

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, October 19, 2022 - 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks Training Conference Room/Zoom Meeting**

CALL TO ORDER

Warren Strandell, Chairperson, called the October 19th, 2022, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:04 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

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

Absent: Clarence Vetter.

Guest(s) present: David Murphy, East Grand Forks City Administrator; and Ryan Brooks, Grand Forks City Planner.

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 SEPTEMBER 21ST, 2022 MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY ROST, SECONDED BY LUNSKI, TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 21ST, 2022 MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF FINAL APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO THE 2045 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN (MTP)

Halford reported that just a recap, the City of East Grand Forks has requested the MPO to amend the 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) to move the Bygland/Rhinehart Roundabout from the short-range list of projects to the mid-range list of projects. She stated that they further requested that the MPO amend the plan to add the following projects:

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19, 2022

- 5th Ave. NE (15th-20th St. NE)
 - Miscellaneous concrete panel/C&G replacement
 - Miscellaneous sidewalk replacement
- 5th Ave. NE (Highway 2 -10th St. NE)
 - Miscellaneous concrete panel/C&B replacement
- DeMers Avenue (4th St. to 10th St.)
 - Replace stamped concrete crosswalks
 - Remove bituminous pavement from old railroad tracks and replace with concrete pavement
 - Miscellaneous concrete panel/C&G replacement
 - Miscellaneous sidewalk replacement

Halford stated that the process we followed for this amendment was to submit it for consideration to the Technical Advisory Committee at their September meeting, they had no comments or questions; to the MPO Executive Policy Board, there were a couple of comments, mostly as to where it should be placed on the project list timeline, and it was decided that the Illustrative List didn't make sense so it should be moved to the mid-range list so that adjustment was made. She added that the East Grand Forks City Representatives attended the September ATP meeting on September 29th, and gave an update on where they are at on spending their Sub-Target funding, and that they were looking at doing these projects. She said that both Cities submitted letters stating that no amendment to their Comprehensive Plans need to take place, doing it administratively is fine so we didn't have to do the two month process, and now we are back seeking final approval of the amendment.

Halford commented that there was a statement made by Dana Sande, Council President for Grand Forks, at Monday's City Council meeting in Grand Forks, questioning if this should have been done administratively or if it should be done with a more formal action, but looking at the project, and really it is amending the 2045 MTP, going from 2023 to 2027, moving it to 2028 to 2037, it really isn't changing much in years, they only see this funding every four years, and we are also currently updating our 2050 Street and Highway Plan so all of this will be relooked at during that update.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY LUNSKI, TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING.

Murphy said that he doesn't have any comments, but just wanted to say that he is here for East Grand Forks to answer any questions you may have.

Grasser commented that at the Grand Forks City Council meeting on Monday he thinks that part of the question Mr. Sande had was whether a roundabout in particular would increase traffic capacity to the southend. He said that his question is, for the MPO or the City of East Grand Forks, is that one of the intents of that project, and would, in-fact, a roundabout increase any traffic capacity. He stated that he isn't aware, generally, that it would but he is looking for some thoughts or validation that that isn't what the intent of is of that improvement.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19, 2022

Halford responded that the intent of the project is to help the traffic flow as there is a bit of congestion a few times in a day, particularly in the mornings and school hours so it would help with the traffic flow issues. She said that really what this is, is what we've learned with various studies is that the current situation is more of a nuisance, it is something that they probably want to do in the future, but it doesn't need to happen right now. She added that she did tell Mayor Gander, in a couple of conversations, that they are okay now but that it is better to be proactive now so it would be better to move it to the mid-range list. Murphy agreed, adding that the way they have been viewing this is that it is more of a flow issue than a capacity issue, there are congestion issues really two times a day, and this project would help to alleviate that, they haven't been looking at it to increase the capacity because the roadway would have the same configuration, it would handle the same amount of traffic, it would just help the flow at that intersection.

Halford stated that, just a reminder, this project is tied to Sub-target funding, so originally they wanted to do the roundabout project, it is a good size project that the City would normally have trouble finding funding for, so it is funding they get every four years and this was a good project for those funds but things weren't aligning up to do it and they didn't want to lose those funds so they are now looking at these projects that they can get done now. Grasser said, then, that this project could have happened in the short-term, and by moving it all you are doing is shifting the point in time when it would have happened, it could have happened in the short-term without an amendment to the MTP, so that is really just shifting the time period.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY ROST, TO GRANT FINAL APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE 2045 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN (MTP), AS PRESENTED.

DeMers asked, if there is a divided vote, a tie-vote, what happens to a motion, does it fail, because this board is evenly divided. Murphy commented that he has had either the fortunate or unfortunate experience of working for ten years for a City that had an even number of voting members on their Council, so they would have tie votes often, and a tie vote fails because it isn't a majority vote. DeMers said that that is what he thought. He added that he had heard comments had been made, and he thought it was kind of a little bit of a much-ado about nothing, that it was just people that took standard procedure that we've had and kind of used it to make a political statement that really isn't germane to what was being done. He said that his time on this board has been pretty positive, although there have been some differences among different people, different boards, different groups, but he has always thought that this board has been above that, it has been a great conduit for joint collaborative type of work between the cities, among the cities, among the counties, and he wants that to remain; the reason he asked that is kind of, we don't want to see this evolve into a thing where cities are blocking important infrastructure projects out of kind of petty political points, petty political disagreements. He stated, again, that this board has been very, and he doesn't want to say apolitical, because obviously we work within a political realm, we work in something that deals with public dollars,

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19, 2022

public input, all those types of things, but it has risen above political issues to address things in a informed, quantitative matter that he wants to continue because as he said before, this is one area, obviously we have different interests, different perspectives, but our ability to progress through the future, through these 50 year plans, is very dependent on us understanding and working together and he doesn't want to see that change. He said that his point about asking that point of order is that it is very easy for either side to stick a fork in other people's projects, and he doesn't want to see that, he thinks it is kind of ugly and petty.

Vein commented that he just wants to note that Mr. Sande did not talk to him prior to the City Council meeting. He said that he did reach out to Mr. Sande after the meeting, that he really did think it was important to understand the perspective that might be there, but he didn't return his call. He said that it was just a few hours ago, and he understands what this entails in the long term, but he did not get anything additional that would like to say was more specific, and he didn't go back and relisten to the video either, so he isn't in a position to understand where he was coming from, and like Mr. DeMers he tries to do what is best for the community, he typically doesn't get involved a lot with what happens in East Grand Forks because you guys represent East Grand Forks and they represent Grand Forks, but he would assume there are times when there might be an influence and we have always been free to talk about them when there is an issue.

DeMers stated that the benefit that we have had, and he has never had a problem weighing in on issues that are intricate to Grand Forks, because he feels it is a good idea for them to give a different perspective than maybe what you are dealing with, and he would think it the same the other way, we look for perspective from someone that isn't tied into a much more emotional political issue that is intricate to East Grand Forks, so he wants that to be able to go forward and he thinks it has been laid out by their City Administrator, that the issue here is not one of changing from what East Grand Forks' plans and goals are going forward, it is more of a technical issue, kind of a timeline issue, kind of a bureaucracy issue that they are trying to get through in order to get to what we want later, obviously a roundabout is integral to that and that is why they made the effort to make sure that it wasn't just put off in an illustrative project but that it still remain in our plan and at a fairly moderate timeline, that horizon still remains something that we want to get done because it does it matter for not just a bridge, but for local transportation in that area, so to him he didn't want to see this happen, he didn't want this to be the avenue they took, but it ultimately does make sense, and it doesn't do anything to change East Grand Forks' progress, goals, or any of the work that he thinks the MPO has done up to this point.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Vetter.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF UND INTERN AGREEMENT

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19, 2022

Halford reported that she will give just a quick recap. She said that at the August Technical Advisory Committee meeting this committee tabled this item for further study. She reiterated that this was something that was started before her time, and during that process up to current times the right players weren't part of those conversations, so a small group met and reviewed the document and requested some edits be made. She stated that at the October Technical Advisory Committee there were no comments, and they were happy with the edits that were made, and recommended approval of the agreement.

Strandell said that this is just the beginning of the process, they don't have a candidate yet correct. Halford responded that the candidate will basically be working at UND, they won't be housed in the MPO office, but they will be reporting on a regular basis their findings and that is something she can bring to this group to share. Strandell said, though, that we don't know who this person is yet. Halford referred to Daba to respond to that question.

Daba responded that they already have a graduate student in place who has already begun working on this.

Grasser commented that he thinks we got some good value out of the small working group that helped define all of this, he thinks it was worth the effort and we will get a better product because of it.

DeMers asked what is the difference in the deliverable from what was originally proposed to this edited version. Daba responded that originally they had proposed giving quarterly reports and that was changed to monthly reports in addition to a final report at the end. He stated that the final report will include all of the tasks, the literature review, data, cost effective options for calming methods, etc. DeMers said that he thought that at one point there was discussion about having this scope include areas in front of the schools to kind of dovetail into some of the study that we've already done based on bridge corridor stuff, is that included in this or has that scope changed. Daba responded that they have a temporary, but the final location really depends on the preliminary speeding ticket and crash data analysis targeting the areas of concern, so the final locations will be decided based on data analysis.

DeMers said that the other thing he was going to say is, we talked about using speeding ticket data, and he is wondering if there is any ability to use other data, does the traffic data that comes from Google, does that have any rate of speed data that could be used for illustrative information besides just using traffic counts. Daba responded that there could be but based on his discussion with the Traffic Engineering Division, they don't keep the recording even though they can record all of this information at the signalized intersection, but they are willing to present illustrative data based on discussion with Traffic Engineering. He said that he doesn't know who the new person will be with Ms. William's retirement, but they did work very well with her in the past. DeMers stated that he is very much in favor of this partnership, he thinks it is something we can do going forward, he is just worried about the validity of the data based on traffic citation information.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE PARTNERSHIP WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA FOR AN INTERNSHIP, AND TO AUTHORIZE THE MPO EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH UND, AS PRESENTED.

Lunski commented that the way she understands how Google data works is, if Stephanie is cited for going 65 in that area, we won't know it was her, we would just know it occurred in point A, so she thinks that would be available. DeMers said that he just knows that he knows we have some of that information, he just doesn't know if it is something that could augment or benefit this study. Lunski said that she thinks it is a valid point because that information is already there so it would be nice to take advantage of it. Daba commented that they will use all the information they can get; the crash data, speeding data, Google data, data from the City, any recordings we can get from the Traffic Engineering Division of the City of Grand Forks, in addition to doing speed measurement at locations they see a concern, so it will be a very comprehensive study

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Vetter.

MATTER OF 2024-2027 T.I.P CANDIDATE PROJECT SOLICITATION

Kouba reported that this is basically our Transportation Improvement Program, and we are now starting our new TIP cycle; as you know we just completed our previous one, but this is for 2024-2027. She said that for FY 2027, the new year, we have no projects specifically involved yet, but there is always a review of all the projects that are happening within the timeframe. She said that we are looking at the cities, and we are still waiting to find out when some of these solicitations are due, Minnesota has most of their solicitations out already, or they have passed, or at least their letter of intent has passed. She said that we are just going to be working through the process with all the staff and hopefully work with the DOTs to find out when some final dates are for some of these solicitations.

Powers asked, on the list of projects, it says project type, what does CPR Grind mean. Grasser responded that it is concrete panel repair, and then we usually do a grinding over the top of that to smooth it. He stated that that is what they did on Gateway Drive a few years ago. He added that it is basically a rehab on a concrete street.

Information only.

MATTER OF 2050 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE

Halford reported that they had a more formal presentation on the Street and Highway Element at the Technical Advisory Committee, but Jason Carbee from HDR is on-line and he will give a bit shorter overview of what is going on with the Street/Highway Element Update.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19, 2022

Carbee referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request), and went through it briefly,\

Carbee reported that they gave a Street and Highway Plan background overview; and they walked through the existing conditions. He stated that traffic operations and safety is kind of what they are focusing on, and they are really building towards, on November 3rd they will be holding a public open house that will give the public the opportunity to come in and see some of the work that has been done and to get that first round of input on the Street and Highway Plan to see what the public feels we need to be focusing on.

Carbee referred to a slide with the plan schedule and commented that the need to be done by the end of next year so they worked with the MPO to identify a schedule that gets them three major milestones for getting public input, and they are going to do a kind of bonus on-line public input opportunity between as well, so while they are building the framework for the plan, what kinds of projects and strategies should they include in the plan, that is where they will have both a public open house and have the on-line bonus activity. He said that he will point out that with all three open houses they will also have the opportunity for people to review the materials at the website and also be able to give input using a mapping option and leave comments on some of their ideas for the future of transportation throughout the region.

Carbee referred to a slide of the existing conditions progress and went over what they have worked on so far, and what they have in progress. He said they identified some of the safety hot spots, where they have some historical crash records and issues they need to look at as part of the transportation plan; some traffic operations in terms of where they have peak hour congestion and where they have travel reliability. He stated that they are also looking at the condition of roads and bridges, and how it all connects together. He added that they are also looking to the future, this is through the year 2050, so we want to make sure we are identifying where those growth areas are located and to make sure we have the street system in place to support the overall needs not only today but into the future.

Carbee referred to a slide of Existing Conditions Traffic Safety and commented that he will point out that they looked at safety and the noticed that, not surprising, we have more crashes in the winter than we do during the summer due to winter driving conditions, there is more travel during the week so we tend to have more crashes between Tuesday through Thursday and Friday, and then did identify crash hot spots so where we have more traffic we have more crashes, so that was no surprise, but they also did look at crash rate so they kind of adjusted for the level of traffic. He stated that these are the areas that they will focus on to see if they need to identify some opportunities for potential safety improvements.

Carbee stated that he will talk real quick about the First Public Engagement Milestone, and again, as he said, it will be an open house format, and it will be held at the East Grand Forks Public Library, it won't be at City Hall because of the election. He added that it will be from 5:00 to 7:00 and there won't be a formal presentation, they are going to have boards and staff there to visit with the public as they come and go; they find this is a pretty effective way to

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19, 2022

engage with a broader set of folks, and then have some activities so folks can give their input. He said this will also be online as well. He stated that they do have a Stakeholder Committee, and it is going to be kind of a focus group just representing a diverse set of folks.

Carbee referred to a slide showing the next steps for the update and went over it briefly:

- 1) Finalizing where the system sits today
- 2) Begin working towards identifying where they think issues and opportunities might pop up in the future
- 3) They have that online engagement opportunity coming up for those that can't make it to the open house on November 3rd.
- 4) They will start talking about the overall Street and Highway goals, objectives, policies, and performance measures.

Grasser said that he has a couple of comments more so than questions, but he is looking at some of the data sources you have here; they are going to have a couple newer data sources that he thinks haven't been identified, at least as he is paging through this. He said that they are working on the Environmental Analysis for an Interchange on 47th Avenue, and they are also working on the Grade Separation for 42nd and DeMers Avenue, and those will have, very shortly, probably already exists, a host of traffic analysis. He added that part of it is looking at future configurations and part is just validating existing conditions also. He said that another one, just a comment, and he kind of struggles with this every time we do one of these transportation updates, but he is looking at some of their data sources being 2017, and it is 2022, so we've already got five years differential, and he is just wondering if you anticipate that there might be some more recent general traffic data available, something that is more current than 2017. Carbee responded that that is a great comment. He stated that there are two different levels here; they are doing essentially the whole region at once, and they are using what he calls a planning level approach to identifying where we might have some traffic operation issues. He said that these studies tend to go into a little bit more detail, in terms of looking at the exact peak hour and using the Highway Capacity Manual method, and really getting a little bit more refined with that analysis, but where they don't have the latest information and where they don't have any of this information they are kind of supplementing it with their own analysis. He stated that they will look at, when they do this, they do look at how much traffic has grown, for instance on I-29 since that past study, and they will just make sure that they haven't missed anything in terms of five or six years of traffic growth there because you are right if that is a 2017 study the traffic data is probably from 2015 or 2016. Grasser stated that, if he can, just coupling one more time on that, they do have traffic signal counts that go back a few years and are available almost in real time, and again, that doesn't always give you the corridor, but it give a lot of information at quite a few intersections so he would encourage, if we can somehow incorporate that, that is pretty current data. Kouba commented that the MPO has given them access to those reports and information from the traffic signal counts and have also given them the most up-to-date traffic volume counts from the NDDOT as well as the crash data up to 2021. Grasser said he is just wants to get them the most up-to-date information we can.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19, 2022

Vein said, then, that this is the document that will look at potential future bridges also, correct. Kouba responded that it will continue on with the information that we used in our future traffic study. She said that as in the traffic study, we have not completely determined a bridge location, there are still the two options of Elks Drive and 32nd for possible locations, but it is up to the two cities to cooperate to finalize that final decision. Vein said, correct me if I am wrong, the Grand Forks City Council has approved the 32nd Avenue Bridge location, the East Grand Forks City Council approved the 32nd Avenue Bridge location and the MPO has approved the 32nd Avenue Bridge location in the current transportation plan, that is what we have today, now we are restudying some of that, but letter of the law those three things are in place today. Kouba responded that that is correct, it is planning level document though because, once again, there needs to be other documents and other review, especially on an engineering level that need to happen that could change that. Vein agreed, but added that that is still what is current today, and we will have a new one when this is done, and that could change what we have currently, and he knows in the past we were criticized somewhat for not communicating well enough, and we have worked hard to overcome that. He said that what he is trying to get at is that we need to have a really robust communication plan so that we don't run into that problem, is that a part of what we are approving here now. Halford responded that this is just an update right now, we aren't approving anything at this time. Vein agreed we aren't approving anything now, but in getting to that final document we want to make sure that as much of the public as possible are informed of the public houses. Halford responded that we are doing everything we can to get a little bit more out there, but if there are any ideas on how we can do more please let us know. Vein asked what the process of communicating this is. Halford responded that in the past it has been advertising it in the Grand Forks Herald, Facebook, reaching out to both Cities to post it on their websites and Facebook pages as well, but we are trying to do a little bit more than that and be a little more creative. Kouba added that at the end of the day we follow our Public Participation Plan that has been adopted, and is available on our website, but we are always trying to improve upon it the best practices that we can. Vein commented that he just thinks that communication will be really critical, but even if we do what is in our plan, he wants to make sure we go above and beyond. Kouba responded that that is our goal as well, to continue to improve our public participation and getting the word out.

Grasser stated that something to think about, and he doesn't have an answer for by the way, but he thinks one of the challenges gets to be when we end up doing the Long Range Transportation Plan it has to be financially constrained, right, the City has a long list of illustrative projects, and he isn't sure how to communicate to people, because on one hand, yes, there is a location identified, but you are also identifying that we don't have a funding source, so the challenge is how to communicate that better, and again, he doesn't have an answer, and he thinks that is part of the challenge. Kouba commented that that list is also the opportunity to, when you as a City find you need something else that is in that illustrative list to be moved into the financial constrained project list, and you move something out of that list and into the illustrative list it makes it easier for us to be able to do that as quickly as possible, so that is kind of the reason for having an illustrative list, and it is also why she put the financially constrained projects when she gets the TIP solicitation so that we kind of looked at those as well and if there is anything that needs to be changed out of that we can work on the process at the same time for the Cities to be able to get the best projects that they can using federal funding.

Grasser commented that, listening to this conversation, it might be something that we want to add to the study that we are working on, the current bridge study where we are getting a consultant, having them help give us some guidance as to how to move that from the illustrative into more of an actual because that tends to make it more real he thinks in that process so maybe the consultant can help give some guidance as to how that process might look and what things may end up having to be considered for trade-offs. Kouba responded that we were discussing something similar with our North Dakota Federal Highway representative and she made the suggestion of possibly doing some sort of phasing of projects that will get you to that point, which is something that the consultant can definitely look at to help you move it along.

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 we are at the point in this work program that we are mostly focused on our three big plans; we just got the update on the Street and Highway Plan.

Kouba stated that they are working on getting out a new open house timeframe to get some new projects and get people's input on some of the information that they have gathered together on the Bike/Ped Plan Update. She said that at the previous open house they had a gathering of what people's goals are and what they are seeing needs to be improved so the next one they will be looking at ideas of what those goals will be and what projects would be good to do, and kind of queuing people up to think about those types of things for bike and pedestrian improvements.

Kouba said that for the Transit Development Plan we are at a point where are going to be starting the adoption process. She explained that this plan is part of both Cities Comprehensive Plans, so there are ordinances that need to be updated to include the Transit Development Plan.

Information only.

B. MPO Updates

- Halford reported that the application for the Safe Street For All was submitted, we haven't heard back and probably won't hear anything until the end of this year or the beginning of next year.
- Halford reported that she doesn't have much to report on the Bridge Update. She said that she knows the consultant hasn't given an updated estimate on the budget. She

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19, 2022

explained that they were going to do some adjustments after a couple of side conversations, but nothing has been formally submitted. Vein asked if there was an overall timeline for the Bridge Update. He said that the consultant was going to come in to work on this because it was out of the ordinary to kind of identify the process or procedure for how we pursue a local bridge, is that right. Halford responded that they haven't finalized the revised scope yet but she did receive an email this morning and they think it will be around \$150,000 and it will be about an eight or nine month timeframe to do it. Vein said that he understands that there was a pedestrian injury at Minnesota/4th in the last month. Kouba said that she thought there was also one close to the Ben Franklin School area, and then there was a pedestrian/beet truck injury in downtown area at DeMers and 3rd. Vein said that he was told Minnesota/4th, he didn't personally see anything or validate it, but he just mentioned it because of the importance of getting this done.

DeMers that someone made a comment to him that it seemed like there was more beet truck traffic through the downtown this year than normal, and it seems like we have tried to do things to make that less so, but it was kind of odd and he thought the same thing, but you never know what you see and when. Powers said that he agrees that there seemed to be more. He said that he went for a ride with some guys that he used to drive with and a little ride was six hours and he thought the same thing, that there were more trucks. He asked why we run beet trucks through Sherlock Park through the City when they can stay on the highway and come down 5th. DeMers said that he thought it was interesting, he actually went up the on-ramp onto Highway 2 from East Grand Forks and there were beets all along that road, so he tries to stay away from trying to get into peoples heads and figuring out how things happen the way they happen, but there were beet trucks going west on the road, who knows why, but it does make the case that a Merrifield Bridge, while it doesn't do anything with Minnesota/4th Avenue, by Phoenix School, but there is a need for reducing truck traffic through town and those type of things to, so we do need something like that. He added that the Thompson Bridge is 30 miles if you go that way, so that isn't really an option, it has got to be Highway 2 or something else.

Rost commented that there are some farmers over in the Grand Forks area, Beau Bateman and Drees, and some others that are pushing for a Merrifield Bridge, and they are actually getting a petition together. He said that that is all he knows right now. DeMers stated that he has heard the same type of things from Growers on the east side that would like to see that bridge to go through as well. Rost added that he thinks there has been some discussion between the Polk County Highway Engineer and the Grand Forks County Highway Engineer, and he thinks there are some people that are going to the Legislature about it as well so we will have to see what happens, it is all about money.

Grasser commented that just by general proximity of the land you've got, there are also some of them that are using DeMers Avenue, as that would be the shortest route for them.

Rost stated that the issue is an overpass over I-29, the existing one right now, according to the NDDOT would have to be removed because it is too narrow, so we would have to build a whole new bridge with on and off ramps and that takes federal review from Federal Highway. He said

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 19, 2022

that they had a North Dakota Association of Counties meeting and he brought the issue up and that is what he was told then.

Information only.

- Halford reported that there was no Programming Update Workgroup meeting held in September, so there isn't an update.

C. Approval Of September 17, 2022 To October 14, 2022 Bills/Checks

MOVED BY DEMBERS, SECONDED BY ROST, TO APPROVE THE BILLS/CHECKS FOR THE SEPTEMBER 17, 2022 TO OCTOBER 14, 2022 PERIOD.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ADJOURNMENT

STRANDELL ADJOURNED THE OCTOBER 19, 2022 MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:51 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO Transaction List by Vendor September 17 through October 14, 2022

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
AFLAC.							
Liability Check	09/26/2022	AFLAC	501	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-593.97
Alerus Financial							
Liability Check	09/26/2022	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-2,284.52
Liability Check	10/14/2022	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,209.34
Bolton & Menk							
Bill	09/28/2022	Inv. #...	Work On Bike...	206 · Accounts Pay...		545 · Transpor...	-11,951.23
Bill Pmt -Check	09/28/2022	7293	Work On Bike...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-11,951.23
Cardmember Service							
Bill	09/20/2022	Acct #...	AMPO Confer...	206 · Accounts Pay...		530 · Educatio...	-1,942.84
Bill Pmt -Check	09/20/2022	7289	AMPO Confer...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-1,942.84
Bill	09/20/2022	Acct #...	Docking Stati...	206 · Accounts Pay...		-SPLIT-	-191.75
Bill Pmt -Check	09/20/2022	7290	Docking Stati...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-191.75
Constant Contact							
Check	10/03/2022	Const...	October 2022...	104 · Checking		517 · Overhead	-20.00
Fidelity Security Life.							
Liability Check	09/26/2022	AVESIS	50790-1043	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-30.42
Forum Communications Company							
Bill	10/11/2022	Inv. #...	Public Notice...	206 · Accounts Pay...		555 · TIP	-429.98
Bill Pmt -Check	10/11/2022	7300	Public Notice...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-429.98
HDR Engineering, Inc.							
Bill	09/28/2022	Inv. #...	Work On 205...	206 · Accounts Pay...		545 · Transpor...	-10,084.44
Bill Pmt -Check	09/28/2022	7294	Work On 205...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-10,084.44
Kimley-Horn And Associates, Inc.							
Bill	09/28/2022	Inv. #...	Work On TDP...	206 · Accounts Pay...		545 · Transpor...	-13,813.83
Bill Pmt -Check	09/28/2022	7295	Work On TDP...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-13,813.83
Liberty Business Systems, Inc.							
Bill	10/07/2022	Inv. #...	Contract Bas...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-206.00
Bill Pmt -Check	10/07/2022	7299	Contract Bas...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-206.00
Madison Nat'l Life							
Liability Check	09/19/2022	7288		104 · Checking	X	215 · Disability...	-64.74
Mike's							
Bill	09/21/2022		MPO Lunche...	206 · Accounts Pay...		711 · Miscellan...	-96.00
Bill Pmt -Check	09/21/2022	7291	MPO Lunche...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-96.00
Minnesota Department of Revenue							
Liability Check	09/26/2022	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-477.00
Liability Check	10/14/2022	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-462.00
Minnesota Life Insurance Company							
Liability Check	09/21/2022	7292		104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-44.46
Nationwide Retirement Solutions							
Liability Check	09/26/2022	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-510.56
Liability Check	10/14/2022	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-510.56
NDPERS							
Liability Check	09/26/2022	NDPE...	D88	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-4,412.64
Liability Check	10/14/2022	NDPE...		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,535.92
QuickBooks Payroll Service							
Liability Check	09/29/2022		Created by P...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-6,301.18
Liability Check	10/13/2022		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-6,127.44
Stephanie Halford							
Bill	09/28/2022		Reimburse Fo...	206 · Accounts Pay...		530 · Educatio...	-100.30
Bill Pmt -Check	09/28/2022	7296	Reimburse Fo...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-100.30
Bill	10/04/2022		Reimburseme...	206 · Accounts Pay...		530 · Educatio...	-76.25
Bill Pmt -Check	10/04/2022	7298	Reimburseme...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-76.25
Teri Kouba							
Bill	09/19/2022		Reimburse Fo...	206 · Accounts Pay...		530 · Educatio...	-476.05
Bill Pmt -Check	09/19/2022	7287	Reimburse Fo...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-476.05