

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, January 18, 2023 - 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks Training Conference Room/Zoom Meeting**

CALL TO ORDER

Warren Strandell, Chairperson, called the January 18th, 2023, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:04 p.m.

INTRODUCTIONS/WELCOME NEW MEMBERS

Strandell asked that everyone please state their names and the organization they represent for the new members present today.

CALL OF ROLL

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

Absent: None.

Guest(s) present: None.

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 DECEMBER 15TH, 2022 MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

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

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 10TH, 2022 TO JANUARY 13TH, 2023
BILLS/CHECKS**

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO APPROVE DECEMBER 10TH,
2022 TO JANUARY 13TH, 2023 BILL/CHECKS, AS PRESENTED.***

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF PERFORMANCE TARGETS

Kouba reported that this is something that, depending on what type of performance targets and measures we are looking at, we do every four years with a review at two, one of which is the bridge and pavement. She stated that we also have travel reliability, which is done every year.

Kouba commented that basically what we are adopting are these various targets, and she will go through what these measures are; trying to figure out where they are coming from. She stated that she would like to start off with what the federal highway is generally calling PM-2, which is Bridge and Pavement Condition performance measures and targets.

Kouba stated that for the Bridge and Pavement Condition, PM-2, we are looking at the deck area, and only on the National Highway System, to determine whether it is in good or poor condition. She said that the bridges are checked on a schedule that is presented and updated when they are checked, and that information is provided. She added that in the past we have done some; we set most of our targets with the States for the bridges.

Kouba said that for the pavement we are looking at lane miles for the Interstate as well as on the Non-Interstate Highway System, which is what NHS stands for, National Highway System.

Kouba commented that both the Bridge and the Pavement Targets are four-year targets, but generally they are re-evaluated at mid-point to establish whether or not we are on target, and if not we have an opportunity to change those targets at that time. She said that there is no real penalty for an MPO, but it is pretty important on a state level.

Kouba stated that this is basically our second four-year period, we had one performance period, which included an update. She said that it is a little tentative for the simple reason that when you look at the previous period we were also at a point where we were trying to figure out what those targets were and what they mean, and what we are looking for so we did have some adjustments in some areas, but previously for the MPO we had just stated the States and we wanted a bit more definitive answer, definitive numbers for those so we ended up with the specific numbers for each particular State in the past, and because there is only interstate in North Dakota in our MPO area we just stated the North Dakota numbers for pavement condition.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 18, 2023

Kouba commented that now that we are in a new period we are reviewing some of the old data, as well as trying to figure out the new, which is one of the reasons why there is a very mathematical equation formula, heavy in defining what these percentages are, and gathering that data for the MPO staff is bit difficult so we tend to rely on the States and getting some of that actual data, especially for the North Dakota side has been a bit difficult, and once again these are all on State levels, not just our MPO area, which is also a little bit different especially when we are looking at bridges, there are only three bridges in our MPO area, and only two are on the National Highway System, the Sorlie and the Kennedy, and an overpass on the Minnesota side too, and we know that we have had some issues with condition and structure that are being looked at being fixed in the future but we do know that that does implement, especially with the bridge deck area.

Grasser asked if, just by way of review, Ms. Kouba could bounce through the roads in Grand Forks and East Grand Forks that are on the National Highway System, so we have an idea of which ones are on it. Kouba responded that the Interstate is Interstate I-29, and then for Grand Forks and East Grand Forks Highway 2 is on the National Highway System, and then for Grand Forks only there is US#81, which is Washington Street and then 32nd Avenue South as well. Grasser asked if Columbia Road was also on the NHS system. Kouba responded that she believes it is, adding that any that is a Principle Arterial or higher is on the NHS system.

Kouba stated that because we generally, in the past, have gone with the States targets, that is something that MPO Staff and the Technical Advisory Committee recommends we continue to do, and to just go with the State of North Dakota targets for interstate pavement conditions.

Larson asked about the rankings, if it was only good and poor, are those the only two categories that these fall into. Kouba responded that there is also a fair condition category which is kind of that middle area, so if you are in the fair area you are doing good. Larson said, then, if we look at these numbers and we see that 30% in the top category, that is 30% of great or in the good condition, is that how we should read that, and then for the poor condition it would be no more than say 2% in that same column. Kouba responded that was correct.

Kouba commented that Federal Highway generally calls the next targets PM-3, which is reliability performance measures and targets. She explained that when we say reliability it means travel time reliability, so it isn't necessarily that it is not congested, it is that it is reliably congested, so your you can set your timing from Point A to Point B at 20 minutes, depending on the time of day, so it is reliable miles and we also look at it from an Interstate point of view and a Non-Interstate point of view.

Kouba stated that with truck time reliability they have their own index set up. She said that Federal Highway Administration has set up a collection point that can be accessed whether it is on a State, MPO, or a City level so that is one thing we have always looked at before. Strandell asked who is making these recommendations. Kouba responded that it is done mathematically done, they have their formulas, but it is set by Federal Highway as well as a portion of federal law. Strandell said that it isn't done by the State. Kouba responded that it isn't, adding that she doesn't believe the State even does their own calculations, they rely on the very same

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 18, 2023

information, but when they look at it they look at it on a State level, whereas when we look at it we would just look at it with our own MPO region. Strandell said, then, that these are not MPO determinations. Kouba responded that for the previous periods we had not gone with the State targets because they were Statewide ones, and we do have the same apples to apples information on an MPO level, so we went with MPO targets. She stated that at one point in time we did go with the States targets along the Interstate, but this time around in looking at what the States have adopted for each one of them, they all have put some high standards there, or their targets were, the baselines are high for North Dakota and their target is kind of in that 85% range so they are making sure they can meet their targets, and Minnesota is doing the same, but again the MPO area doesn't have interstate in Minnesota.

Kouba referred to a slide showing Interstate Reliability in the MPO area and commented that it shows the data that we get straight from the same source that the States do, and within our own MPO area that reliability is excellent.

Kouba referred to a slide showing Non-Interstate NHS Reliability, and stated that once we start looking at the Non-Interstate, both States are looking at pretty good numbers, and they are making sure they are staying within the range they set so that they meet their targets. She said that for our MPO area we are doing pretty good. She added that we have one area that isn't reliable, and that is that corner of US2 and Central Avenue in East Grand Forks, but overall it is still in very good to excellent condition and reliable.

Kouba referred to a slide showing Truck Travel Time Reliability Index and commented that, as she stated before, they have their own index in this program, and in North Dakota they have really good numbers but they want to make sure they are meeting their targets consistently. She said that Minnesota as well has been having a pretty good reliability across the State. She stated that for the MPO area, once again it is just the Interstates, and we are at that 1.24, which is basically what the States would see if they went into this program.

Kouba referred to a slide showing State Adopted and MPO Proposed Targets and commented that for this time around we are looking at; this is another one that has a four year time frame with a review period at the two-year timeframe. She stated that both States have adopted their targets, but both MPO staff as well as the Technical Advisory Committee have recommended going with our own targets.

Kouba referred to the Transit Asset Management slide and explained that she just wanted to give a brief review of this. She said that we did adopt the Transit Asset Management Plan last month, so she just wanted to go over what those are, what we are looking in those for percentages, and what we adopted was that zero percent of facilities in a condition that has met or exceeded their useful life benchmark; ten percent or less of its vehicles in a condition that has met or exceeded their useful life benchmark; and then ten percent or less of any equipment in a condition that has met or exceeded their useful life benchmark, so these are already adopted but since we are going over the full performance measures and targets she just wanted to let everybody kind of fully understand where these fall into everything else.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 18, 2023

Kouba referred to the Transit Safety Performance slide and commented that for Safety Targets, we did adopt the PTASP, which stands for Public Transit Agency Safety Performance, and is the safety performance targets and measures plan for public transportation. She explained that as part of the PTASP requirements, transit agencies must set safety performance targets in their safety plans based on the following performance measures that FTA has established in the National Safety Plan (NSP): 1) Total Fatalities; 2) Rate of Fatalities; 3) Total Injuries; 4) Rate of Injuries; 5) Total Safety Events; 6) Rate of Safety Events; and 7) System Reliability. She said that even though we adopted this, we did include some information in there, like expect 5% reduction in safety-related events and that each year it is assessed to determine the percentage of reduction in all measurements. She added that Cities Area Transit is going to be setting up TransTrack to track their safety items, but it hasn't been set up yet, so in lieu of that, in the past we have used North Dakota State targets, and they have not changed from the previous year, so it has been proposed by MPO staff and the Technical Advisory Committee concurs, that we should continue to use the North Dakota State targets until we can establish targets specific for Cities Area Transit in the future.

Kouba stated that that was her presentation, and as she said, the Technical Advisory Committee recommended the Executive Policy Board adopt the targets as presented. She added that we also have resolutions, and unless the Board decides to use different targets, staff would also recommend the Board approve the targets as presented and approve authorizing that the Chairman and Executive Director sign the corresponding resolutions.

Kouba referred to the resolutions and explained that there are technically three resolutions; one for the Bridge and Pavement, one for Travel Reliability, and one for Transit Safety Targets. She said that if you agree with the recommendation from MPO Staff and the Technical Advisory Committee to adopt the targets presented, you can just adopt the resolutions as presented as well.

Vetter asked if there is a downside if we don't meet our targets. Kouba responded that at this time there isn't for our MPO area, but what is nice about having MPO specific targets is that we can make cases for additional funding focuses for safety and other things to make sure we are meeting the targets that will be supporting the States as well, in the overall sense. Vetter said, looking at it from the City's perspective, and granted East Grand Forks doesn't have the Interstate on our side of the river but North Dakota Department of Transportation, for the Interstate is looking at 85% but we are recommending 90% , but the City can't put any money towards it anyway so why not just adopt the States 85%. Halford responded that we could. She added that there is a grant that we just recently applied for that we teamed up with Fargo, the Safety Smart Grant, and that would be looking at just the I-29 Corridor, and specifically the safety aspect of it. She said that we also went after a Safe Street For All Grant as well, so they will help with that scenario, looking for funding for stuff like that. Vetter stated that he guesses if there is no downside it doesn't matter whether we do 85% or 90% anyway. Standell commented that as an organization we don't vet any projects, we don't have any taxing authority or any powers that way.

Kouba said that in the overall sense, it is nice to have it being looked at on an individual level as opposed to just as part of the State, it could be seen as making it easier to have a higher focus on

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 18, 2023

our area to make sure we get the funding we need for various projects rather than it just being part of the State and having them make the decision on what areas need the most projects and funding.

Grasser commented that we kind of had this same discussion the last time targets came up and what we really don't know is if you don't meet the target will that provide an incentive for additional funding or will that end up being some sort of a penalty in which you have to make corrective action. He said that we just decided last time to do it this way, and until we test it and find out nobody will really know, so, just a little bit of background, he thinks that is kind of how we got to where we were before, and probably where we still are at today. Kouba said that in transit there are more punitive reasons, the transit agency need to meet those targets, but as she said, and in her presentation, there generally isn't a penalty for the MPO, but for a State level they have to, especially when it is for safety or other issues, there is some sort of penalty, so they have to specify 100% funding of certain pots of money to that so they meet the targets.

MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE PM2-BRIDGE AND PAVEMENT CONDITION, THE PM3-TRAVEL RELIABILITY, AND THE TRANSIT SAFETY TARGETS, AND TO AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIGN THE RESOLUTIONS, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

Halford commented that she just wanted to kind of circle back quickly, that was a lot on our Performance Targets, especially for our new members, feel free, when our packets go out, if you have any questions before hand we are more than happy to sit down with you and go over things and asking questions definitely during the meeting is welcomed, and we are low-key and very relaxed here.

MATTER OF SOLICITATION OF CARBON REDUCTION PROGRAM FUNDING

Halford reported that this is a new program, there is \$1.234 billion dollars of federal funding out there, and that will increase annually by 1.9%. She stated that right now we are just opening up for solicitations; this is only for the Minnesota side, she has heard that there may be something similar on the North Dakota side.

Halford said that in our MPO area we have an opportunity to apply for funding just like any kind of grant that opens up, and for FY2023 and FY2024 the Minnesota side can apply for a grant for a project that is \$20,000 to help with any kind of carbon reduction program. She stated that it is a very vague program that leaves a lot of wiggle room, so you could put it towards a bike sharing program, towards sidewalks, it has so much opportunity. She said that it isn't very much money and is based on population, and in the MPO area past grants were based more on who owns the road, but this is done by area, so we can have this project anywhere on the Minnesota side. She

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 18, 2023

added that as of now we just announced it, we announced it at the Technical Advisory Committee, so she has had a couple of conversations with City employees on the Minnesota side and she thinks they will be applying for the grant. She said that she also let them know that even though this is for FY2023 and FY2024, \$20,000 for each year with a 20% local match, they can also combine years if they want to; we've been presented with that idea so they can actually ask for \$30,000 or \$40,000, and she heard that they would be open to going up to \$50,000, but then you would either take this year off or next year off from asking for money, so they are kind of scratching their heads a little bit to figure out what they want to submit, so she hasn't heard anything yet, but they do need to put an application to the MPO by February 23, 2023, and then it will go to the Technical Advisory Committee and the Executive Policy Board in March for approval.

Halford stated that she didn't add any more guidelines or requirements than what the State is requiring for the application as she didn't feel there was any reason to add more hoops than is necessary, so again, this is just to let you know this is out there, and that the City of East Grand Forks is looking at it. She added that only certain groups can apply for it including the City, the County, not just anybody can apply for it. She said that even MnDOT can apply for it but they have stated that they don't intend to do so this year. She added that the ATP will also have a pot of money as well, but it will be for outside the MPO area, so it is done by area.

Lunski asked, so you said "they" apply, who is "they". Halford responded that it would probably be the City of East Grand Forks and then they would have to come up with the 20% match for whatever project they want to do. Vetter asked if it would be the actual project or just planning the project. Halford responded it could be either, depending on the project, if you want to pay for the funding for what it would cost to design a sidewalk, or you could apply for the construction part of it, or buy a bike for bikeshare, if you wanted to come in and say that East Grand Forks hasn't had the funds to put in for bikeshare in the past but now it will only cost 20% on top of the federal share. Larson said that the dollar amount is so small, some of your comments about bike lanes or bike share, maybe some sharrow striping, that seems like a good fit for \$20,000 to \$50,000. Halford agreed, stating that that is why she keeps using those examples, because even putting in a sidewalk in, do you think \$20,000 would buy you a lot of sidewalk, it actually doesn't, you could maybe put in a corner, so she isn't sure what they will come up with, but at least it is out there for consideration.

Halford reiterated that it is a quick turnaround for FY2023 and FY2024. She said that there is money for FY2025 but we are just looking at FY2023 and FY2024 right now. Larson commented that they have a project coming up for the recreation area along the river, maybe there are some additional bike lanes that could be funded with those funds. Vetter asked who would be looking for projects, would it be Nancy Ellis and the engineers. Halford responded that she has spoken with Reed and Nancy, so they are both aware of it.

Lunski said that the Downtown Development Association has a bikeshare program, is that something that you would want to team up with them, or is that not possible. Halford responded that the Downtown Development Association can't apply for it but they could go to the City and

say that this is your opportunity to be a sponsor and buy some bikes for them, and do it that way, but it would have to go through the City.

Powers asked if we apply some of this funding to a project, can we carry it over to the next year. Halford responded that if submitted a project asking for only \$10,000, and then your local share is \$2,000, for a total project cost of \$12,000; the remaining \$8,000 will carry over into 2024 and is added to that pot so you would have \$28,000 in 2024.

Information only.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FY2023-2026 T.I.P. AMENDMENTS

Halford referred to the staff report and stated that just as she did last month, she used the same layout as it seemed to work. She said that she will go over them briefly but can give more details if anyone would like.

Halford went over the changes, pointing out that the first one (an Urban Roads Project) is just updating a current project, the dollar amounts have changed slightly, and the pots of money are changing, so it is just updating that. She said that the next one is a new project, and a portion of the project is in the MPO area, however not the entire \$1.5 million will be in the MPO area but they don't break it out into the different areas, so this shows the whole project and we have to put it in our TIP because of the portion that is in the MPO area. She said that the next one is also a new project where, again, a portion of the project is in the MPO area so not all of the \$1 million dollars will be in the MPO area but because a portion of the project is in the MPO area it needs to be in our TIP. She said that the next one is also a new project, Grand Forks received Transportation Alternative funding for converting a gravel path into a concrete shared-use path along the east side of South 48th Street. She stated that the next three are updating current East Grand Forks projects by changing some of the wording that we saw in December, but we had to update some information, numbers and descriptions that MnDOT wanted to see.

Halford said that she went through that quickly, but she can definitely stop and give more details on any of the projects if anyone has any questions.

Strandell stated that this is a public hearing.

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY LARSON, TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

There was no one from the public present for comments or discussion.

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY LARSON, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOVED BY LUNSKI, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE FY2023-FY2024 TIP AMENDMENTS, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF RFP FOR AERIAL IMAGERY COLLECTION

Kouba reported that in the past this was something that the MPO collected every three years, but after some discussion with the Cities of Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, it has been determined that we should do this every two years instead. She stated that the last time we collected this imagery was in 2021, so we are now looking to collect it again.

Kouba said that if the recommended actions are little confusing that is because just before we presented this to the Technical Advisory Committee, and after discussing some technicalities with the State of North Dakota, we changed from a Request for Quotes to a Request for Proposals, just a slightly different process. She explained that the Request for Quotes is a sealed bid type of process, and who is chosen is based on qualifications, so it will take a little bit longer, previously we thought we would be able to get a contract together in February, but we now won't be able to get one together until March.

Kouba stated that the only other change is that the City of Grand Forks requested that we go with the 3-inch resolution instead of the 6-inch resolution, and she believes the budget we have will accommodate that change.

Kouba commented that this is in our work program, and both the Technical Advisory Committee and staff are recommending the MPO Executive Policy Board approve the release of the RFP, with those changes discussed.

Strandell asked if the actual flying would be done after the snow is gone correct. Kouba responded that that is correct, they will do it after the snow is gone and before the trees leaf out, and, finger crossed, the river is in its banks.

Lunski asked for a definition of what ortho-photography is. Kouba responded that it is basically the idea of having that aerial imagery done, it is called "ortho-imagery" or "ortho-photography", so it is the idea of being up in the sky. Lunski said, then, that it is done with a plane and not a drone. Kouba responded that is correct, but added that it can be done with a drone, but she believes right now we can get our best results, with a wider angle, using a plane as we do have a wider area to look at for our MPO area. She added that it isn't just the City Limits, it also extends into the counties as well.

Grasser commented that he thinks that at this time the size of drone you would need to do this it is cheaper to use a plane. Lunski asked what the difference is between this and Google or

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 18, 2023

satellite images. Kouba responded that you have to pay attention with Google because if you look in our area some of that is very very old. She stated that some of the southern part of Grand Forks that is inside City limits doesn't even show up, so there are other ways, but for our area it isn't done as often, and with the growth, especially in Grand Forks, it pays to do this. Grasser added that you get a higher level of resolution than you can on Google Earth, Google is more generic.

Grasser stated that they asked for a 3-inch digital on this because they can use it for a fairly high degree of things like preliminary engineering almost off of that degree of accuracy on the photos.

Vein asked how many firms typically submit to do this work for us, are there multiple or just a couple. Kouba responded that in the past we have received three or more each time we have put it out. Vein said that he is just trying to figure out the rationale for shifting from and RFQ to RFP format; under an RFQ you do a qualification based selection and then you open the bids versus looking at price proposal, is that correct. Kouba responded that it is but it is also trying to work within a realm of what the State sees as procurement, this would fall under a procurement process that the DOT just doesn't have a grasp on and the RFQ process is very defined and very well laid out and is something they understand quite well. She said that if we go with a procurement process there are some other rules that need to be followed that they are not as familiar with or can help us with. Vein said, then, that the recommended action is to go to an RFP process versus the RFQ process. Kouba responded that is correct. Grasser added that he thinks that what the State has done now is they have defined this as a professional service, so you go through the professional service qualification hiring as opposed to what we would otherwise do, he thinks otherwise we treated it more like a vendor, where you treat it as just submitting a price on a product, so again he thinks that is just a clarification that they are making at the State level.

Larson asked, this file, once it is all stitched together, do we make that available to other entities for their GIS Maps. Kouba responded that we absolutely do. She added that send it to both Cities, we've had requests from consultants, and from some GIS Warehousing entities out there on a state level as well.

Strandell stated that he is thinking that since Merrifield is in the bridge discussion, and Merrifield is not in the MPO area, would it make sense to expand to at least cover that area. Kouba responded that Merrifield is in the fly area. Halford commented that she is pretty sure the County recently did their area, on a county level, so they do this as well too. Strandell asked if she was referring to Grand Forks County or Polk County. Halford responded that she is trying to remember which side, but she got an e-mail saying that they recently did this. Strandell stated that it must have been Grand Forks County. Larson commented that Polk Counties images are pretty old, if you look at the Polk County GIS Map it is a really old aerial image.

Rustad asked how far south the aerial boundary goes. Kouba referred to a map showing the flight area and pointed out that the boundary goes just past the yellow line is how far south we will go. Vetter added that it goes out a mile and a half south of Merrifield Road. Strandell said that there should be some value in that.

Kouba commented that we changed it in the past when Grand Forks purchased property to the north of city limits to make sure that we went out beyond for that purpose. She said that they keep on top of distances and things like that, so we always review that process every time we put this out. Strandell asked what the actual southern boundary is for the MPO. Kouba responded that she believes it is, we go about a half mile to a quarter mile; half mile is on the south end and the quarter mile is on the west side and we make sure we stay within the dike area in Polk County.

MOVED BY LARSON, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO APPROVE THE RELEASE OF A REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) FOR THE AERIAL IMAGERY COLLECTION, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE GRAND FORKS-EAST GRAND FORKS TRAVEL DEMAND MODEL PROJECT EXTENSION REQUEST

Kouba reported that we were definitely hoping to have this model completed by the end of December 2022, but reduction in staff and staff time caused us to have to prioritize and reprioritize our duties and deadlines, which caused a delay with this project. She stated that ATAC has the information they need and they are working on it, but we still need to extend the contract. She explained that this extension will be a time extension only, no changes will be made to the cost of the project.

Kouba said that the proposed new end date is April, but we do believe that we will have a finished model before then. Halford commented that you will also see this next month, if this is approved, as an amendment to the work program.

MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE CONTRACT EXTENSION WITH ATAC FOR THE TRAFFIC DEMAND MODEL UPDATE, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

OTHER BUSINESS

Lunski said that she has a question. She asked, with Grand Forks voting last night, does that mean the study can move forward on the bridges. Halford responded that that study is not going through the MPO, we are just part of the conversation, so East Grand Forks is spearheading that study. Vetter added that his understanding is that they will be bringing to Polk County and Grand Forks County, to try to get them to buy into as well, and once they sign off on it then they will contract with the consultant, so it is now in the hands of the counties. Strandell said that it wasn't before them at the Polk County meeting yesterday. Vetter responded that he thinks that Mr. Murphy was just in contact with the County Administrator, so it would have been difficult to get on the agenda this quickly. Rustad added that it wasn't on the Grand Forks County Commission agenda either. Powers said, then, that this will be a county issue as well as the Cities. Vetter stated that everyone is supposed to pay a quarter, so it is a matter of the Counties saying that they agree and will pay their quarter of the cost. Powers asked if anyone had visited Rich Sanders, Polk County Engineer, on this. Strandell responded that they haven't. He added that Chuck Whiting, the County Administrator, has kept him updated on that, and he thinks it is probably favorable, but you never know. Powers asked when they would meet again. Strandell responded that they would meet again next Tuesday. Powers said that he hopes it is on the agenda then. Strandell said that he doesn't know if it is at this time. He added that in order for it to be on the agenda for Tuesday's meeting it has to be requested by this Friday, if it doesn't make that deadline it could be on the agenda for the first Tuesday in February, but he doesn't know if there is a rush to get this done or not. Vetter commented that they have been working on this for over a year already so he doesn't think there is any rush. He said that he would like to see it done soon, and he is sure that Ms. Lunski would also, but he found that the government works really slow, if you gave to us private sector people and you would have had it done five times over already. Strandell said that he knows that if it isn't on the agenda it won't get discussed, their administrator is really a stickler on that.

Discussion on making sure it gets on both County agendas ensued.

Halford stated that she would also like to talk about one other issue on the bridge discussion, another thing that came out of the Joint Council meeting was questions on the value and validity of the data that the MPO comes up with, if it is flawed or correct, and that was something that she brought up for discussion at the Technical Advisory Committee and wanted to bring it up to this board as well before moving forward, and that is to get direction, especially at the board level, of how you would like MPO staff to handle that question.

Halford commented that in the past maybe the MPO has given the perception that we are another hoop or obstacle, or something more that the Cities need to question when information has been presented, but the purpose of the MPO is to help the Cities, Counties, and the Partners answer these questions that they have and give you the information to help with these questions, not be another thing you have to question, so this is just kind of throwing it back at the board, is this something that you want us to address to each council as a mini-update, have our partners come forward and kind of be an education of how we get our data, a simple e-mail, this is just looking for direction on how to address this.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 18, 2023

Halford said that this was another thing that came up, the question that Dana Sande brought up, just the value and where this data comes from, and that it maybe should be relooked at, so she just wanted to bring it forward to the board and get some thoughts from you guys.

Vein stated that he would like to respond to this. He said that that really almost shows a concern for the validity of all the information we get; he has always stated that we go through a structured process and hire reputable firms that do engineering studies that really are valid, and that becomes the basis for how we do all of our planning, and he probably takes exception that this information isn't valid because he has sat through at least three of these Long Range Transportation Plans, and what has been interesting about them is that all of them have come up with the same basic data from different firms every time, and if we aren't using good data then we wouldn't have outcomes, and he believes we have great outcomes and that the information we get is very valid and sometimes people don't like the answers that they get but it is done independently by a third party that uses their professional integrity to give us information.

Vetter commented that as far as the bridge discussion goes he wouldn't address it there, this is just one council member's attempt to delay the project a little farther down the line; you may want to have your ducks in a order for the 2050 plan. Halford stated that we are working on our 2050 plan right now, what her fear is is that we get down to the approval process and this hangs it up, and she would also hate for something like this to continue to get built upon. She said that this seems like a statement that could keep being brought up and she would like to try to squash it or handle it instead of letting it fester out there in no-man's land, so it doesn't come up again when we are going through approval process and it hangs things up, that is what she is worried about. Vetter said that if you want to pull the one individual aside and give him a one-on-one lesson on how things are done, that is your prerogative, but he wouldn't spend a lot of time on it, he would have, as he said, when the 2050 plan is put before us to approve, make sure that we can tell everyone at that time, here is the process that we used, and it is standard business process.

Larson said that just to build upon that, as the 2050 is coming is coming out, a little like an educational seminar on how the data is collected; he doesn't know if it is actuary science or civil engineering, all of that hard data, best practices directed by Federal Highway or MUTCD, just showing that these are the frameworks that we work within that everyone in the whole country works within, here is the data and how it is collected. He stated that this is really just hard numbers, there is no political input into the data collection that these professional firms are putting together for us, and if the hard data is in conflict with their political position, that is rally out of your guys' hands, so he would hate for you to feel you are under attack from that perspective, because he certainly doesn't believe the majority feel that way. Halford commented that it is more, moving forward she wants the MPO to be kind of a tool in a tool box for you guys, some of these decisions, especially on the council level, you are faced with that, it is nice to have that information to help guide your decisions instead of something that now you have to question or it kind of puts another tweak in something. She said that she hopes that is our position, and she doesn't want it to look like it is just another thing you have to look at with a fine tooth comb and question it.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 18, 2023

Powers asked if Mr. Sande offered any alternatives as to where he got his information. Halford responded that he thought we were using Fargo data and we can't be compared to Fargo, is how it was presented. She said that he referenced a couple different pages from the 2045 Long Range Plan, and she will get those page numbers from him, but he was just calling out that the data is flawed because we are using Fargo data, but that's not the whole story, because looking at the big picture, you either use a comparative community or you look at it at a national level, so it just made more sense that we looked at it at more of a local level, where you can look at some trends, it isn't that we are using their numbers, but there is a little bit more information with that, so if that is something that you want the direct MPO staff to go more into depth, we can bring partners from ATAC to kind of address those comments, to explain where they got their data for modeling from, and how they came up with it, we can do that at the next update, and that is what she is looking for direction from this board as to how you would like MPO staff to move forward with this.

Rustad stated that he already got confirmation that it will be added to the Grand Forks County Commission agenda for the meeting two weeks from yesterday, so his recommendation would be that, at least a few members that this isn't their first meeting, probably show up to kind of explain the position; there are probably people going "I wonder why he is asking me that"; and considering he asked for that and this is his first hour and six minutes being part of this, he just got the packet last night, but he thinks it would behoove us, as an organization to have a little bit of representation there so he isn't sitting there going "well, here is the deal".

Vein commented that one thing we can do to help is he wouldn't mind having Stephanie and Tricia and himself sit down with any member of the City Council and review the legitimacy of what we are doing and try to address it as much as we can one-on-one with them, and listen to what they are saying, but he thinks that everything we have been doing has been defensible for years, some of it is more political than technical, and that has been stated in the past, and he hasn't talked to Tricia about this but he thinks the three of us can easily try to handle this more clearly.

Grasser stated that there were a number of points brought up in that discussion; one of the things he thought that he heard at the joint meeting, was a discussion about how current the data is that we are going to be using and as we move forward through this next RFQ. He said that, recognizing we are kind of at the end of a five year cycle, and are almost ready to do the next five year cycle, but if the consultant uses the 2045 plan we are using data from, he isn't quite sure when, he thinks if we could, and we are so close, if we could somehow incorporate the most current data that we are assembling for the 2050 plan, and use that as part of the bridge analysis he thinks that would help alleviate the question of, he will just call it aged data, because there were a number of things brought up, but he thinks that is the one thing he thinks we could make some positive movement on is to try to get the most current data input into this discussion and analysis, we are really close, right.

Kouba said that she believes that she can put some perspective on this; in our future bridge study we did update a lot of that information, a lot of our model information and things like that, just so we can get that more up to date information for that particular study, considering the

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 18, 2023

importance of it. She stated that what we base a lot of this information on, we brought forward that traffic demand model, that is exactly what we are talking about, is we've divided up this MPO area into several blocks, and we have to estimate population, we do that population off of 2020 population, and this time around we will do estimates, and then come 2025 we will use as much information and multiple sources as we can to update so that we know what kind of growth we are looking at, but we also do look at another plan, we look to the cities to make sure that they have the right information and the right idea of how they are growing and that is the Land Use Plan for each City, we take those numbers from there and use that as kind of the basis of how we grow out. She said that it can be a complicated process; over the years she has managed to formalize it and have white papers written up for reference for other people to use.

Halford commented that the project extension request we just approved for the Travel Demand Model, that will be the most up to date information that we will have in our possession. She said that they are looking at April as the latest for that information, so that will be available and will be used for the 2050 plan and they can definitely share that information when the bridge study comes through too. Grasser stated that he thinks that would be helpful; if he remembers hearing from the consultants, they are going to take the 2045 model, and start looking at it and are going to use that as a basis moving forward, and the question was, well that is kind of old, right, we've got some brand new stuff that is right on our doorstep, so he thinks if we can communicate that we are going to be able to essentially use this most current data, he thinks and assumes that that would make that question go away. Kouba added that she has a feeling that by the time there is some settlement on that whole process of getting the consultant and the information we will probably have that updated information anyway. Grasser agreed that that is what he is thinking that we are really close to having it. Halford said that it might line up just right.

Vetter said that if you listen to the consultant on this joint project, Al, and that is what he said, we are going to start with 2045 and visit with the Corp, Federal Highway down the line, yeah we may update stuff, but usually once they start looking at something they want to continue looking with that process, and again this is one person trying to delay the project, let's wait until 2050 is all approved and done before we even start this process and then we have the most current information, but he doesn't know that that is the right thing to do, he is agreeing with the consultant they are looking at hiring, let's start with 2045 and if one of the federal agencies wants it updated at some point down the line then we update it at that point in time but if the federal agencies are perfectly happy with 2045, let's use the 2045 plan. Halford added that the 2050 plan, as a whole itself won't be approved, but it sounded like timing wise we would have the data though, the plan won't be approved but they could have access to more recent data than what is in the 2045. Vetter said that he is just saying, we are hiring a consultant, the consultant has worked with Federal Highway Safety and the Corp numerous times, let's use his judgement.

A. 2021-2022 Annual Work Program Project Update

Halford reported that we listed all of the projects we are looking at for FY2023 and FY2024 so you know what is coming down the pipeline, so nothing is surprising, so we don't have any dates for those. She said that we don't have the TIP stuff up there but will add that in, as well as some other things that are going to be coming up, so it is on your radar of up-and-coming things.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 18, 2023

- Bicycle/Pedestrian Element Update – Halford reported that she did just get the final draft of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Element Update, so MPO staff is reviewing that this week, then it will go to the Selection Committee for their review, and then we are hoping it will go through the adoption process in March and April, and will come through the Technical Advisory Committee and the Executive Policy Board twice.
- Street/Highway Element Update – Halford reported that we discussed the goals and objectives at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting. She said that the Technical Advisory Committee itself is acting as the Advisory Committee for that project, so they had their eyes and ears on that and didn't really have too many comments on it.

ADJOURNMENT

STRANDELL ADJOURNED THE JANUARY 18TH, 2023, 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 December 10, 2022 through January 13, 2023

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
AFLAC.							
Liability Check	12/23/2022	AFLAC	501	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-395.98
Alerus Financial							
Liability Check	12/23/2022	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-2,152.52
Liability Check	01/06/2023	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,344.56
Bolton & Menk							
Bill	12/30/2022	Inv. #...	Work On Bike...	206 · Accounts Pay...		545 · Transpor...	-12,363.43
Bill Pmt -Check	12/30/2022	7344	Work On Bike...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-12,363.43
Bill	12/30/2022	Inv. #...	Work On Bike...	206 · Accounts Pay...		545 · Transpor...	-17,003.92
Bill Pmt -Check	12/30/2022	7346	Work On Bike...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-17,003.92
Bill	12/30/2022	Inv. #...	Work On Bike...	206 · Accounts Pay...		545 · Transpor...	-13,023.85
Bill Pmt -Check	12/30/2022	7347	Work On Bike...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-13,023.85
Business Essentials							
Bill	01/12/2023	Inv. #...	Office Supplie...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-43.68
Bill Pmt -Check	01/12/2023	7350	Office Supplie...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-43.68
Bill	01/12/2023	Inv. #...	Office Supplie...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-38.38
Bill Pmt -Check	01/12/2023	7353	Office Supplie...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-38.38
Cardmember Service							
Bill	12/15/2022	Acct. ...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-162.13
Bill Pmt -Check	12/15/2022	7338	Charges For ...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-162.13
Bill	12/15/2022	Acct #...	Charges for 1...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-482.07
Bill Pmt -Check	12/15/2022	7339	Charges for 1...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-482.07
City of East Grand Forks							
Bill	01/04/2023	Inv. #...	1st Quarter 2...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-2,684.30
Bill Pmt -Check	01/04/2023	7349	1st Quarter 2...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-2,684.30
Constant Contact							
Check	01/03/2023	E-Bill	Monthly Char...	104 · Checking		517 · Overhead	-20.00
East Grand Forks Water and Light							
General Journal	12/31/2022	887	4th Quarter 2...	517 · Overhead		206 · Accounts...	667.13
Bill	01/12/2023	Inv. #...	2022 4th Qua...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-667.13
Bill Pmt -Check	01/12/2023	7351	2022 4th Qua...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-667.13
Fidelity Security Life.							
Liability Check	12/23/2022	AVESIS	50790-1043	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-30.42
Grant and Contract Accounting							
General Journal	12/31/2022	885	Work Done B...	545 · Transportation...		206 · Accounts...	2,496.45
General Journal	12/31/2022	886	Work Done B...	550 · Corridor Plann...		206 · Accounts...	6,603.30
Bill	01/12/2023	Inv. #...	Work On Traf...	206 · Accounts Pay...		550 · Corridor ...	-6,603.30
Bill Pmt -Check	01/12/2023	7354	Work On Traf...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-6,603.30
Bill	01/12/2023	Inv. #...	Work On Traf...	206 · Accounts Pay...		545 · Transpor...	-2,496.45
Bill Pmt -Check	01/12/2023	7355	Work On Traf...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-2,496.45
HDR Engineering, Inc.							
Bill	12/28/2022	Inv. #...	Work On 205...	206 · Accounts Pay...		545 · Transpor...	-21,335.50
Bill Pmt -Check	12/28/2022	7340	Work On 205...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-21,335.50
Bill	12/28/2022	Inv. #...	Work On 205...	206 · Accounts Pay...		545 · Transpor...	-15,222.66
Bill Pmt -Check	12/28/2022	7342	Work On 205...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-15,222.66
Kimley-Horn And Associates, Inc.							
Bill	12/30/2022	Inv. #...	Retainage Du...	206 · Accounts Pay...		220 · Retainag...	-22,488.80
Bill Pmt -Check	12/30/2022	7345	Retainage Du...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-22,488.80
Liberty Business Systems, Inc.							
Bill	01/04/2023	Inv. #...	Contract Bas...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-206.00
Bill Pmt -Check	01/04/2023	7348	Contract Bas...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-206.00
Bill	01/12/2023	Inv. #...	Contract Bas...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-206.00
Bill Pmt -Check	01/12/2023	7352	Contract Bas...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-206.00
LSNB as Trustee for PEHP							
Liability Check	12/23/2022	PEHP		104 · Checking	X	216 · Post-Hea...	-123.75
Madison Nat'l Life							
Liability Check	12/23/2022	7341		104 · Checking		215 · Disability...	-64.74
Mike's							
Bill	12/15/2022		MPO Lunche...	206 · Accounts Pay...		711 · Miscellan...	-85.10
Bill Pmt -Check	12/15/2022	7337	MPO Lunche...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-85.10
Minnesota Department of Revenue							
Liability Check	12/23/2022	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-451.00
Liability Check	01/06/2023	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-500.00
Minnesota Life Insurance Company							
Liability Check	12/23/2022	7343		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-44.46
Nationwide Retirement Solutions							
Liability Check	12/23/2022	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-510.56
Liability Check	01/06/2023	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-538.36

**Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO
Transaction List by Vendor
December 10, 2022 through January 13, 2023**

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
NDPERS							
Liability Check	12/23/2022	NDPE...	D88	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-2,941.76
Liability Check	01/06/2023	NDPE...		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-4,319.78
QuickBooks Payroll Service							
Liability Check	12/22/2022		Created by P...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-5,964.36
Liability Check	01/05/2023		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-6,541.54
Stephanie Halford							
Bill	12/12/2022		Travel Reimb...	206 · Accounts Pay...		530 · Educatio...	-37.50
Bill Pmt -Check	12/12/2022	7336	Travel Reimb...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-37.50