

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, August 17, 2022 - 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks Training Conference Room/Zoom Meeting**

CALL TO ORDER

Warren Strandell, Chairperson, called the August 17th, 2022, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:05 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Warren Strandell, Marc DeMers, Tricia Lunski, Mike Powers, Clarence Vetter, Ken Vein, and Al Grasser.

Absent: Bob Rost.

Guest(s) present: Gracie Lien, Grand Forks County; Kathryn Engelhardt, MnDOT; and Daba Gedafa, UND.

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.

WELCOME NEW BOARD MEMBER

Strandell welcomed Tricia Lunski to the MPO Executive Policy Board and asked her to tell a bit about herself.

Lunski said that she is the Representative of Ward 4 in Grand Forks and she works at H.S. Sound and Light, and is in charge of the Greenway Takeover Festival that is coming up in a few weeks.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JULY 20TH, 2022 MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE JULY 20TH, 2022 MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF SELECTION OF SECRETARY TO THE BOARD

Strandell reported that we need to select a Secretary to the Board from the Grand Forks side.

Strandell opened the nominations.

DeMers nominated Ken Vein for Secretary.

Strandell asked if there were any other nominations; there were no other nominations.

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO CLOSE THE NOMINATIONS AND CAST A UNANIMOUS BALLOT.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Rost.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF GF-EGF MPO SELF-CERTIFICATION

Kouba reported that this is an annual thing that the MPO does to confirm to the USDOT that we are following the practices required by federal law for transportation planning, statewide planning and various other acts such as Clean Air, Civil Rights, etc., that we are required to fulfill.

Kouba stated that we do this by signing a Transportation Planning Process Certification Statement that lists those requirements.

MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD CHAIRPERSON SIGN THE 2022 SELF-CERTIFICATION STATEMENT, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF 2023-2026 T.I.P.

Kouba reported that last month we brought forward a listing of projects that we had hoped to have finalized between the State, as well as to be able to have given the public opportunity to review and comment on those changes but we were unable to complete that, therefore, while the Technical Advisory Committee has recommended approval of the 2023-2026 T.I.P., staff is recommending tabling it to our September meeting in order to make additional changes and to

allow for the public to review and comment on those changes. She added that we also hope that the State is able to update their S.T.I.P. as well.

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO APPROVE TABLING THE FINAL 2023-2026 T.I.P. TO THE SEPTEMBER MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD MEETING.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Rost.

MATTER OF UND INTERN

Halford reported that this item came as a little bit of a surprise. She explained that this conversation started at least a year ago between Mr. Haugen and UND Staff regarding a possible partnership for an intern to do a traffic study, but unfortunately between when they had that conversation until now not all parties were part of the conversations, so we had to have a scope of work that, during the Technical Advisory Committee meeting last week, it was determined needed some edits made to it, things that we need to go over to make sure that everyone is clear and on board, so a few of the Technical Advisory Committee members, MPO Staff and UND will be meeting tomorrow to go over some of those edits to the scope of work, so this item is being requested to be tabled as well.

Halford commented that we do, however, all agree that this would be a great partnership and relationship building, so we just need to see some more tweaking done to the scope of work. She said that she can go over the existing scope of work but it is going to be changing with their conversation tomorrow, but she can definitely open it up to any questions, or if you want to be part of that conversation; Daba Gedafa, with UND, is also on via Zoom and is available to answer any questions as well.

Powers asked if we have ever done anything like this before. Halford responded that we have had interns work for us before, but this is going to be an intern that reports to a UND Professor, and then they will have monthly check-ins with us on how the study is going, and it will go over a two-year period, so we haven't done it quite like this before. Strandell asked if this person would be attending out meetings. Halford responded that they probably wouldn't. She said that they will be located at the University, they won't be here in the building.

DeMers asked where the \$30,000 budget is coming from. Halford responded that is the amount that was originally agreed upon, and it will be split over a two-year period. She said that we do have a little bit of money shown under the intern column in the budget, so if it does get started this year we do have some money set aside, but that is something she will have to work into the budget for next year and 2024 a bit. She added that they would be working on this, as of now, about 10 to 15 hours a week.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 17, 2022

Vein stated that maybe he needs to have us take a step back; this intern is going to work for a UND Professor and won't report to us; what is the association with the MPO. Halford responded that basically we will build on a relationship and get a study out of it, so the work they do we will get the results. Vein said, then, that the study is about something that we identified. Halford responded that the original scope of work includes studying the southern part of Grand Forks; from 32nd to 55th and Belmont to Washington, to look at safety measure and things like that in that area of town, and what they would come up and what recommendations they would make would be ours, would be a study like we would get from a consultant. Vein asked if it was pedestrian, vehicular, all of that, is that what it would entail. Halford responded it would. DeMers asked if this was a study that we devised and sent to UND and asked if they could study this, or is this just something that they came to us saying it was something they want to study. He said that he is just wondering where this comes from and why. Halford responded that she has gotten a lot of that same reaction, and that was her reaction when she got a call from Daba one day asking where things were at with this, and she was kind of caught off-guard, and neither Teri or Peggy knew much about it either; so when Mr. Haugen left, that information wasn't shared with anyone, which is unfortunate, but they were looking at having their intern start on it this fall, so now we are just playing catch-up.

Halford asked if Gedafa could explain the history of this project. Gedafa responded that he is the Chair and Professor of UND Civil Engineering Department. He said that it has been almost two years since they started discussing this with Mr. Haugen, so the idea came from the MPO to look at the traffic speed calming measures and also the pedestrian safety aspects for the southside of the City. He said that studies have been done in the past north of the area they are targeting now, so this is just to expand to the south, but it is just a starting point, so the selection of the area could be expanded after they analyze safety data, pedestrian, safety traffic, speeding, tickets, all those things. He added that they already communicated with the Grand Forks Police Department to get speeding and ticket information and with the NDDOT to get the data to analyze pedestrian and other safety issues so that they can finalize locations.

Strandell said that he sees there is a \$30,000 budget. He asked how we fit into that. DeMers responded that we pay it.

Vein stated that the question he has, and just looking at the boundary, could we move the boundary, can we change this, he thought he heard we can. He explained that one of the issues we have is traffic on 32nd Avenue South, with the bridge and the schools, this starts at 32nd and moves south so why wouldn't we maybe look at pedestrian traffic, the schools and everything we have in conjunction with 32nd, which is something we have all agreed we need to do. Powers added that we could go west instead of south. Vein agreed adding that we can keep that up and that whole corridor with what is happening on Belmont Road, those people need to understand it. He said that it seems like that might be a better option, lets put it that way. DeMers said that the project scope might be something we'll have to address. Vein asked if that is something we can ask them to consider. Halford responded that that will be something that will be part of the conversation at the meeting tomorrow. DeMers commented that it sounds like they have already started the study. Powers said that he thinks that Mr. Vein has a good idea, but he thinks we are

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 17, 2022

going the wrong way. Vein pointed out that this goes all the way south past what. Halford responded it goes to 55th and Belmont to Washington.

Halford asked if, when we are talking about the scope of work at the meeting tomorrow, is that one of the things that UND would be open with, changing the scope of area, correct. Gedafa responded that that is correct. He added that, as he mentioned, this is just a starting point based on discussions with Mr. Haugen, in the proposal they specified that the location can change, they can add more locations depending on the analysis and the need of the MPO.

Grasser stated, maybe a couple of comments or follow-up, being more so that when you have the detail meeting, he would like to explore the budget a little bit more too. He said that, if he recalls, the City of Grand Forks, when they have an intern he thinks there is a cost sharing arrangement with UND whereby UND picks up part of the cost and the City picks up part of the cost, and he would be curious to know, again back to the budget, if this is an intern is there that cost sharing and is it included in here. Gedafa responded that UND is going to pay the tuition for the Graduate Student, and tuition is more than the \$15,000 per year from the MPO for a Graduate Student, so UND is going to pay the tuition and the MPO is going to pay the stipend for the student for two years.

Grasser said that another thing he would mention, he thinks there need to be a good robust public communication as part of this, notifying people and keeping them in the loop. He added that one thing he recalls that came up with staff, that someone suggested, was moving traffic control devices around, and things like that, that's kind of concerning relative to surprising drivers that it is there, then it is gone, and then it is showing up someplace else, so he thinks that process needs to be thought through as to how and when you do that and how you communicate that, because the general concept of traffic engineering you try not to do a lot of those surprise activities, so he will just leave those as things to be explored and to be defined in the scope of work.

Lunski asked if they are taking into consideration that new Children's Museum that has been proposed be built next to Choice. Halford responded that she would say that, as it sits now, probably not, but as the are working on the study she is sure it would come to light.

DeMers commented that, in principle he thinks this is a good idea to utilize our university and it becomes a win-win, we are training people and we are injecting them into our community, and hopefully we get a buy-in from that end, and we've had good luck in the City with some internships, so in principle he thinks it is a good idea; \$15,000 a year doesn't sound crazy expensive, but he also thinks we want to make sure that we are getting a product that fits what our direction and priorities are, so as long as we can iron out what exactly that scope is, he would be in favor of this. Vein added that the scope is really important, but also the credentials and the credibility of who they are working under, to make sure that we are getting state of the art information back, that we have that level of oversight working with the intern. DeMers said that he wondered that too; you said you already received speeding information, is that just like tickets, or are we monitoring speeding, or what. Gedafa responded that he talked to the City of Grand Forks and they agreed to provide speeding tickets for the past five years, so once they start the study they will get the data from the Grand Forks Police Department and also from the

NDDOT to analyze safety pedestrian and vehicular crash data for the past five years. He said that that is the first literature review on the analysis of existing safety and speeding data and they will determine final the location in coordination with the MPO.

Gedafa stated, you mentioned about credentials, he is a professor and one of his expertise is in traffic engineering, including traffic safety and he has been published in those areas. DeMers said that he was just wondering about those data sets and how telling they are, primarily because of how small they are; the pedestrian safety information is probably a pretty small data set and the ticketing thing definitely has its own biases and issues with it, but lets figure out a scope that works for what we are looking for and that works in their timeframe and move forward.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE TABLING THIS ITEM TO ALLOW FOR THE SUBCOMMITTEE TO GO OVER THE SCOPE OF WORK AND THE CONTRACT AND MAKE ANY NECESSARY CHANGES TO BOTH DOCUMENTS.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF 20-YEAR STATE HIGHWAY INVESTMENT PLAN

Halford introduced Kathryn Engelhardt from MnDOT and said that she is here today to give a brief presentation on the Minnesota 20-Year State Highway Investment Plan.

Presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request), continued.

QUESTIONS:

DeMers said that he was wondering, recently he had a chance to go East of Minnesota, and we talk about revenue versus needs, he is wondering if Minnesota is going to end up following the model of others to the East and West of Minnesota and use tolls to help generate revenue. Engelhardt responded that that is a good question, but it is something that they haven't discussed and it isn't part of the revenue scenarios that are part of the plan currently.

Grasser commented that he likes the fact that they have tools that bring the budget into the question about what do you want to do, he has complained a few times, hopefully not too vocally, but a lot times what they have done in the past when they were asking questions looking at the Long Range Transportation Plans, to say what would you like, and you just open the universe up to what do I want to have, and without having any kind of budget constraint on there he doesn't think it really gives us a good picture of how you would balance what you want versus what you need, etc, etc,, so he is just going to put that plug in to be thinking about that when we do the long range transportation plan, and by bringing in the budget you actually have to make some choices, he likes that part of what they are doing. Vein agreed, adding that a lot of times everyone has a wish list of what they want but it isn't fiscally constrained so this would

give us some opportunity to design the constrained system by which you are going to working with. DeMers stated that as you go through these processes, he would imagine that it is a pretty nice application that they wrote but it isn't anything that is out of the realm of creation or replication or whatever so as we think about consulting and public interaction that may be one tool that we request, or something along that line.

Information only.

MATTER OF 2023-2024 UPWP/BUDGET DISCUSSION

Halford reported that this is just a discussion item, she just wants to kind of plant a seed in your head that this is coming up and give you a picture of where we are sitting with our timeline for the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

Halford referred to the timeline and pointed out that we are currently working on our Transit Development Plan Update, our Bicycle and Pedestrian Element Update and our Street and Highway Plan Element Update. She added that we are getting close to finishing the Transit Development Plan Update. She also noted that she did expand the timeline a bit so you can see where the timeline starts over in a continuous motion. She commented that there are two plans that will continue into next year, and Teri will go into more detail on where we are sitting with them, and they are the Bike/Ped and Street/Highway Elements.

Halford stated that she just wanted to get everyone into the frame of mind that these discussions and draft reports will be coming forward in the near future. She added that she will submit the draft documents to the NDDOT and MnDOT who will be looking at them first, and then they will be brought forward to this body so she just wanted to give you an idea of what our work program is for 2023 and 2024 as well as what the budget might look like.

Information only.

MATTER OF BRIDGE UPDATE

Halford reported that she has a couple of updates that she is aware of and then she will open it up for anyone else that may have additional information.

Halford said that there has been a Selection Committee formed, and they have held two meetings. She stated that the first meeting was reviewing and revising the scope of work and looking at prepping for the interviews, determining what questions to ask of the three firms that submitted proposals as it was decided that all three would be interviewed. She said that a date for the interviews has not yet been set.

Halford commented that she did a radio interview with Dave Zavoral and Barry Wilfahrt last Wednesday at 3:00 p.m. and there was discussion on the bridge issue.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 17, 2022

Vein said that the process today really is selecting a consultant or advisor or whatever that will work with the two communities, right. Halford responded that was correct. Vein asked who they will answer to directly. Halford responded that it is her understanding that they will be answering directly to David Murphy, East Grand Forks City Administrator. Vein that he is just making sure that that is established at the very beginning. He added that it will be somewhat expanded so that both sides are working together to do the selection, is that right. Halford responded that that is correct. She added that at the July 11th meeting there was also discussion about looking at Merrifield as well, so not just 32nd as was in the original scope for the RFP, so they will no have Merrifield as part of the mix as well. Vein said then that they could do one, the other, or both then, is that what you are saying. Halford responded that she thinks they are saying to do both, so they will have the consultant look at both sites and determine what the steps would be to move either bridge forward. Vein stated, and correct him if he is wrong, but one is in the county and one is in the city so you have two different governing bodies looking at each one, so we don't have a say from the City perspective on what the county wants to do, and the county probably doesn't have a say on what the city wants to do and yet we are all part of the MPO. Halford responded that we do have a county representative from either side, so they are on the Selection Committee as well. Vein stated that that is great, that is the process of getting somebody on board, but he is trying to understand that once we have them on board what that structure will look like, because where does the MPO; we already have a transportation plan that has been acted on that we are following today, so that exists, and now the way he understood it is how do we fund this, who is going to fund it, who is going to lead it, how are we going to implement both of these. Halford responded that that is part of the discussion, but as of now it is just figuring out what are the steps to move a bridge forward. She said that it is her understanding that nobody around this area has done a bridge, or knows what this kind of project will look like, so nobody knows what the next steps are and that is what we are looking for, so if we move forward what will the steps be and then at least we will know what those steps are and then we can look at who is going to pay for what, what kind of money we can go after, and that is part of the scope of work too to see what kind of funding is available out there and what kind of grants we can apply for.

Vein commented that part of this is, and you say that we haven't done this before, but we just went through the redevelopment of the Kennedy Bridge, as an example; we were going to replace that so it isn't like we haven't worked on bridges between the two communities in the past, and we chose of course to not replace it but to rehab it and keep it in order, but there were all those things that we decided that flowed through the MPO to both communities because it is an inner-city bridge. Halford agreed that that is correct, but this is a new location and a totally new bridge, those others are current locations that have either been rehabs or replacing an existing bridge, so there is some background that we know of, but this is still a completely new bridge and a new location.

Powers said that Mr. Strandell has had a lot of experience with the Merrifield Bridge location; when you stop and think and reflect on it is there anything you learned that we should be doing, where do you start, where do you get the ball rolling. Strandell responded that as far as the Merrifield Bridge the two County Engineers are kind of the leaders, and he knows that the Polk County Engineer has a number of bridges on his mind, and Merrifield is one of them, but he is

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 17, 2022

very good at determining or finding funding for projects, at least going after it. He said that he has funding in place for the Climax Bridge which is scheduled for 2024, the funding has already been determined, he doesn't know where it is coming from but it is there, and he knows that he has other applications in for funding for Nielsville and another bridge in Clay County as well, he just gets way ahead of him and he is very good at it, so he needs to be involved in any kind of planning that would be done for a Merrifield Bridge.

Powers commented that sometimes he gets the impression that on the North Dakota side it isn't even on their calendars, it isn't a county bridge, its not a state bridge, its not a city bridge, it's a bridge to nowhere and we have to get past that so we can get it classified so that it is on the books, it is in the plan. Vein responded that that is what he thought the MPO would do in their transportation plan, we would be able to identify the bridge, what the funding sources would be, all of that, isn't that what we are supposed to do as an MPO, so he thinks that each side has to commit. He added that what he thinks has happened so far is that we have a commitment in the Long Range Transportation Plan to 32nd Avenue South, that exists and both cities have approved it, but what he thinks we haven't approved is a funding source. Kouba responded that we can assist in getting the funding but the Cities are the ones that actually have to apply for those funding sources and have that plan to continue to move forward so that it stays in our TIPs and the funding can continue to be pursued, and she thinks that is where we are kind of getting stuck, that process of how we are going to continue phasing things through in a manner that will continue to keep that project in our TIP, funded, because we have illustrative projects that have no funding source, that is where these bridges have been for the past few years, but we have to have actual funding sources that have been approved in order for them to continue to roll through in our TIPs, and that is the document that actually will have the federal government recognize it, as well as the State DOTs recognizing that this project is getting built. Powers said then that we need to talk to our local legislators more so than not. Vein said that he thinks for Grand Forks, especially since they have a legislative session starting, we have an opportunity to be able to start requesting some funding, and we really don't want to wait until the session starts, we should be working with the DOTs now to get these things into their planning and potentially into the Governor's budget, and beyond to get it going. He added that he assuming, again, that the person we hire is going to help us do that, isn't that what we are trying to do over and beyond what we would normally do as an MPO. Halford responded that that is correct. Vein said that he just wants to make sure that we all understand what the MPOs role is in moving this thing forward, because we don't need to reinvent the wheel when we've got an organization that it is their role to do that already. Kouba said, again, that we are a communication format but we are not a funding format, we don't apply for the funding, we can help with applications, we can give information, but the cities also have a roll to play in this as well.

Grasser said that in his opinion what the consultant should be doing is doing all of these things that we were just talking about, which is preparing the roadmap; what funding sources are out there, which ones are real and which ones are fictitious because quite frankly there is some funding out there that you have a better chance of winning the lottery than getting that funding. He stated that that is part of this, understanding which ones are really viable and who should take the lead and what are the steps; for instance if we go to the State of North Dakota and say we want money for a bridge, and we ask the DOT where that is on our State Transportation Plan,

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 17, 2022

and the States responds it isn't anywhere on it, so step number one is probably to get that recognized before you do anything else so he thinks it is important for the consultant to help us organize the steps so they are in the right order so we can move through and get the correct roadmap. He said that to him that is really a primary piece that they need to do to give us that roadmap to get from A to B and to C.

Vetter commented that it is even greater than that, when we talk about this, we talk about we want to hire someone and then nine, twelve, sixteen months down the road we get "here's your roadmap"; we want it to be a progression so that as they start working there is a first step, here is what we need to do, here is the first study we need to do so we can put out an RFP for that study as they continue to build the roadmap, so it isn't going to be where we start it and here is your roadmap at the end and now we are going to start at step one, they have already identified step one and we are going to start working on step one, whether it is to hire that firm to do it or if they would help us with the RFP to hire another firm to do it. Grasser agreed saying that it is kind of a living working document in relationship to some degree because timing is important because they are going to have a legislative session coming up in five or six months or so, and if we are going to do anything during that session, it doesn't do any good for them to identify that we should go to the legislature next May, it has to be kind of timely. Vetter stated that he anticipates that whatever firm is hired they will be holding our hand from now until the bridge is done.

Strandell asked, as far as the cost of hiring this consultant, is that something the MPO is going to pay for or do the two counties need to step up and pick a piece of this. Halford responded that they haven't asked the MPO to pay for anything yet, so far it is a split cost between the cities, they have been discussing asking the counties, but there hasn't been any kind of formal ask yet that she is aware of. Vetter commented that originally it was just the two cities because it was specifically for the 32nd, but then they talked about adding Merrifield and he did bring up that it should be a four-way split. Strandell agreed it should be a four-way split. He asked if Merrifield been formally included in the scope of work. Halford responded that she hasn't seen a draft yet but the plan was that it would be redrafted to add it into the scope. Strandell asked who was drafting the scope of work. Halford responded that Dave Murphy is doing the redraft. Vein asked if by redrafting you mean redrafting of the RFQ. Halford responded that is correct. She added that she thinks it might be changed to more of an RFP than an RFQ. She explained that the proposals they got back were more for an RFP. She said that it was good to see what they can do and what their projects have done, but some of them still answered them more like an RFP proposal but some of them were answering it like a past project so it was a bit of a miscommunication there, but she knows that Mr. Murphy reached out to all of the consultants and they are all still very interested even though the scope is changing a bit. Grasser reported that in North Dakota you have to select services based on qualifications, and then you can negotiate the scope of work, how does that work in Minnesota. Halford responded that she doesn't know all of the details but they are different, they have a little bit more flexibility, so that is another kind of plus that East Grand Forks is taking the lead on this, as they have a bit more flexibility. Grasser said that on the North Dakota side you have to award it on an RFQ basis and then you go back in and negotiate the costs. Halford stated that there is some room for negotiations with the cost too, we don't have that on the North Dakota side.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 17, 2022

Strandell commented that it would be hard for a consultant to put in a bid amount so to speak because the work required isn't totally clear at this point. Vein said that you have to have a refined scope to give a bid, otherwise what are you bidding on. Halford stated that it is her understanding that right now there will be a couple of phases and scenarios that the RFQ will ???, and we are asking for cost estimates for each of those. Grasser commented that you almost have to generate a recognizance level estimate to do the cost of that and then refine the scope.

Strandell asked what is the next step in this process. Halford responded that it would be to refine the scope of work and reaching out to those consultants again and setting up interviews, and then the Selection Committee can interview all three. Strandell asked if was are the decider or decision maker on this. Halford responded that we aren't. She explained that she sits on the Selection Committee along with David Kuharenko, Tricia Lunski, Nick West, Rich Sanders, and Brian Larson, and they will do the interviews and make a recommendation to the City Councils on who they feel should be hired and then East Grand Forks will make the final decision.

Information only.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

OTHER BUSINESS

A. 2021-2022 Annual Work Program Project Update

Kouba referred to the 2021-2022 Annual Work Program Project Update Table and stated that it shows where we are at with all of the various plans we are working on.

Kouba stated that Pavement Management is not quite completed yet, the contract is finished but we are still waiting on some additional data before we will release the retainage, other than that you did approve the final report at your meeting last month and we did receive the final printed report as well

Kouba reported that we are still working on finalizing the Transit Development Program, looking at financials and capital improvement for the plan. She stated that the Steering Committee will be meeting at the end of the month or the beginning of September to review the information.

Kouba stated that they are working on gathering data and input on the Bike/Ped Plan from the results of the first Survey and will hopefully will be able to start looking at public input and Steering Committee input and determine how we are going to move forward with existing conditions.

Kouba commented that they just posted the website for the Street and Highway Plan update, but they are still working on gathering existing condition and other data.

Information only.

B. Safe Streets For All

Halford reported that we have received over a dozen letters of support and are still expecting a couple more. She stated that the application is due September 15th, and they started a draft of answering questions and putting together a narrative. She said that once we submit the application we should hear whether or not we get the funding by the end of this year or the first part of next year.

C. MnDOT Programming Update Workgroup

Kouba stated that there was a copy of a presentation that wasn't included in the packet from last month's meeting but it mostly covered final recommendations that were submitted to the State of Minnesota concerning the Sub-Target funding allocation; which was to continue the current allocation process. She said that they are looking at the funding for transportation enhancement projects and are recommending that it go to the ATPs to disperse so that it will give the ATPs a bit of flexibility in spending those monies. She stated that they discussed the off-system bridge program and a new estimation for other bridge needs. She said that they did discuss some different options and it sounded like the most favorable option was to do a disbursement of funds with the ATPs so that they can increase the state funding to the ATPs but the ATPs don't explicitly use it on bridges so it will be a bit more work for the MnDOT which is nice because the funding still gets spent and all of the ATPs get their equal share.

Kouba commented that they are looking at some other projects; HSIP and DRMP/STPP/BFP funding for MnDOT Districts, with more information coming in the future.

Information only

C. Approval Of July 16, 2022 To August 12, 2022 Bills/Checks

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE BILLS/CHECKS FOR THE JULY 16, 2022 TO AUGUST 12, 2022 PERIOD.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ADJOURNMENT

STRANDELL ADJOURNED THE AUGUST 17, 2022 MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:15 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO
Transaction List by Vendor
 July 16 through August 12, 2022

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
AFLAC.							
Liability Check	07/22/2022	AFLAC	501	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-395.98
Alerus Financial							
Liability Check	07/22/2022	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-2,209.34
Liability Check	08/05/2022	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,209.36
Business Essentials							
Bill	08/02/2022	Inv. #...	Office Supplie...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-7.09
Bill Pmt -Check	08/02/2022	7268	Office Supplie...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-7.09
Constant Contact							
Bill Pmt -Check	08/02/2022	Const...	August 2022 ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-20.00
Fidelity Security Life.							
Liability Check	07/22/2022	Aveis	50790-1043	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-30.42
Forum Communications Company							
Bill	08/08/2022	Inv. #...	Public Notice...	206 · Accounts Pay...		555 · TIP	-479.98
Bill Pmt -Check	08/08/2022	7269	Public Notice...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-479.98
LSNB as Trustee for PEHP							
Liability Check	07/22/2022	PEHP		104 · Checking	X	216 · Post-Hea...	-123.75
Madison Nat'l Life							
Liability Check	07/22/2022	7263		104 · Checking		215 · Disability...	-64.74
Mike's							
Bill	07/20/2022		MPO Lunche...	206 · Accounts Pay...		711 · Miscellan...	-107.07
Bill Pmt -Check	07/20/2022	7265	MPO Lunche...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-107.07
Minnesota Department of Revenue							
Liability Check	07/22/2022	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-462.00
Liability Check	08/05/2022	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking	*	210 · Payroll Li...	-462.00
Minnesota Life Insurance Company							
Liability Check	07/22/2022	7266		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-44.46
Nationwide Retirement Solutions							
Liability Check	07/22/2022	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-510.56
Liability Check	08/05/2022	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-510.56
NDPERS							
Liability Check	07/22/2022	NDPE...	D88	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-2,941.76
Liability Check	08/05/2022	NDPE...		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,535.92
QuickBooks Payroll Service							
Liability Check	07/21/2022		Created by P...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-6,127.44
Liability Check	08/04/2022		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-6,127.43
Standard Insurance Company							
Liability Check	07/22/2022	7264		104 · Checking		217 · Dental P...	-243.72
Teri Kouba							
Bill	07/26/2022		Reimburseme...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-34.99
Bill Pmt -Check	07/26/2022	7267	Reimburseme...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-34.99