

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, July 20, 2022 - 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks Training Conference Room/Zoom Meeting**

CALL TO ORDER

Warren Strandell, Chairperson, called the July 20th, 2022, 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: Warren Strandell, Marc DeMers, Tricia Lunski, Bob Rost, Mike Powers, Clarence Vetter, Ken Vein (via Zoom), and Al Grasser.

Absent: None.

Guest(s) present: Meghan Arbegast, Grand Forks Herald.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Strandell declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 15TH, 2022 MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE JUNE 15TH, 2022 MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF 2022 ANNUAL UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATION

Halford reported that this item brings good news. She said that fortunately for us some additional monies have been found, in the amount of \$73,981.45 in CPG funding. She stated that this came at a great time because what an oversight was made in the 2022 Annual Unified Work Program Budget and no funding was allocated to the Special Studies item, and both the Pavement Management Update and the Future Bridge discussion carried over from 2021, so

currently that item shows a negative balance so staff is recommending that we transfer the entire \$73,981.45 into that item, which will not only cover the negative balance, but give us a little left over for additional staff time as she doesn't think the bridge discussion will die down in the next week or two so she anticipates more staff time going towards that.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATION TO THE FY2022 ANNUAL UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM BUDGET TO ALLOCATE ADDITIONAL FY2020 CPG FUNDS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$73,981.45 TO THE SPECIAL STUDIES ITEM.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FY2022-2025 T.I.P. ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATION

Kouba reported that basically the T.I.P. is our four-year program of projects that are happening within the MPO area, and we update it generally every year but there are always changes, updates, modifications that need to happen.

Kouba stated that the NDDOT has requested that Grand Forks Project #ND18, rehab traffic signals on the Urban Road System in Grand Forks be moved from FY2023 to FY2022. She said that since it is the current year we are working in we need to modify our FY2022-2023 T.I.P. to make this change. She added that it is just a simple change in year, no monetary changes are needed.

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATION TO THE FY2022-2025 T.I.P., AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT 2023-2026 T.I.P. PROJECT LISTING

Kouba reported that we are talking about the 2023-2026 T.I.P. Project Listing. She said that you have seen projects from Minnesota previously, and this time around we are seeing them for the final time. She stated that all of the information has been sent to MnDOT leaders and will be forwarded to FHWA, but this will be the last time we will be seeing this.

Kouba stated that we are looking at mostly North Dakota's Project Listing. She said that a public hearing was held at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting last Wednesday, and no comments were received.

Kouba referred to a slide and explained that it is a map of the areas that the projects are located and each project has been given an ID number as well, so if anything changes we can keep track of them easier. She pointed out that the blue squares are 2026 projects, so this is the first time we are seeing them.

Kouba stated that there have been some changes in the years, but she doesn't believe there has been much change for the most part.

Kouba referred to the 2026 project list and went over them briefly. She stated that staff is looking for approval of this draft and they hope to a Final TIP in the next two months.

MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT 2023-2026 T.I.P. PROJECT LISTING, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVE (TA) PROJECT APPLICATION

Halford reported that this is the Transportation Alternative (TA) Project and the City of Grand Forks has brought forward an application for a shared use path along South 48th Street between 17th Avenue South and 32nd Avenue South, which you can see highlighted in red on the map.

Halford stated that currently it is located on the east side, it is a gravel path, so this is an exciting new project because not only is it adding a mile of multi-use path, but it is basically adding another transportation option for people to get to jobs around the area.

Halford commented that this did receive approval from the Grand Forks City Council, and there weren't any comments from the Technical Advisory Committee.

Grasser said that this is a result of the change that was made to the TA Program, previously we were limited to \$290,000 so we would have broken this up into two or three phases, but we are going to try to tackle it as one phase.

Grasser stated that you've probably heard him say this before, but it is kind of hard, it is almost as cheap to do it yourself as it is to use federal money and jump through all the red tape, so they are hoping this moves the needle for us in that regard. Halford referred to a slide showing the project and pointed out that you can see what Mr. Grasser is talking about; highlighted in green

along the bottom, that is about the size of how much project they could get done with the money they were able to get in the past, but since they have gotten rid of the cap on funding, Grand Forks is going big. DeMers asked if there was no cap or just a larger cap. Grasser responded that there is no cap, although he is sure there is a practical one somewhere. Halford added that there is still an 80/20 split, so you still have to come up with a local share. Grasser said that the problem is there are still some of those unqualified costs that don't qualify for cost participation, that's where we run into some of the issues about funding the balance. Lunski asked if the land to the left of the project farmland right now, is it possibly up for development. Halford responded that she is sure in the future, as that industrial park grows, it could be developed.

DeMers asked how this lines up with the TK Street. Grasser responded that it is quite a bit north of this project. DeMers asked if it is west. Grasser responded that 48th would be a block or two west of where the TK would be.

Halford stated that, again, this is an existing gravel path so what they will do is remove a couple of layers of gravel and make it into a ten-foot-wide concrete path.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VEIN, TO APPROVE THE TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVE (TA) PROJECT APPLICATION, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT CONDITION REPORT

Kouba reported that we started this project back in 2021. She said that they did a first round of gathering data, and then they came back and did some additional data gathering in April of 2022.

Kouba stated that we are nearing the end of this particular contract and we have the final report of the summary of the condition of the functionally classified roads; it does not include the local roads. She said that they worked in conjunction with the Cities of Grand Forks and East Grand Forks to collect data for the local roads at the same time, but they were the responsibility of the local authority.

Kouba stated that as the MPO we could only do the collectors and minor and principal arterials and we left the interstate for the State to do.

Kouba said that this gives us a tool to understand what the road conditions are; this time around it wasn't just a pavement condition it was also a ride quality that was looked at for an overall analysis.

Kouba stated that we have the report, we have the information that the cities need to move forward with any of their projects to give them a better idea of what is going on. She added that

in terms of pavement management software they can also get an idea of where to go look and verify various needs around the city, so it works well for both cities.

Grasser asked why we are approving a draft as opposed to the final, is there something that is keeping it at a draft level. Kouba responded that staff hasn't heard anything back from anybody about this, and at the Technical Advisory Committee it was just a matter of whether or not they had any additional input on the report, and they didn't have any changes. Grasser said, then, that this is in fact a final report. Kouba stated that it is in effect the final report.

MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY DEMERS TO ACCEPT THE PAVEMENT CONDITIONS ANALYSIS REPORT, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF SAFE STREETS FOR ALL (SS4A) – SAFETY ACTION PLAN

Halford reported that she went into a little more detail in the staff report, and she can definitely dive down into any of it if you have questions, but she was just going to present the highlights of it.

Halford stated that really Safe Streets for All is a new program with \$5 billion in funds to be distributed over the next five years. She explained that the purpose of SS4A grants are to improve roadway safety, reducing or eliminating roadway fatalities, and serious injuries through safety action plan development and implementation.

Halford said that the program provides funding to develop the tools to help strengthen a community's approach to roadway safety and to save lives. She stated that the program provides funding for two types of grants; an action plan grant and an implementation grant.

Halford explained that the action plan grant is used to develop complete, or supplement basically a Safety Action Plan. She said that to apply for an Implementation Grant you need to have a qualifying Action Plan, which we do not have in place at this time, so that puts us where we would want to apply for the Action Plan Grant.

Halford stated that the award amounts will be based on estimate costs. She said that they want the applications to start at at least \$200,000.00 and not to, since we fall under the Metropolitan Planning Organization area, not to exceed \$5 million; and she doesn't think we would go for that much because it is an 80/20 split.

Halford said that we are looking at doing a joint application, at the very least with both Cities so East Grand Forks and Grand Forks and the MPO would put in an application together for a Safety Action Plan grant. She stated that if we are awarded funds we would get notified by the

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 20, 2022

end of the year or the beginning of next year, so we would do this plan next year, although it may go into 2024 a bit as well.

Halford stated that applications are due September 15th, so pretty much right after this meeting, at 2:00 p.m. she is meeting with reps from Grand Forks and East Grand Forks to go over the application, but really when we are having first conversations about it, not only is this a great opportunity if we get an Action Plan Grant and then we put the plan into place but it opens up for both communities to apply for even bigger funding, so it is a great opportunity but it is adding another plan into the mix, but when we were having those first conversations we decided it would be best to go through the Technical Advisory Committee and also the Executive Policy Board to get their input and thoughts on it. She said that the Technical Advisory Committee didn't have any comments or questions, so she took it as their thinking it is a good idea, but she definitely wants to open it up for questions or thoughts about the program.

Grasser asked, for this program, when we actually get to a construction project, will these go through the individual States or is it a direct competition at Federal level. Halford responded that it is a country wide, federal program. Grasser said, then that it doesn't have to go any individual States, we can apply directly. Halford added that they are anticipating awarding hundreds of action plans.

DeMers asked, with this program, if we get through the action plan and we get to the actual construction dollar type things, can this be used for things like ADA compliance projects, or is it a separate funding source. Halford responded that she isn't quite sure on that because things are still unfolding, but she wants to say yes because the emphasis is on safety.

Vein asked if there is a possibility of this being able to be used on some of the pedestrian street safety that we had at Minnesota and 4th and Cherry and 32nd for the schools. Halford responded that it may be possible. She stated that when we go through the Safety Action Plan the hope would be that it would be a list, basically a shopping list of projects, so when a grant and opportunities come along you can just pick a project off the list and apply for it and most of the legwork will have already been done; that is basically what it is, it will be going through both communities as one whole area, and basically calling out what we need to do. Vein said, then, that you are saying that those types of project should be eligible, along with others that might be added to the list. Halford responded that that is correct.

Grasser said he has a couple of comments on the program; probably for our council folks, the, and correct him if he is wrong, but he thinks that for this one the local entities have to up-front the money and then get the money back via reimbursement later on, so you are talking about a \$500,000 project that we will have to figure out how to cash flow, and he thinks that also part of the consideration would probably be a memorandum of understanding between the communities because the MPO would be leading it, correct, so there are some logistical financial pieces in there so each individual city will have to make sure they can do this. DeMers asked if you apply for the grant, do the project and then receive the funds or do you do the project then apply for the grant and receive the funds. Halford responded that you apply for the grant, hire a consultant,

pay them, and then after the job is complete you get reimbursed. She added that there is an 80/20 split, so it is 100% reimbursed.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE MOVING FORWARD WITH THE JOINT APPLICATION FOR SAFE STREETS FOR ALL (SS4A) – SAFETY ACTION PLAN GRANT WITH THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS, CITY OF EAST GRAND FORKS, AND THE GRAND FORKS-EAST GRAND FORKS METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO, AND TO PURSUE A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING AGREEMENT BETWEEN BOTH CITIES AND THE MPO.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF BRIDGE UPDATE

Halford reported that she has a few things to share and then will open it up for discussion.

Halford stated that with the RFP, East Grand Forks did receive three proposals from SRF, KLJ and Stantec. She said that a decision hasn't been made on them, but the thought is that some representatives from both sides of the river would be on the selection committee and select a consultant. She added that there was also the July 11th meeting, and all of you were there along with both City Councils. She said that basically the discussion was high level of safety, location, design, and she thought it was at least exciting to see everybody in the room together and having a conversation. She stated that if you want to talk about it more, she will open the floor, but she wanted to keep it high level and see what you wanted to discuss about it.

Lunski asked for an explanation on what exactly the three proposals are. Halford responded that right now they are just looking at the next steps in the process. She said that it isn't very often that a bridge is built so nobody really knows what the next step is or the next three steps are, so there is that. She added that there was a call-out of the location at 32nd being looked at, but it sounds like they might be adding Merrifield to the RFP as well, which makes her think there might be another couple edits, but she hasn't heard any detail on that, so that is basically what they want the consultant to do, what do we need to do to move this forward, what basically is a checklist because one isn't out there, and adding Merrifield possibly as well. Vetter added that it is to walk us through the whole process to get from where we are at now to a shovel ready project, because there is a lot of federal monies coming down the pike and we want to be ready when it is available, so the consultant, if he read the proposal right, they will identify that this may be your next step, this may be your second step, but we are going to start this first step because we hired them, or they may help us reach out to eligible professionals that can do that step, so they will be working on the steps at the same time they are developing the plan, so they aren't going to go through the whole plan and then go back and say, okay now we are going to do step one, they will identify step one and we are going to start step one, and they will continue with the plan.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 20, 2022

Grasser stated that, as he understood some of the conversation at the last meeting, the intent was, kind of, to carry the Merrifield Bridge and an inner-city bridge concurrently. He added that we did a hydraulic analysis on 47th, 32nd, and Elks but we didn't do a hydraulic analysis at Merrifield and he thinks it might be good, as part of this process to get them all on the same platform, because there was some good information that came out of that analysis, for instance we basically eliminated 47th through that analysis because we found out the flood mitigation techniques were going to be probably too onerous to deal with, so his suggestion is that we should consider that as part of this overall process, to get Merrifield and an inner-city bridge on the same platform. Vetter commented that he did hear that they are looking at adjusting the RFP to include Merrifield; if that is the case, putting on his City Council hat, he isn't looking at a 50/50 cost split then with Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, he is now looking at a four-way split between the two counties and the two cities because Merrifield is outside of the City's jurisdiction, for both cities. Lunski said, though, we aren't going to tie them together so one can't happen unless both of them happen, right. Vetter responded that we have a hard enough time getting two jurisdictions to agree, now you want to get four jurisdictions to all agree at the same time. Lunski said that we don't know how much federal money there is either, that will be available. Halford responded that we don't, but added that there have been more opportunities then there ever has been before, so it is good that we are having these conversations, and by chance if we can make a decision, there is some good money out there that will help with the cost any way we go, with a no decision, an Elks decision, or a 32nd or Merrifield decision, they all come with a cost, so these all are decisions that we have to make.

Grasser commented that if he can, he thinks to put some of this in context, you know the federal government, about a year or so ago passed an infrastructure bill, and so what we are seeing, what we are experiencing, even in some of the discussion here today, is to distribute those monies they are coming up with new programs and we talked about a couple today, so as it is funneling through the federal bureaucracy there may be opportunities for funding for different things but we don't necessarily understand where or when or how the program might work, so he thinks, to a degree, strategically we are kind of trying to keep all of our doors open for potential funding that we aren't sure exactly yet what will be there, but we don't want to miss an opportunity so there may be money for bridges, and the closer you can get to shovel ready the better the opportunity might be so he thinks, strategically, that is kind of what we are doing in this organization, right, we are just trying to explore all those options. Halford stated that there is a big pot of money out there, and she doesn't know the dollar amount, for bridges but it is for existing bridges, and she did send an email to NDDOT and told them the situation and they said it isn't for a new bridge, but, there was a little bit, this is kind of way off topic, but a gray area she just wrote in there as she thought that while she had their ear, we do have an existing pier in the middle of downtown, and they couldn't answer her. She asked if that would count as an existing bridge and they couldn't answer her, so they passed her down, and she doesn't want to muddy the water anymore, but you don't know until you ask them. She said, just to go with what Mr. Grasser said, with the Safety Action Plan it is better to be proactive and do what we can and do our homework and kind of lay the ground-work so when the opportunity comes around it is better to be ready for it then scrambling and trying to grab that money and a lot of times it doesn't work out when you do that.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 20, 2022

Vein asked, as far as steps forward, the idea right now is to get this consultant hired to help map the path forward, that is kind of what we are talking about right. Halford responded that kind of what the bridge discussion and the next steps is that there will be a selection committee put together to go over the RFPs after a more final draft is put together, so we need to select a consultant and then hopefully bring the full councils together and have a joint council meeting again and get them an update of where we are at, and that is what she is hearing are the next steps. Vein said two things; you said, is the RFP different than the consultant selection. Halford responded that there was an RFP that went out and there were three consultants that showed interest in doing the work. Vein said, then, that the RFP is already done, right, and we would just piggyback on the work that East Grand Forks already has done, and really the next step is to do a final review of those three applicants and make a choice. Halford responded that that is correct. Vein said, then, that he thinks that just fundamentally, how does the process work; he would guess that the hired consultant would establish how we will move any of the projects forward through the system, correct. Halford responded that that is correct. Vein stated that the consultant would then work for whom. Halford responded that she isn't sure, but she thinks the RFP, and maybe someone from East Grand Forks can correct her, but her understanding what that it was originally that the City of East Grand Forks would spearhead it, but would like assistance from the Grand Forks side, but with the addition of Merrifield and maybe counties involved there might be more of a joint effort. DeMers said that he thinks Ms. Halford is right, at least the way he envisions it, and he doesn't know if it has all been written down, but that East Grand Forks would basically be the spearhead, probably the fiscal agent of it, they would handle the contract and be the legal agent and fiscal agent and handle the legal and fiscal side of it, submitting requests to other constituents, Grand Forks County, Polk County, etc., and then ultimately be steered by representatives from those groups, and then staffed by all entities staff, but fundamentally he thinks organizationally the agent would be East Grand Forks. Vein said that this would be similar to what we did with the other bridges in the area where one agency or one state usually takes the lead even though it belongs to both, so that would be similar to what you are talking about here which would be then, East Grand Forks/Grand Forks; East Grand Forks would take the lead, but we would all be involved in it. DeMers responded that that is correct. He added that he thinks that this would be the case as someone has to be responsible for paying the bills, etc., but everyone would look over any contracts, but someone has to staff it and maintain scheduling and be the point of contact, so he thinks East Grand Forks would probably be that agency, and that is through this process, obviously we've been told that at some point, if it does get to construction we would probably then move it over to the North Dakota side for logistics and cost and other regulatory hurdles. Grasser commented that he thinks that that is all part of what the Consultant would kind of even help us map out because the costs here are not federally eligible so part of it is you are exploring federal and state programs that could give us funding, but because there is really no federal cost nexus he thinks that is how it kind of ended up with East Grand Forks, one of us had to take the lead on it.

Strandell said that, as far as splitting the costs, did hear the number \$60,000 or \$80,000 in costs that came out of the discussion. DeMers responded that he thinks the cost is somewhere around \$150,000 for the consultant. Vetter commented that the RFP that was let didn't have any costs associated with it, it was just here is what we are looking for, and once we select a consultant

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 20, 2022

then we will sit down and determine the cost of the project. Grasser said that it will boil down to identifying what the scope will be. DeMers stated, though, that if you could add 25% more cost and divide it by 50% more it saves everyone. DeMers commented that going through this process obviously, he thinks procedure and process and identifying those things are important. He said that what he comes back to, through the meeting, after the meeting, is still that there is really a reluctance or inability on the Grand Forks side to actually identify a project. He stated that we can talk about how to get a project done, he thinks that is something we hire consultants for; when we tell them we have a confirmed project identified, it becomes an abstract procedure that we are going through anyway. He said that in this group we all kind of agree that the working thing is 32nd because that is the only thing that has been approved by the MPO and the Councils on any level, but practically, and we had that meeting, and there is hesitancy and inability to try to go after things and make it whatever, but after the meeting he talked to at least two council members from Grand Forks who said if you did it at 47th it would be done for sure and if you did it at Elks it would be done for sure and he doesn't know if that is exactly true, you would probably have 3.5 votes for 32nd and 3 for Elks and 3 for 47th, and for him that ultimately is the whole question, what is the process for getting Grand Forks to decide which corridor, if any, is possible or is preferred or is what they are going to go for, because, and he has said this before that he thinks financing and the procedure, while they may seem complex or they will not be given to you they are things that are very achievable; he thinks the heart of it, the thing we are working on is picking a project, and that is just the question he has, is there anything from the Grand Forks side that says we can identify this or not, and obviously Mr. Grasser isn't on the council, but Mr. Vein and Ms. Lunski are, and he doesn't know what the answer is. Vein commented that he appreciates what Mr. DeMers is saying; we have to figure out a process to get ourselves on board, even though there was an earlier vote at council, we need everybody to support whatever direction this goes, and he thinks we need to look at what process might get us all together. He said he just wanted to make those statements and then he has to leave for another meeting.

Lunski asked if the consultant would help us with some of these decisions, would they help us sell it to Grand Forks. DeMers responded that he doesn't believe so. He said that the role of the consultant, as he envisions it, is purely a procedural one; this is the path we need to follow, if this is the project, this is how we get it done. He stated that he thinks we have said it here, and he knows that Mr. Murphy said it at their council meetings; you call MnDOT and say we want to replace this bridge, they have every procedure that they work through for a hundred years on how they do bridges, what they need to do, it is like clockwork, it is this type of thing that really becomes that unknown, but we are trying to work through it, but as far as giving, to some credit, what President Sande said it becomes a political question is in some ways true; at some point there you can figure any type of data, you can put any type of an anecdote to it and people will come to their own conclusion, it is how do you foster it. He added that one of his takeaways is that Grand Forks really doesn't have any interest in doing a bridge. Lunski said that she disagrees. DeMers stated that his point is, if there was an interest there would be a resolution, if there is a reason or whatever, then people want it, and not that there is no interest, it is just that it is so far down on their priorities that it doesn't merit the political costs or the political fight to get it to that level. He said that that is just his bleak outlook; he doesn't know if that is 100% true, but if that is the case than we really are just paddling with one oar. Lunski commented that we

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 20, 2022

already have so many studies, but 32nd is the only one that financially makes sense, so what are we going to learn new from the new proposal, from the new RFP, what are we hoping to learn that is new. Powers responded that he hopes they tell us to place and build it. Halford commented that pretty much what the studies have told us in the past, it is saying that if you put a bridge at this location this is the results you will get, and the same at each of the locations, and it is more data driven. She said that this one will be, and that only takes us to, kind of like where we have been, and this is, if we go this direction this is what result we will get at any of the locations or doing nothing, but nothing has been looked at like, well if we go down this route to actually build it, what is the checklist or the steps that we have to go through to get this kind of funding, or what kind of different studies do we need to put in place to actually get a bridge in, and there isn't just construction, there are all sorts of environmental documents and things that will be needed as well, and what are those requirements because we aren't sure who we need to talk to; it is more going down that, it isn't really to look at, as of now, to look at traffic changes or anything like that, it is really just how do we get a bridge here and what are the steps needed to do it.

Kyle Kvamme that to echo to the comments earlier; absolutely, on the Grand Forks side when you think about our priorities you think of an interchange and an underpass, for him those are the top two, but the third one would be an inner-city bridge so he doesn't think that there's no desire for it, he thinks that if this consultant can show us how it would it done, he thinks that great, he thinks it is more important that we come together and continue the conversation that we had at the Joint Meeting. He said that he thinks the vast majority of the council wants an inner-city bridge, so working through that he thinks is the most important thing. He added that getting additional data, he doesn't think it is really needed, he thinks we all understand the cost/benefit analysis but we also, as was stated earlier, data kind of takes you down a certain path, but it stops at the political factor or the emotional factor, so just to echo that, if this consultant will help us understand the mechanisms to get this paid for then that is of high value, but he doesn't think we need a cost benefit analysis, and again, he thinks that if we can come to terms with a location, then let's work out how we can make it work for our communities rather than trying to force the best possible solution and then just be stuck in a stalemate.

Halford commented that what she is hearing when Grand Forks says that there's not really interest in an inner-city bridge, she thinks it just capacity issues, and just kind of even looking at your work load it is just something that you have to start putting in a list of what you have to get done, and this is all we have time for, so with East Grand Forks coming in and saying, hey we'll take the lead on the RFP, and taking the lead on this, that kind of relieves Grand Forks from being the lead on it, definitely want to still be part of the conversation and have interest in it, they just don't have the time and staff to dedicate to it with all these other projects going on, so it seems to her that they are interested, they just don't have the time to be the lead on it. Kvamme responded that that makes sense. He added that he couldn't comment on that, but he would like to thank everyone for letting him speak on this.

Grasser said that he is trying to recall, and he thinks in times past when they were looking at the efficiencies and the numbers between Elks and 32nd, the differentials between the two were very very close at one point in time, and he is wondering if we could review some of that. He said

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 20, 2022

that it seems like the last analysis ended up being more of a diversion, and he is trying to remember if he is recalling that correctly or not so he wouldn't mind seeing how some of those benefits kind of step through over time. Halford responded that 32nd is going to have the best inner-city traffic relief; what she saw on the numbers they are not as close as what she is hearing you say, there is still going to be some relief, but not as much as what you are going to see at 32nd. She added that when she looks at the studies and look at the other studies and Land Use, it is kind of hard, but you can't just look at that one corridor, it is just what kind of ripples out from that, and what it affects, and definitely with that study you saw certain corridors and intersections that were studied, but none of that as like the neighborhoods and how traffic will go through those neighborhoods right there; you have Elks where it says that traffic will go along Belmont and it will still go along 32nd, but how much of that traffic will just bleed through that neighborhood right there, and the same like if we do nothing, how much of that traffic will just bleed from Minnesota Avenue to 32nd; we are already seeing it along Reeves and Belmont but we don't know how much is going through all those small streets, we don't know how much traffic is going through those. She said that with the traffic counts and stuff you saw some relief on Elks, but definitely it was more on 32nd. Kouba added that there is also the issue of the projects that are going to be needed to answer to any of the other capacity issues; Washington and DeMers is the biggest example, because the Sorlie and the Point Bridges, anyone who doesn't turn off at Belmont will be going to DeMers, so we now have a big clump of vehicles that are going to DeMers or to Washington and then are either going South or West, so what are you going to have to do to for that intersection in the future in order to handle that capacity, what are you going to have to do to the roads further down, are you going to have to add lanes, all those things cost extra money; what other accommodations are going to be needed for other forms of transportation; transit, bikes, pedestrians just on Washington, but those are going to have to happen on 32nd as well no matter what because there is going to be an increase in traffic on 32nd, with a bridge or without a bridge.

Powers commented that he was somewhat disappointed in the joint meeting. He explained that when he sat and listened, and he didn't talk at all, but as he reflected on what he heard and digested it in his mind, he thought that we were doing a straw vote as it were that night, and he saw more than one person, and he isn't picking on Grand Forks, but some of those people came in and said that after listening to what they heard that night, it is obvious that 32nd is not the best choice, so what he was saying was that he made up his mind that night; sorry but we have been digesting this question for over ten years, and he got the feeling that a lot of the people in that round table, as it were, seemed to be uninformed. He asked when did the joint councils vote on 32nd, that was a while back, many years right. Vetter responded that he thinks the only time we've done it was in our Land Use Plan. Grasser added that we also approved it in the Long Range Transportation Plan last time it was adopted, five years ago. Kouba said that we are working on a new Long Range Transportation Plan, but 32nd has been in previous plans as well. Powers said that he just got the feeling that there were some people there that didn't know what was going on, and quite frankly it scared him. He said that maybe we should be sending them a copy of the recording of the minutes that we have here so they can digest it more clearly, or study it, but he personally was appalled; they listened for twenty minutes and then said that they were against 32nd, and he has been hearing this comment that it is just going to pour more traffic onto 32nd Avenue, they are going to have more traffic on 32nd Avenue no matter what they do,

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 20, 2022

and quite frankly he thought Ms. Halford did a really good job, but he doesn't think half the people there listened, such as all those people that were clapping every time someone said something against 32nd, and he said that half the people in this room will be dead by the time that bridge is built, and he hates to say that but it is probably true. He stated that these people have to look down the road, not just what is going on now, but what is going to be going on in ten, fifteen, or more year from now, the decisions that we make today are long term, and they can't comprehend that it seems; those people thought we were going to build the bridge the next day. He said that he ran into Brad Bail the other day and he was asking about it, and he has been studying this for quite some time, and he said that we have been doing a lot of talking about it but not doing much to do it; he said the thing to do is pick a spot and then build it, and he would really love to hear whoever we hire to come in and tell us that because he thinks we have done a lot of homework, and now we need to do something. Halford commented that this discussion has been identified that we should have a southern bridge since the 1970s, so we have been talking about this for a long time.

Halford stated that she put this out there, again, and she will continue to do put it out there, the MPO can offer its services and help education as much as we can, unfortunately we can't make the decision, it becomes a political and emotional decision, but we can carry it to about that point of any study you need help with, any kind of reach out, going to meetings and helping with the education part. Powers said that he is just getting frustrated, he is getting tired of talking about it, he wants to do something.

Grasser commented that this is a meeting that he hasn't irritated everyone yet, so he will see if can do that. He said that a couple of observations, we are a planning organization, and the reason we are in trouble with an inner-city bridge is from lack of planning. He added that this goes back to the 1960s, and nobody here was on the board then, but the one bridge we have a chance to plan to get ahead of the problems is the Merrifield Bridge, and he isn't saying that should be the one, he is just saying that as a planning process, where we can actually plan, otherwise we are just reacting; and the other question he wrestles with is that, and he will just feel it out philosophically, if nobody can agree on what the best alternative is, sometimes the art of compromise is finding a solution that nobody likes, and he will just let that sit for now, and some of you know where that probably leads to a little bit, but he thinks that is the conundrum we are in right now, and we may have to pick an option that nobody really likes.

Strandell asked which body will make the ultimate decision on; say we come up with a proposal and we have funding for this bridge and that bridge, who will make the decision whether that is approved or not, is that going to go through legislation and congress, or is there some body that is going to have some say in that. Grasser responded that he hopes this consultant that gets hired helps us navigate that question.

DeMers said that, to your point about planning, Al, we've been looking at southend bridges so long, with the changes that potentially Grand Forks may be doing on the north end, we may require a north end bridge before too long, and a north end interchange, and those types of things, so we are out-pacing our south end bridges that we should have built 50 and 30 years ago, and now we are going to be looking at a north end one, and it may not be in this next Long

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 20, 2022

Range Transportation Plan, but he guarantees that if the changes on the north end of Grand Forks happen, he would bet in the next one we will see some demand for a north end interchange and a north end bridge. Kouba said that there was discussion of a north end bypass in past Long Range Transportation Plans. Strandell commented that the north end bridge option was replaced with a south end bridge option some years ago. He said that his thought about who makes the decision, unless these communities, including the counties, can't come up with a plan that has good support, no opposition to it, it will be hard for that body to actually get approval for the funding because the politics will come into that issue, and will probably kill it because of lack of support at the local level; if there is division, the chance of passage becomes more difficult. Halford said, though, if you can come to an agreement, that will be very strong to go after funding. DeMers commented that that is why he has always said that the financing isn't a problem, but it is a big qualifier.

Rost said, and correct him if he is wrong, coming out of that meeting, they are putting together a committee with the Grand Forks County engineer, Polk County engineer and some city people and they will meet and discuss all of these issues we've been talking about for the half hour or so to come up with a plan on where they think this thing should go, isn't that what came out of that meeting. Halford responded that it was more to have a committee together to review what consultant they should go with that will tackle the RFP. Rost said, though that they will get input from Cities and Counties. Halford responded that is correct. She added that she thinks that is smart as we don't want just the east side doing all of it, but we would have representatives from both sides. Grasser commented that part of that is that as they explore funding options, there may be more or less opportunity for a rural bridge than an inner-city bridge, so to him that is part of what they need to explore, what are the best options for outside funding. He said that he doesn't know the answer to that, so he isn't implying anything.

Strandell stated that he knows that their Polk County Engineer, Rich Sanders, he is about as knowledgeable as anyone around here on funding options, he is really up on that, and in-fact he has the funding in place, and requests made for the Nielsville and Climax bridges, in-fact the Climax bridge is in line to be built in 2024, and that is in conjunction with Trail County, ND.

Information only.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

OTHER BUSINESS

A. 2021-2022 Annual Work Program Project Update

1. Grand Forks 2050 Land Use Plan: Kouba reported we finally received the final Grand Forks 2050 Land Use Plan report, so once it approved next month that project will be complete.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 20, 2022

2. Pavement Management System Update: Kouba stated that we just already discussed the Pavement Management Update and it will be completed next month as well.
3. Transit Development Program: Kouba said that there are just some finalizing tasks and things of that nature, and getting final stuff for the Transit Development Plan.
4. Bicycle & Pedestrian Element Update: Kouba reported that they did a bike audit for the Bike & Pedestrian Plan and there is a survey out for release as well.
5. Street & Highway Plan/MTP Update: Kouba commented that we are just laying the foundation for the Street and Highway Plan.

Information only.

B. MnDOT Programming Update Workgroup

Kouba stated that she also included some information on the Programming Update Workgroup as well, just hitting some highlights, particularly that they were discussing some of the division of money, they got clarification that the States were not required to suballocate to small MPOs, only that they have to ensure funding was being spent according to the population categories and also clarification that small MPOs remain at a “consultation” status and not a “cooperative” status as are larger MPOs. She added that MnDOT will make a recommendation to just keep the ATP funding as it currently is so the City of East Grand Forks will continue to get the same sub-allocation as they have in the past. She said that they are still waiting on census information and what those out apportionments will be and what the population is in each of the urban areas. She added that North Dakota has the same issue, especially as they are waiting to see if Minot will become an MPO, which would affect the formulas for getting funding between the MPOs. Halford added that whether or not Fargo becomes a TMA will also affect the funding formulas as well. Kouba stated that they talked about the alternatives, trying to figure out how much of an increase for transportation alternatives there will be for funding for the various ATP areas or districts that MnDOT has in place. She said that they are looking at increasing in targets and showing increases for TIPs and STIPs as well.

Kouba said that MnDOT is holding a meeting on this every month.

Information only

C. Approval Of June 11, 2022 To July 15, 2022 Bills/Checks

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY ROST, TO APPROVE THE BILLS/CHECKS FOR THE JUNE 11, 2022 TO JULY 15, 2022 PERIOD.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 20, 2022

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO ADJOURN THE JULY 20, 2022,
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:17 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO
Transaction List by Vendor
 June 11 through July 15, 2022

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
AFLAC.							
Liability Check	06/24/2022	AFLAC	501	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-395.98
Alerus Financial							
Liability Check	06/24/2022	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-2,209.46
Liability Check	07/08/2022	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,209.36
Bolton & Menk							
Bill	06/22/2022	Inv. #...	Work On Bike...	206 · Accounts Pay...		545 · Transpor...	-3,006.36
Bill Pmt -Check	06/22/2022	7243	Work On Bike...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-3,006.36
Bill	06/30/2022	Inv. #...	Work On Bike...	206 · Accounts Pay...		545 · Transpor...	-8,102.75
Bill Pmt -Check	06/30/2022	7248	Work On Bike...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-8,102.75
Card Member Service							
Bill	07/15/2022	Acct #...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-627.05
Bill Pmt -Check	07/15/2022	7258	Charges For ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-627.05
City of East Grand Forks							
Bill	07/06/2022	Inv. #...	2022 3rd Qua...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-2,513.58
Bill Pmt -Check	07/06/2022	7253	2022 3rd Qua...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-2,513.58
City of Grand Forks IT Department							
Bill	06/30/2022	Inv. #...	Dell Laptop, ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		535 · Equipment	-1,956.98
Bill Pmt -Check	06/30/2022	7249	Dell Laptop, ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-1,956.98
East Grand Forks Water and Light							
Bill	07/15/2022	Inv. #...	2nd Qtr 2022 ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-431.91
Bill Pmt -Check	07/15/2022	7259	2nd Qtr 2022 ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-431.91
Fidelity Security Life.							
Liability Check	06/24/2022	AVESIS	50790-1043	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-52.41
Forum Communications Company							
Bill	07/08/2022	Inv. #...	Public Open ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		545 · Transpor...	-489.99
Bill Pmt -Check	07/08/2022	7254	Public Open ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-489.99
GoodPointe Technology							
Bill	06/30/2022	Inv. #...	Work On Pav...	206 · Accounts Pay...		565 · Special ...	-26,491.54
Bill Pmt -Check	06/30/2022	7250	Work On Pav...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-26,491.54
HDR Engineering, Inc.							
Bill	06/30/2022	Inv. #...	Work On 205...	206 · Accounts Pay...		545 · Transpor...	-5,089.28
Bill Pmt -Check	06/30/2022	7251	Work On 205...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-5,089.28
Kimley-Horn And Associates, Inc.							
Bill	06/22/2022	Inv. #...	Work On TD ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		-SPLIT-	-18,866.02
Bill Pmt -Check	06/22/2022	7244	Work On TD ...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-18,866.02
Bill	07/13/2022	Inv. #...	Work On TD ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		545 · Transpor...	-9,874.81
Bill Pmt -Check	07/13/2022	7257	Work On TD ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-9,874.81
Liberty Business Systems, Inc.							
Bill	07/08/2022	Inv. #...	Contract Bas...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-206.00
Bill Pmt -Check	07/08/2022	7255	Contract Bas...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-206.00
LSNB as Trustee for PEHP							
Liability Check	06/24/2022	PEHP		104 · Checking	X	216 · Post-Hea...	-123.75
Madison Nat'l Life							
Liability Check	06/24/2022	7239		104 · Checking		215 · Disability...	-64.74
Mike's							
Bill	06/15/2022		MPO Lunche...	206 · Accounts Pay...		711 · Miscellan...	-125.00
Bill Pmt -Check	06/15/2022	7237	MPO Lunche...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-125.00
Minnesota Department of Revenue							
Liability Check	06/24/2022	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-462.00
Liability Check	07/08/2022	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-462.00
Minnesota Life Insurance Company							
Liability Check	06/24/2022	7246		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-44.46
Nationwide Retirement Solutions							
Liability Check	06/24/2022	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-510.56
Liability Check	07/08/2022	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-510.56
NDPERS							
Liability Check	06/24/2022	NDPE...	D88	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-2,941.76
Liability Check	07/05/2022	NDPE...		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,535.92
Peggy McNelis							
Bill	06/13/2022		Reimburse Fo...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-155.76
Bill Pmt -Check	06/13/2022	7236	Reimburse Fo...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-155.76
Bill	07/08/2022		Reimburseme...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-697.13
Bill Pmt -Check	07/08/2022	7256	Reimburseme...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-697.13
QuickBooks Payroll Service							
Liability Check	06/23/2022		Created by P...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-6,128.28
Liability Check	07/07/2022		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-6,127.43

Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO
Transaction List by Vendor
 June 11 through July 15, 2022

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
SRF Consulting Group, Inc.							
Bill	07/15/2022	Inv. #...	Retainage Du...	206 · Accounts Pay...		220 · Retainag...	-13,487.48
Bill Pmt -Check	07/15/2022	7260	Retainage Du...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-13,487.48
Standard Insurance Company							
Liability Check	06/24/2022	7241		104 · Checking		217 · Dental P...	-243.72
State Tax Commissioner							
Liability Check	07/11/2022	NDST...	45038827301	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-504.00
Stephanie Halford							
Bill	06/15/2022		Reimburse Fo...	206 · Accounts Pay...		530 · Educatio...	-64.35
Bill Pmt -Check	06/15/2022	7238	Reimburse Fo...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-64.35
Bill	06/24/2022		Travel Expen...	206 · Accounts Pay...		530 · Educatio...	-73.71
Bill Pmt -Check	06/24/2022	7245	Travel Expen...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-73.71
Bill	07/06/2022		Reimburse Tr...	206 · Accounts Pay...		530 · Educatio...	-113.64
Bill Pmt -Check	07/06/2022	7252	Reimburse Tr...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-113.64
Teri Kouba							
Bill	06/29/2022		Facebook, Ad...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-232.14
Bill Pmt -Check	06/29/2022	7247	Facebook, Ad...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-232.14