Contract Bas...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-178.93
Bill Pmt -Check	12/09/2021	7148	Contract Bas...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-178.93
LSNB as Trustee for PEHP							
Liability Check	11/26/2021	PEHP		104 · Checking	X	216 · Post-Hea...	-123.75
Madison Nat'l Life							
Liability Check	11/26/2021	7142		104 · Checking	X	215 · Disability...	-67.34
Mike's							
Bill	11/17/2021		MPO Lunche...	206 · Accounts Pay...		711 · Miscellan...	-84.00
Bill Pmt -Check	11/17/2021	7141	MPO Lunche...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-84.00
Minnesota Department of Revenue							
Liability Check	11/26/2021	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-200.00
Liability Check	12/10/2021	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-200.00
Minnesota Life Insurance Company							
Liability Check	11/26/2021	7143		104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-111.72
Nationwide Retirement Solutions							
Liability Check	11/26/2021	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-495.89
Liability Check	12/10/2021	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-495.89
NDPERS							
Liability Check	11/26/2021	NDPE...	D88	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-3,059.28
Liability Check	12/10/2021	NDPE...		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,535.92
QuickBooks Payroll Service							
Liability Check	11/23/2021		Created by P...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-6,383.88
Liability Check	12/09/2021		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-6,383.88
SRF Consulting Group, Inc.							
Bill	12/09/2021	linv. #...	Work On GF ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		560 · Land Us...	-2,958.39
Bill Pmt -Check	12/09/2021	7149	Work On GF ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-2,958.39
Standard Insurance Company							
Liability Check	11/26/2021	7144		104 · Checking		217 · Dental P...	-118.88