

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, February 16, 2022 - 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks Training Conference Room/Zoom Meeting**

CALL TO ORDER

Jeannie Mock, Chairperson, called the February 16th, 2022, 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: In-person - Jeannie Mock, Marc DeMers, Warren Strandell, Bob Rost, Mike Powers, Clarence Vetter, and Al Grasser. Ken Vein via Zoom.

Absent: None.

Guest(s): Tangee Bouvette, Grand Forks City Human Resource Director

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 JANUARY 26TH, 2022 MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AND THE JANUARY 28TH, 2022 MINUTES OF THE MPO FINANCE COMMITTEE

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 26TH, 2022 MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AND THE JANUARY 28TH, 2022 MINUTES OF THE MPO FINANCE COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF DISCUSSION ON EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HIRING PROCESS

Haugen reported that he put together a staff report just highlighting the discussion the Board had at its last meeting, and also letting you know that the Technical Advisory Committee did meet last week and they have appointed their two people, as noted in the staff report. He added that

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, February 16, 2022

Ms. Bouvette is here to go over the Grand Forks Human Resource Departments proposed hiring process, and to answer any questions we might have.

Bouvette stated that she is the HR Director with the City of Grand Forks. She said that she was approached by Chairperson Mock to assist in your process of hiring your MPO Executive Director position so she put together a proposed hiring process.

Bouvette stated that they have posted the position at this point, it was posted January 27th through February 28th, and she put together sort of a look at the next month timeline, plus some proposed processes and is looking for feedback and input from this Board as to how you would like to proceed. She said that she does recognize that you have two members of the Technical Advisory Committee appointed, and then two members from this committee to be appointed or are they already appointed. Mock responded that they have already been appointed, Clarence Vetter and Ken Vein have been appointed and Mr. Vetter is the East Grand Forks City Councilperson and Ken Vein is the Grand Forks City Councilperson, so there will be two representatives from each side on the selection committee.

Bouvette referred to the hiring proposal included in the packet and commented that she will just take you through it briefly. She said that you can see their advertisement approach, they used City of Grand Forks resources plus a few paid resources to get this regionally and nationally posted. She stated that they will create an Assessment Center and the timeline of this really will depend on the Selection Committee's availability and then how we choose to proceed.

Bouvette stated that they would like to hold the Assessment Center here at East Grand Forks City Hall as they feel it would be a great space to hold it, and some of the things she would like to go through with you today is just how you would like to structure the Assessment Center, so we can prepare for that, and even prior to that she will just let you know that they have so far received four applicants for this position, and so the discussion we should have today is how many you would like to see interviewed in that final Assessment Center and then who you would like to work on it if we want to perform a screening matrix to get down to that number, so those are some of the topics we should address today.

Bouvette said that as far as, with the Assessment Center, there probably will be an interview portion and perhaps even a presentation portion; part of what she would like to see decided today is if those things are recommended, is her department, Human Resources from the City of Grand Forks, could work with that committee in developing target focus for maybe the presentation as well the interview questions, so just working outside of this venue.

Bouvette commented that you provided four people for the selection committee; one thing she would ask clarification on, that was brought forth to her from one of their City Council members, was regarding the process, in that once the Selection Committee recommends their top candidates, they would give them to the Finance Committee, but since the Finance Committee is made up of two Minnesota members and one North Dakota member, they are wondering if there could be parity somehow, so there is at least two from both sides of the river, is the comment she received, so if that could be a discussion point as well. Mock said that she got that comment as

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, February 16, 2022

well. She stated that the way we have it structured is the Selection Committee would do the interviews, and there are two from this board and two from the Technical Advisory Committee so we get the kind of policy side as well as the technical side. She said that they did meet as a Finance Committee, since that is the standing committee we have to talk about kind of finalizing the Job Description and discussing an interim director, so it was thought that we could potentially have the Finance Committee handle the negotiations moving forward, but that suggestion was made to her as well so she thinks we could consider appointing a special committee and having two from the East Side and two from the Grand Forks side, whether that is just adding another person to the existing Finance Committee or appointing a temporary Ad Hoc Committee. She said that she doesn't think it is necessarily a bad thing however we do it we have a lot of voices at the table that way so that there isn't any concern with impropriety or pushing of a particular candidate through, especially if we have the negotiation committee have different representation than the hiring, because then we are taking advice from one committee and the other is handling the negotiation, so she thinks that is all up for comment or discussion.

Bouvette asked, just a point of clarification on that, with the Selection Committee, it is her understanding is that they will recommend their top choice to the negotiating committee, if you will, and if those negotiations fail then they would move on to the next ranked person, but if the Selection Committee does not come up with a second ranking then is it deemed a failed search, or how would you like to structure that. Mock asked if Grand Forks has a hiring committee, do they typically suggest to them that they can rate their candidates one, two, three, etc.. Bouvette responded that what she would recommend is that you determine the rankings of the candidates so if you interview four people, and rank them and decide as a committee that the top two would be acceptable, but below that we would like to go out for another search, or start a revised search, but maybe there is one candidate that rises to the top and in that case that is what the Selection Committee would recommend, if that is acceptable. Mock said that that would be acceptable for her, but we've got four people identified and are hopeful that when they see candidates in the interview, they can have clear standouts and we would trust their recommendation.

Grasser commented that when he looks at this organization there has been a lot of effort taken to make sure everything is balanced, so part of this, maybe just as a visibility piece, we've got a balance on the Selection Committee, so he thinks the next step, he would suggest, is that we have balance on the negotiating committee, and ultimately we have balance when it comes to the full Executive Board, so if somebody questions balance, for lack of a better term, we've got that consistently throughout the process, so he thinks if nothing else, just because of the optics of all of that we want to make sure we carry it through.

Grasser said that he has a question about the meet and greet, particularly, should we open that up to more than just the Executive Board, and he is thinking maybe both Mayors, or whatever because that is more of just a somewhat informal process, but introducing them to the community as a whole. Bouvette responded that we can go over the Assessment Center if we like; the meet and greet was an option, they typically do a meet and greet for department head level positions with the City, and they have gotten really positive feedback with that from all around as it gives a chance to a little more informally converse with the candidates, so that is an

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, February 16, 2022

option. She said that also a bus tour of the cities, and they have done that for a variety of positions as well if that is something you want to add on to your assessment process just so your candidates have a better feel of the area, the community. She added that one thing they have done with the City is to have their candidates attend a City Council meeting, she doesn't know if timing wise, we'd have to time it around a Board meeting, but if that is something that you would be interested in having the candidate sit through, or not, that is something they could look at arranging. She said that as far as the interview and presentation piece, there are various ways you can structure that, you can do the interview and the presentation just in one block, so you are interviewing a candidate for forty minutes and then they do a twenty minute presentation with a question and answer period, or you could do a morning session, with specific focused interview questions and then an afternoon session and presentation, there is a whole variety of ways we can structure that, and she can work with the Selection Committee on developing some of that if you'd prefer, or if this group would like to decide how to structure it she would welcome that feedback as well.

Grasser commented that he likes that structure because it exposes the candidate to a little more time to get a little more in-depth. He said that he went through it with his hiring, as miserable as it is for a candidate, but it is sometimes too easy to sit through a twenty-minute quick question and answer session, and he thinks that is why we want to have more visibility, to put them in more situations, so, again, that is why the meet and greet takes them out of the interview mode and gives another kind of insight as to their personalities. He added that he is used to this process, they have done a lot, especially with department heads, so he would recommend we go through that, if we want to let the Selection Committee go through the details of exactly what and how to do it he is fine with that, he just thinks it is a good process.

Vetter stated that he likes the meet and greet, but he is just thinking if you are inviting council members and mayors, breakfast may not necessarily work for everyone, you may want to do it the evening before, maybe just have a social hour when everyone isn't working. He said that department heads can take time out of their day, some do a breakfast meet and greet, but for an elected official it is harder to do.

Vein commented that unfortunately he doesn't hear many of the participants speaking so he isn't aware of what has been said, he can hear Ms. Bouvette, Ms. Mock and Mr. Haugen, but he doesn't hear anyone else, so it isn't easy to respond but he is willing to work with the Selection Committee to figure out a solution, or if one has been figured out now that is fine, but he thinks the process in general that Ms. Bouvette has laid out is a very good one, and he has participated in using that in the past with other hires, so he has a lot of confidence that it is worthwhile. He said that the one thing he would say is that he may have a conflict the week of March 14th, he knows right now he is supposed to be gone for at least a part of that week, so he really needs to take a look at getting some of that firmed up and maybe even working with Ms. Bouvette on the day or days so he can get it into his calendar sooner rather than later, it is something he can try to adjust if need be but some of it he will actually be in Dallas.

Bouvette stated that March 14th was a day that was just thrown out there, we may have to, and this board can decide how flexible you want to be with the timing of the hiring and the

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, February 16, 2022

participation of the candidates; if we have someone from out of the region who needs to fly in, do we want to offer a virtual interview versus an in-person interview, or would you prefer the in-person and then there are some logistics with that too, whether you want to offer a reimbursement or hotel room or such. Vein responded that he would prefer in-person interviews if at all possible, and of course we would have to deal with the expenses of doing that but the importance of the hire and looking at the verbal and the non-verbal it is just better if we can do it in-person and have the meet and greet, all of that would be his preference.

Rost commented that they have joint meetings, the County Commission and the City Council, so if the City Council sets up a meet and greet for these candidates then he would like to see the commissioners get invited also to that, and he doesn't know how Polk County feels about it, but they are part of it too.

Strandell asked if they would have the meet and greet for all of the candidates or just for the final selection. Bouvette responded that typically they do the final candidates, whether you select to have three or four top candidates, that is sort of the discussion here. Mock asked what they typically like to have for department heads, five or three candidates. Bouvette responded that it really will depend on what the differentiation is, whether you've got three or four candidates, or if you have two that are really close, then you might have to adjust to do five, but for this level of position you would typically have three to four top candidates that you want to proceed with, but that is also why we use the Matrix or Screening Tool, to help identify those top candidates.

Grasser said, then, that we would actually just interview say three or four. He was debating, in his mind, the question of reimbursement and virtual; if you say you are interviewing ten people and a lot of them are a long way away, sometimes a virtual can be used for the first cut, but it sounds like we are kind of going to weed that out through the Matrix. Bouvette added that you could do a screening tool matrix just on paper, right, but you can also do say a five question, the Selection Committee could do a pre-cut round. Grasser said that it will depend on how many applicants we get. Bouvette agreed, adding that if you have fifteen applicants then you probably want to do a paper screening matrix, and if you are down to five that you are questioning, whether you want to do three or all five, you might want to do a quick screen.

Mock stated that it seems like we have kind of a consensus, that we asked for those folks and we trust their opinion and their input, and she thinks that generally what she is hearing is support for the meet and greet to be set for folks to come to, and she thinks we just have to set the time and whomever can come can come, as long as everyone is invited and knows about it, and then we let the rest of the details go to the Selection Committee. She said that it also seems like there is support for the interview questions and presentation. Bouvette explained that typically how they do that is her department would work with the Selection Committee and really drill down to what you are looking for in a candidate and then design the interview questions around that as well as the presentation topic and then the presentation topic would be given to your candidates about a week before so they have the same amount of time to work on it and they would likely not release the interview questions until the day of the interviews.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, February 16, 2022

Mock asked, in terms of candidates, are we, as a committee okay with having the screening unless we have so few that we want the Selection Committee to maybe do a pre-round of virtual. Vetter said that he would suggest that the Selection Committee get together with Ms. Bouvette and fine tune all that to determine how we want to proceed; pick the interview questions, whether we want to do presentations, whether we want to have a bus tour, to figure all that stuff out. Bouvette responded that she thinks that would be great.

Mock asked, in terms of negotiation, do we want to select, she thinks we could just balance the Finance Committee and perhaps put another person from the Grand Forks side to provide that balance or we could do an Ad Hoc Committee for negotiations. McNelis asked how many people negotiate for Grand Forks. Bouvette responded that they typically have just one person. McNelis suggested that maybe just have two members of the Finance Committee negotiate, one from each side. Vetter stated that he would be fine with that. Grasser said that he wouldn't have any problem with that, the only question he would have is if we do say the first candidate and it doesn't work and the second, he thinks the selection should go back to the Selection Committee; the actual negotiation of the contract is fine with this very small group. Mock agreed that the Selection Committee will provide pretty clear direction on what they see for ranking and we can't really know that until we know the interviews and see how they fall. She said that she would trust that the Selection Committee will probably provide direction, the outcome in terms of negotiations, what kind of salary range and a candidate or two to talk to. Strandell agreed, adding that there might be some minor changes required to the current contract, but not much. Mock said that she thinks that if it is too significant then it should be brought back for full Board approval.

Grasser asked, we are doing a regional advertisement, and lets say we have some candidates set that are requesting some reimbursement to come in, would that be something that we can pay for as an organization utilizing some of those planning dollars or would they be excluded, just in case that comes up because he would hate to lose a candidate because we aren't willing to pay for an airline ticket. Haugen responded that those costs would be eligible too.

Bouvette commented that she was just trying to show what options are available, and to determine what direction you want to go, to make sure we have the Selection Committee set and then you set the negotiating team, and that is fantastic, and then she will work with the Selection Committee on the rest of the details.

Information only.

MATTER OF APPOINTING INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Mock reported that the Finance Committee did meet and discussed the possibility of appointing an Interim Executive Director to fill the gap between Mr. Haugen's last day and when whomever we potentially hire. She said that they discussed offering the interim position to Ms. Kouba and she has agreed that she would be open to that position, so we wanted to bring that back to the Board for any comments or questions.

MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY ROST, TO APPROVE APPOINTING TERI KOUBA AS INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

Mock thanked Ms. Kouba for agreeing to be the Interim Executive Director, adding that it isn't always an easy position, so we appreciate it very much.

MATTER OF FY2023 TO FY2026 TRANSIT CANDIDATE PROJECTS

Kouba reported that last month you were presented with some solicitations for Street and Highway projects, this is for transit on the Minnesota side.

Kouba stated that they have been working with the East Grand Forks Transit Operators, as well as MnDOT to come up with what the needs are, and what resources there are for those needs.

Kouba said there was little change from previous years, East Grand Forks generally does the operating for both their fixed route side and their Dial-a-Ride side; with mostly federal funding for the fixed route and state funding for Dial-a-Ride.

Kouba commented that they also purchase buses, so for 2023 to 2026 there will be a bus purchased in 2024, which is already in our current TIP. She stated that the additional year is 2026 and they will be looking for their funding for operating the two services as well as the purchase of an additional bus.

Powers asked if the buses that are being requested going to be gas. Kouba responded that at this time they are. She explained that MnDOT is currently in contract negotiations for purchasing these buses, it is a Statewide Contract, so there are options in the contract for choosing the different kinds of buses, as long as they are similar to the ones that are needed for East Grand Forks. Powers asked how often they look at that contract. Kouba responded that they do it every four to five years, and that is why they are currently in the middle of the negotiation process for a new contract.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE MINNESOTA SIDE CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE FY2023-2026 TIP AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF FY2022 TO FY2025 TIP AMENDMENT

Haugen reported that over the years on the Minnesota side we rarely get TIP amendments, on the North Dakota side we have many TIP amendments. He stated that this is an amendment that is being proposed because between when we finalized our TIP document, North Dakota finalized their STIP document and there are a couple of projects that appear in the STIP that should also appear in our TIP, that is the primary purpose for this item.

Haugen commented that there is also a need, at times, to reconcile exactly what our TIP document says and what the STIP document says, so we are addressing just things that need to happen in FY2022 of the TIP right now so there are some bids that can still be processed in a timely manner.

Haugen stated that one of the first things that we are trying to do is to reconcile the total cost number for a TA project on 32nd Avenue. He said that in the STIP they are using just the pure construction cost, but our total TIP uses construction cost plus some engineering costs, etc., as the total cost, so initially when we put this out for public comment we were just saying that this was an administrative modification that didn't need full public notice, since then it has been brought out that we wanted to hold off on doing this modification so we aren't asking you to take action on it but just because it was out for public comment we are bringing it to you so you know why it is there, so the modification is not being recommended for pursuit anymore so you can kind of ignore it.

Haugen said, however, there are two projects that we do need to amend into our TIP, both are rather large projects that are predominantly are not in our MPO study area but do touch or have some components inside our area.

Haugen stated that the first project is on US#2, out by the Air Force Base; they are going to do a chip seal and they are coming in all the way to 69th Street so the last three eastern miles are in the MPO study area, so it needs to be in our TIP as well. He commented that the total dollar costs here are for the total project, the whole 15 miles, not just the portion in the MPO study area.

Haugen commented that the second project is for pavement markings that are going to be redone throughout the District on State Highways. He said that a portion of those on I-29 are in the MPO Study Area, and again the total project cost is the total for the district wide cost, there is no cost specific to the MPO area.

Haugen stated that we will be adding these two projects to FY2022 element of the TIP. He said that we did advertise for public comment and received none, and both the Technical Advisory Committee and MPO Staff are recommending adoption of the TIP amendment and to not take action on the Administrative Modification.

Grasser said that he kind of gets a chip seal, that is at least a higher-level form of maintenance, but are we going to get into the point of approving pavement markers. Haugen responded that

when they ask for federal funds for paint, yes. Grasser stated that he struggles with that; the State is telling us we have to do that. Haugen responded they are.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY ROST, TO APPROVE THE FY2022 TIP AMENDMENTS, SUBJECT TO EXCLUSION OF THE PROPOSED ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATION.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF CONTRACT AMENDMENT FOR THE GF LAND USE PLAN UPDATE

Haugen reported that this is a time only extension being requested. He said that the Draft of the full Land Use document is out for public comments, particularly with the Land Use Subcommittee and the original contract anticipated a completion date of the end of April, that isn't going to happen, so they are asking for a completion date to be extended out to the end of June, which puts the document for preliminary approval at the April City process and May final approval at the City as well as here at the MPO and then the month of June will allow for any last second changes but more so to be able to assemble all the materials that have been gathered, generated into a package for deliverables to the MPO and the City, so we are just requesting an extension of the contract timewise, but no additional cost compensation to the end of June.

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE CONTRACT AMENDMENT #1 TO SRF FOR WORK ON THE GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN, AS PRESENTED.

DeMers asked if this extension would have any downstream effect on the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Haugen responded that it would not.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF ADOPTION OF PM1 (SAFETY) TARGETS

Haugen reported that every year we are tasked to consider adopting safety targets for the MPO area, and since we have two options, the staff report identifies that your first option is to adopt the State targets as your own MPO targets. He said that under that scenario if you adopt North Dakota targets you automatically have to adopt the Minnesota targets, you can't just adopt one state for the whole MPO area, you have to adopt both states. He stated that we have historically gone with the second option of choosing our own target, but for your consideration we are

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, February 16, 2022

showing what the State's have adopted for their targets, and also a history of their targets that they have set.

Haugen stated that the good news is that there are some good results happening with these safety measures, but we also see that, particularly in the State of Minnesota the numbers are so large that it loses some the relevance for the MPO area.

Haugen explained that we use the same methodology the States use, which is to take five years of five-year rolling data to average out what the target would be for the next year, so that is what we did the prior years. He referred to a table and commented that 2018, 2019, and 2020 we used that methodology and adopted targets as we see; in 2021, the last year, we followed the methodology and we proposed 2021 targets based on the data. He said that the decision was to maintain the 2020 targets, and then in 2022 see what the results are and consider whether we keep the 2020 targets or if we make adjustments to the targets based on the data. He stated that they provided the 2022 target data, again based on the numbers, the difference is that because you now have 2019 data and 2020 data included in the calculation that we didn't have in 2020 the numbers are different, we drop off the previous two years of the five-year rolling averages, so unfortunately for fatalities the last three years we've had a total of four each year where previously we dropped off some years when we had zero fatalities, so those numbers are different, and that is why they are different.

Haugen stated that the Technical Advisory Committee recommended that we maintain the 2022 targets, and so that what is highlighted in yellow on the table. He said that the decision you have to make today is whether or not you want to switch and adopt each State target as the MPO target, or do you want to take the Technical Advisory Committee's recommendation and maintain the 2020 targets.

Haugen said that the last piece of information here is that we are showing what the targets were for 2020, and again these targets are set with five years of five-year rolling data, where the targets are the results, the actuals are just based on the latest five years of data, so even though the number of traffic fatalities in 2020 is four, the five-year rolling average is 1.96.

Haugen stated that, again, the question is do you want to go with the Technical Advisory Committee's recommendation or adopt each State.

Grasser commented that this is exactly the kind of stuff that the Technical Advisory Committee is supposed to do, and to make a recommendation.

DeMers said that the Technical Advisory Committee's recommendation, just so he is sure, is to adopt the absolute values not the rolling average methodology from 2021, because those are all the absolute values, the 1.8, the 5.74. Haugen responded that those were the values that were generated back for the 2020 data sets. DeMers asked if there was a reason the Technical Advisory Committee prefers this. Haugen responded just to maintain a steady target setting system, and to not keep chasing the tail. Grasser added that Covid really influenced a lot of

things, so the last year or two might have some anomalous numbers in there, that might be part of their consideration.

MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED SAFETY TARGETS FOR CY2021, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF MN-60506 OR ND-0000GF02 BRIDGE

Kouba reported that since none of you understand any of those numbers, most of us know it as the Point Bridge. She explained that as they were doing some of the STIP/TIP amendments and solicitation for FY2026, there are plans to do some rehabilitation work on the Point Bridge and there was a question as to what the bridge is called. She stated that on the Minnesota side there is a sign that says “Minnesota Avenue” and no one knows where that sign came from or why that particular name was chosen for it considering most locals refer to it as the Point Bridge.

Kouba stated, however, that we do have to have consistency in our descriptions for naming and such in our TIP in relation to the STIP so we wanted to bring this forward to the Technical Advisory Committee to help us figure out what paths we need to go down to make sure we are consistent in naming different types of projects. She said that the Technical Advisory Committee agreed that most people know it as the Point Bridge so we asked our Minnesota District 2 Representative to track down where the sign came from and how we go about removing it so that it reflects what everyone is calling it, so you don’t necessarily need to take any action on this yet until we hear back from our State Partners.

Powers asked what the State’s initial reaction was. Kouba responded that they were kind of confused by the sign, they didn’t know where it came from, and the only thing she could think of was that on the inspection reports they do note that the connecting road is Minnesota Avenue on the North Dakota side, and that is the only place you see it, but each State has a different numbering system for their bridges, so the number on either side is different.

Kouba commented that the Technical Advisory Committee did recommend that we stay with local vernacular and call it the Point Bridge, but we are asking our Minnesota State Partners to check into whether there is an actual official name.

Kouba stated that staff just wanted to let the Board know that we are tracking this down and keeping with consistency with our federal partners.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

OTHER BUSINESS

A. Thank You And Presentation Of Gift To Earl Haugen

Mock stated that she wanted to thank Earl for all his work and service, and for putting up with all of us and our counterparts that came before us because we aren't always easy, not always easy on the City side either; you've seen a lot in 28 years so thank you very much for your service.

B. 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.

Information only.

C. Approval Of Bill/Check List For 1/15/22 To 2/11/22 Period

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO APPROVE THE BILLS/CHECKS FOR THE 1/15/22 TO 2/11/22 PERIOD.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY ROST, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO ADJOURN THE FEBRUARY 16, 2022 MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:58 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager

Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO
Transaction List by Vendor
 January 14 through February 11, 2022

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
AFLAC.							
Liability Check	01/21/2022	AFLAC	501	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-517.90
Alerus Financial							
Liability Check	01/21/2022	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-2,597.90
Liability Check	02/04/2022	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,597.90
Alliant Engineering							
Bill	01/20/2022	Inv. #...	Work On Futu...	206 · Accounts Pay...		565 · Special ...	-7,962.34
Bill Pmt -Check	01/20/2022	7166	Work On Futu...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-7,962.34
CitiBusiness Card							
Check	01/24/2022	CITIB...	Charges For ...	104 · Checking	X	517 · Overhead	-359.32
City of Grand Forks							
Bill	01/31/2022	2022-...	2021 Lease A...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-2,955.32
Bill Pmt -Check	01/31/2022	7174	2021 Lease A...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-2,955.32
DayDreams Specialties							
Bill	02/09/2022		Clock For Ear...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-89.00
Bill Pmt -Check	02/09/2022	7176	Clock For Ear...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-89.00
East Grand Forks Water and Light							
Bill	01/20/2022	Inv. #...	4th Quarter 2...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-391.38
Bill Pmt -Check	01/20/2022	7167	4th Quarter 2...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-391.38
Fidelity Security Life.							
Liability Check	01/21/2022	AVESIS	50790-1043	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-8.44
Forum Communications Company							
Bill	01/24/2022	Inv. #...	Public Open ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		565 · Special ...	-309.99
Bill Pmt -Check	01/24/2022	7170	Public Open ...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-309.99
Bill	02/09/2022	Inv. #...	Public Notice ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		555 · TIP	-249.99
Bill Pmt -Check	02/09/2022	7179	Public Notice ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-249.99
Grand Forks City'							
Bill	01/31/2022	Inv. #...	Advertising C...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-950.00
Bill Pmt -Check	01/31/2022	7175	Advertising C...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-950.00
Kimley-Horn And Associates, Inc.							
Bill	01/20/2022	Inv. #...	VOID: Work ...	206 · Accounts Pay...	X	548 · EGF FT...	-21,247.81
Bill Pmt -Check	01/20/2022	7173	Work On TDP...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-21,247.81
Liberty Business Systems, Inc.							
Bill	01/21/2022	Inv. #...	Contract Bas...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-178.93
Bill Pmt -Check	01/21/2022	7169	Contract Bas...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-178.93
Bill	02/09/2022	Inv. #...	Contract Bas...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-178.93
Bill Pmt -Check	02/09/2022	7177	Contract Bas...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-178.93
LSNB as Trustee for PEHP							
Liability Check	01/21/2022	PEHP		104 · Checking	X	216 · Post-Hea...	-123.75
Madison Nat'l Life							
Liability Check	01/21/2022	7163		104 · Checking		215 · Disability...	-68.58
Mike's							
Bill	01/26/2022		MPO Lunche...	206 · Accounts Pay...		711 · Miscellan...	-115.42
Bill Pmt -Check	01/26/2022	7171	MPO Lunche...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-115.42
Minnesota Department of Revenue							
Liability Check	01/21/2022	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-204.00
Liability Check	02/04/2022	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-201.00
Minnesota Life Insurance Company							
Liability Check	01/21/2022	7164		104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-111.72
Nationwide Retirement Solutions							
Liability Check	01/21/2022	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-537.71
Liability Check	02/04/2022	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-537.71
NDPERS							
Liability Check	01/21/2022	NDPE...	D88	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-3,116.58
Liability Check	02/04/2022	NDPE...		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,535.92
Peggy McNelis							
Bill	02/09/2022		Reimburseme...	206 · Accounts Pay...		711 · Miscellan...	-20.98
Bill Pmt -Check	02/09/2022	7178	Reimburseme...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-20.98
QuickBooks Payroll Service							
Liability Check	01/20/2022		Created by P...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-6,498.03
Liability Check	02/03/2022		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-6,502.03
SRF Consulting Group, Inc.							
Bill	02/09/2022	Inv. #...	Work On GF ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		560 · Land Us...	-15,510.06
Bill Pmt -Check	02/09/2022	7180	Work On GF ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-15,510.06
Standard Insurance Company							
Liability Check	01/21/2022	7165		104 · Checking		217 · Dental P...	-118.88

**Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO
Transaction List by Vendor
January 14 through February 11, 2022**

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
Vaaler Insurance, Inc.							
Bill	01/26/2022	Inv. #...	Insurance Re...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-1,350.18
Bill Pmt -Check	01/26/2022	7172	Insurance Re...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-1,350.18
Workforce Safety and Insurance							
Bill	02/09/2022	ID# J4...	WSI Premium...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-250.00
Bill Pmt -Check	02/09/2022	7181	WSI Premium...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-250.00