

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, April 19, 2023 - 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks Training Conference Room/Zoom Meeting**

CALL TO ORDER

Warren Strandell, Chairperson, called the April 19th, 2023, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:02 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

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

Absent: Ken Vein.

Guest(s) present: Micah Dickman, Urban SDK.

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 MARCH 15TH, 2023 MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

Halford reported that there was a correction brought forward to us (The North Dakota Solicitation of Urban Roads and Urban Regional System Projects for FY2027 motion listed Lunski as seconding, it should have been Larson), and it has been corrected on-line but the copy you have in your packets is wrong.

MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY RUSTAD, TO APPROVE THE MARCH 15TH, 2023, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS CORRECTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF MARCH 11TH, 2023 TO APRIL 14TH, 2023 BILLS/CHECKS

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY LUNSKI, TO APPROVE THE MARCH 11TH, 2023 TO APRIL 14TH, 2023 BILLS/CHECKS, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ACTION ITEMS:

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF 2023-2024 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM
AMENDMENT #1**

Halford gave a quick background update on our current work program. She stated that we approved the 2023-2024 Unified Planning Work Program back in December of 2022, and we already knew that most likely we would have amendments, especially because we applied for the Safe Streets For All Grant, and we hadn't heard whether or not we had been awarded the grant when we went through the adoption process; and we have since heard that we were awarded the grant, the first part of this amendment is updating the language in the work program to reflect that we have gotten that grant. She pointed out that it was actually included in the work program, but the funding was left blank, so the proper verbiage will be updated as well as dollar amounts in the tables as well.

Halford stated that the second amendment is for the Bike and Pedestrian Plan. She reiterated that at last month's meeting you approved an extension to the deadline in order for us to hold some public meetings to make sure we got public input and more feedback before we start going through the adoption process of the document and we need to reflect this in the work program, there are no changes to the dollar amounts or budget, just the timeline extension.

Halford said that the third amendment is to include Urban SDK in the work program. She reiterated that last month we brought forward Urban SDK, and we feel it will be a big benefit to the MPO and our partners, so on the next agenda item we will be talking about the contract for Urban SDK and in order to be able to approve executing a contract with them it needs to be included in the work program first.

***MOVED BY LARSON, SECONDED BY LUNSKI, TO APPROVE AMENDMENT #1 TO
THE 2023-2024 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM, AS PRESENTED.***

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Vein.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF URBAN SDK CONTRACT

Kouba reported that as Stephanie mentioned, this is the contract for Urban SDK. She said that Micah Dickman, Urban SDK, did a really good job of explaining a lot of the information last month, and as Stephanie said, this will help with staff time as well as hopefully getting better contracts and things like that as this information will be accessible not only to us and our partners, but also to any contractors/consultants as well.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 19, 2023

Kouba referred to the contract and commented that the total cost will be \$24,500.00 for the first year, and if we decide to continue it will also be the cost of the second year and then will increase slightly for subsequent years until such time, we decide to terminate the service.

MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY LARSON, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD CHAIRMAN AND THE MPO EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH URBAN SDK FOR \$24,500.00.

Larson asked, after we have this in place for one year, and we pay the \$24,500.00, what do we expect the annual expenditure will be to keep the data. Dickman responded that he heard the first part of the question but not the second. Larson said that he was asking, after the first year, and the dashboard is set up and the initial data is in place, what is the typical on-going annual expense to make sure the data is current. Dickman responded that it is a one-time annual fee, so next year the renewal amount will be the same \$24,500.00, you are locked in for two years at that same rate, and if you decide not to go forward with them you get to keep the dashboard and data that you have already procured, so that would not go away it would just not be updated with fresh Urban SDK data. Larson said, then, for ongoing budgeting we should have a line for \$24,500.00 essentially every year. Dickman responded that this is correct. Halford added that it was agreed upon that next year the cost would be \$24,500.00 and then if we continue on with them the third year the cost would increase to \$32,000.00.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Vein.

NON-ACTION ITEMS:

MATTER OF DISCUSSION ON URBANIZED AREA

Kouba reported that this is just being brought forward as a discussion item, they brought it to the Technical Advisory Committee to get the discussion started on our urbanized area. She commented that this is something that this is something that we look at every ten years because the Census Bureau re-establishes what is considered urban for each of the areas, it not just based off of population, it was also based off of housing density as well, and now they have added in this aspect of where people are traveling within that urban area.

Kouba referred to the packet and pointed out that there are several maps of the urbanized area that she would like to go over briefly.

Kouba referred to Map A, 2010 Census Urban Area With 2012 Adjusted Urban Area, and said that as you can see it shows the old area that we are working in right now, they just looked at the area inside the city limits and that will change with the new one that they released.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 19, 2023

Kouba referred to Map B, Census Urban Area Comparison 2010 vs 2020, and stated that the area shown in green is the new census urbanized area that they released. She said that in this particular map she also included the 2010 census area so you can tell the differences between all those changes just in the urbanized area that the census put out.

Kouba referred to Map C, 2020 Census Urban Area With 2012 Adjusted Urban Area, and said that she did do some adjustments to that area and they are based off of that they want to make sure that any area that the census has listed as urban needs to be within our urban area but Federal Highway also allows us to adjust for any way that we want to connect up to it so we want to make sure we are making intelligent educated decisions on how far out we are going to grow in the next ten years as well as what areas are really going to be impacted by the urban area.

Kouba stated that as she mentioned to the Technical Advisory Committee the airport area is very new to our area so we will need to bring that into our urbanized area and as she said the yellow striped area is our current adjusted area, which we now have to bring forward to include the green area, it is just a matter of how much more outside of that area do we want to bring it, that makes sense for our urban area. She pointed out that we do have some of the area between that is now considered within city limits, and that is something that we asked the Technical Advisory Committee to consider. She added that because the road at the west edge of the airport is now coming out further, that road has always traditionally been our boundary for our MPO area, we would have to adjust our MPO boundary area as well to meet that and that would be the only thing staff would really suggest doing, just to make sure we are keeping within what would be urban as well because that would also be considered the airport as well going into the future, other than that we still have to have polygons, and the other considerations that we need to make sure are that if a road is going to be in an urban area the whole road is in the urban area, not going down the middle of the road, those are just the little things the census wants us to consider, as well as Federal Highway.

Kouba referred to Map D, 2020 Census Urban Area With 2012 Adjusted Urban Area and City Limits and stated that some of the discussion that we had, she just quickly drew in some of the areas that were being talked about including, shown with the purple line. She said that she did not create a new map for this yet, but these are the areas that the Technical Advisory Committee and staff are suggesting be included, and she wanted to make sure we got the MPO Boards input on it before she creates a new map to take back to the Technical Advisory Committee.

Strandell asked if this includes the annexed area to the north of Grand Forks. Kouba responded that it does. Powers asked if that annexation was a done deal. Kouba responded that it is officially inside city limits. She added that that was one of the considerations, in previous years they considered city limits as well into the urban area that is closest to that census urban area, but there is a lot of space outside of the immediate census urban area that is also city owned, but not necessarily needing to be in the immediate urban area, so that is the other thing the Technical Advisory Committee was also going back and forth on, but as she said we don't want to take a whole lot but we want to make sure that we being considerate of what would be considered in the urban area into the future, especially when looking at growth.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 19, 2023

Kouba referred to the purple line on the East Grand Forks side and said that one thing for East Grand Forks is bringing this down a bit more in the south end to include some of the newly, soon to be developed, possibly in the near future area, there is still negotiating going on with the rural water districts.

Kouba referred to the southernmost area in Grand Forks, and asked if we need to have that little area next to the river included. She responded that we don't really need to include it, but it makes a nice line though. She stated, however, that we definitely want to make sure that we are getting the areas that are already platted, as well as areas around 47th that once the interchange is built, will probably start developing further south.

Kouba commented that the plan is, and she tried to put this in the staff report for the Technical Advisory Committee; what she will do once she receives any comments or suggestions from the board will be to do a couple of different maps to show the suggestions, send it out to them, have them send her comments, and then she will incorporate all the suggestions and comments and then bring it forward to the Technical Advisory Committee again for kind of a draft final approval. She explained that the NDDOT wants a preliminary document in June, so there is kind of a quick turnaround. She said that technically we have a year once the census has put this information out to make our adjustments, and that would mean we have a December 29th, 2023, deadline.

Kouba added that the biggest thing is the connection to everything else, like the functional classification system, as well as funding; all those little silos of what is considered urban, what is considered rural, they don't necessarily change responsibility for those roads, but the pots of money change, where they get funding for maintenance or rehabilitation or reconstruction of roads.

Lunski asked is it ten years before another change can be made. Kouba responded that changes can be made at any time, but the process becomes a bit more onerous, and a lot of times they won't get out there so it will be technically changed but it won't necessarily be easily seen that there is a change by all parties, so this is generally the time to do it. Lunski asked, as they are growing to the south, is there is a pro or con to not including more of that area; wouldn't you want to go to the flood protection. Grasser responded that he could speak to that a bit, at least on the Grand Forks side. He said that their thoughts have been to try to keep the urbanized limits as minimal as they can, and they trying to capture the annexed areas and the soon to be developed potential areas, which are a little harder to slice and dice, but the concern about including them in the urbanized area is that once they are in, like the DOT then will say that that is now the City's responsibility to come up with the local cost share even though it may be in the county or someplace, if it is in the urbanized area it is now our ticket. He stated that the other thing he is concerned with is that we don't know if some of these other federal programs that are going on, again how will they react to it if it is in the urbanized area, will they say that it is now a city responsibility when in fact the benefit may be outside city limits. He said that that is generally why they want to minimize exposure to those types of things. He added that the benefit is theoretically if you are in that area, you can apply federal dollars, but we have lots and lots of places where we can spend federal money without getting into a lot of these other areas, so their

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 19, 2023

opinion in balancing this is to try keep it as minimal as we can, but reasonable, whatever that turns out to be.

Grasser said that he is wondering about the discussion, you mentioned something that piqued his interest, going to the middle of the road. He stated that there are rural areas out here whereby State Statute, there is no road, it is technically just an easement, so the only property you have to go to would be to the section line, which would be the middle of the road so we will have to be aware of that; and there are areas that are platted and you've got one thing and you've got the area defined, but if you drop back to the general State Statutes, you have kind of a different situation. Kouba agreed, adding that that is one of the benefits of going to kind of a section line, which is the case to the north, but you won't know for another ten years really if that is the best place to put it, and by then you will have another round of urbanized area adjustments to look at and to be able to readjust to make sure that roads are included. She said that when you are talking about functional class roads, you are looking at certain types of roads, the State especially wants to make sure that those roads are not owned by townships, especially when we are looking at the higher classification of roads like Washington or Columbia or DeMers, Gateway and 32nd, we want to make sure that an authority with the history of being able to meet the demands of those functionally classified roads can meet those demands. Grasser commented that that is an interesting philosophy when the State is giving as much money to townships as they are to cities. Kouba said that that is one of the reasons why we had to, she personally thought that a section of road was included in our urban area and the State said that it wasn't, that we didn't reclassify it, but we did so we had to rush to get some of that northern portions of Columbia and Washington into the functional classified because according to the state it hadn't been functionally classified yet, so hopefully we will have a better process to make sure we get those changes made later on once we establish our urbanized area.

Kouba stated that she will bring this forward and make a better map to give you a better look at all of this, hopefully next month since we have a shorter deadline for a draft, so we can at least put together a draft for everybody.

Larson referred to the map and asked if, on the southern end of East Grand Forks, the purple line, is that their flood protection or is that somewhere between the existing residential boundary and the flood protection. Kouba pointed out where the flood protection is located in East Grand Forks. Larson asked what the purple line is then. Kouba responded that she drew it on just to show what was suggested being included and/or excluded by the Technical Advisory Committee. She said that she isn't quite sure that it is the best place for it, but she knows that we do have the area in white included in the urban area that isn't really in city limits, but there has been a lot of discussion and land purchases by developers in that area so it seemed reasonable to consider putting it into the urban area, but whether we want to keep it in or if it is something that you feel is a little aggressive is something to consider. Larson commented that he appreciates the conversation, he had the same question as Ms. Lunski did, and Mr. Grasser's explanation meant a lot. He added that he is pretty confident that the City of East Grand Forks doesn't want to take on additional road maintenance from the township or county, they don't want to take on that financial responsibility, but they want to be ready for southern growth too, so we need to strike a

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 19, 2023

balance there. Kouba said that it all depends on, once we put that functional classification on it that is when that ownership of that road will come into play, so it isn't going to let you get into the county or township roads unless you have gone through the whole process of bringing them into your city limits, so while she understands the concern, from previous experience, you do have to make that balance, but she doesn't believe it is as high of a concern as you may think.

Larson said, just to kind of role play, if I was a farmer who had some of the ag land, and had my rural homestead out in that area, and then I got caught up inside this purple boundary, what would the impact be on me. Kouba responded that there would be very little impact on you. Larson asked if the taxes, things of that nature would stay the same. Kouba responded that it would. She explained that once we look at this area, it is about road classification as well as funding categories, urban categories have their own silo of federal funding that we can access; urban areas have their own funding sources as well, so that where it is basically getting to, the funding and what roads can access which funding source, and that is where you get into functional classification. She added that it will still remain a local road, if it is still a local road, and considering that isn't functionally classified they don't really have access to any other funding than they normally would have on a day-to-day basis right now. Larson said, then, it is a balance we need to strike, if the urban area of East Grand Forks got bigger, can we qualify for more federal dollars and then would that offset the cost of that additional space. Kouba responded not necessarily, when you are looking at the funding, especially the formulas that are set, they are getting set right now because the census has put out their urban area boundaries, those populations have been considered and any amendments or anything like that, or challenges that cities or counties or government bodies can put in to increase, although she doesn't think they would want to increase it anyway, for access to additional federal funding, it is all based on, those formulas are all based on population so you wouldn't be able to get access to additional funding because your population wouldn't change, that is the other reason it doesn't make sense if you aren't going to get that big, in the next ten years, it doesn't make sense to go out that far. Larson said that that is helpful because they have their flood boundary on the south, you could say take it there, but what are the pros and cons of that, and that is more the 2050 plan. Kouba said exactly, adding that in the 2050 Land Use Plan for East Grand Forks, they don't even come close to the flood boundary.

Grasser commented that, for full disclosure, when he is describing what is going on on the North Dakota side he has no idea what Minnesota does in those same situations. Kouba said that Minnesota has a lot stricter boundary issue as well, and especially considering for Minnesota, in order for you to change your city limits you have to work with rural water and other entities before you can even officially change your city boundaries, and that is just on the Minnesota side.

Kouba stated that this was just to give you the opportunity to give input on this, just as the Technical Advisory Committee did, and she will work on this and will hopefully be able to bring some options back next month.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no one present for discussion.

OTHER BUSINESS

A) 2022/2023 Annual Work Program Project Update:

- 1) Bicycle/Pedestrian Element - Halford stated that, as we discussed in the first agenda item, the Bike/Ped Plan, we are still taking it to the finish line, it is very close, and we are kind of hovering the line between a June preliminary approval and a July final approval or a May preliminary approval and June final approval timeline. She said that right now it is in the committee's hands for the final review of the latest draft, trying to get their last input before we start taking it through the approval process so it will be kind of a quick turn-around so if that gets stalled in any way it will be June/July but we are hoping for May/June and then with all the contracts finalized and all that the latest would be August and that is what we have in the contract.
- 2) Street/Highway Element Update – Halford reported that there have been a few discussions happening here and there, a couple committee meetings, and we are still waiting on the modeling. She said that we are hoping to hear more, they said April, we are half-way through the month, so we are hoping to hear something any day now. She added that once we get that information, they will move full speed ahead, but it is kind of slowing down, they are still working on things, but they are really waiting for that modeling.
- 3) Aerial Imagery – Halford reported that they have been given the green light go so we are just waiting for mother nature to cooperate with us.
- 4) Safe Streets For All (SS4A) – Halford reported that we have been awarded the Safe Street For All grant, but it has been kind of hurry-up and go, and now it is more slow moving. She said that it has been made clear that we don't want to move forward until we have the contract signed because we won't be able to access any funding until then, and that hasn't happened yet, it has just been webinars and other information on it, so we might see more on this next month.
- 5) Smart Grant – Halford stated that we teamed up with Fargo/Moorhead and Upper Great Plains Institute on a joint application for a Smart Grant for the I-29 Corridor and were informed that we were not awarded the grant.

DISCUSSION:

Lunski asked if this was the time to ask about the bike plan. Halford responded it was.

Lunski said that obviously you know that she has been receiving a lot of emails about the bike plan. She stated that the plan is pretty straight forward, but it doesn't really meld to 13th Avenue South because it starts out wide, then it narrows, there are some curves in it, so she is getting a lot of questions about how it will fit into those narrow portions, and she is also hearing a lot of

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 19, 2023

concern about the number of bicycles expected, and she doesn't know if that is something you will have in the study. Halford responded that she has put forward those questions for those emails to the consultant, and copied David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering, so he is aware of those conversations and concerns, so we will be looking at those comments and discuss what kind of adjustments we should make in the plan, but at the very least those comments will be in the appendix of the plan showing that we received them. She added that she did reach out to a few of those individuals, because they also went to the Bike/Ped Advisory Committee meeting and raised some concerns there as well, so she did a follow-up email to them to let them know this and they appreciated the follow-up and just wanted to voice their concerns. Lunski asked if there is flexibility in the plan to possibly not build the bike-path and put a bike lane or sharrow on the roadway instead. Halford responded that there are some adjustments that can be done, but again with any of these plans that come out, they are just plans, they are ideas and concepts for city leadership to look at, they are almost like a tool in a tool box, it isn't final at all when these plans come out, it isn't saying "this is what you shall do" like a bible, it is really just kind of "this is what we heard, this is what was studied, this was the outcome" and you should take it how you want when making your decisions, so it is just information. She explained that they held public input meetings to gather data and get input from the public and put it into this document to help you make your decisions.

Grasser commented that the hard balance on those things a lot of times gets to be how much right-of-way do you have to work with, and how wide is the road, as mentioned because you can put in a bike path on a road, then you have to meet certain dimensional criteria in order to qualify under that title, even for a sharrow you need to have certain amounts of space in the road in order for it to work, or you can build a path alongside the road, which we have done, but again you still need a certain amount of space. He stated that especially in those older parts of town where you don't have enough right-of-way to work with and you have a combination of mature trees that are valuable, a lot of times what they have done is to just label it a bike route, which involves some signage, which again is different, but like 13th you can go from a narrow place where you don't have much choice and call it a bike route, but you might get it to the west where there is more width and you can put in a sharrow or something like that. He said that it is a difficult balance and it kind of ends up being a bit of a street-by-street issue, and he doesn't know if that is helpful or not, but it is a challenge again that you are working with a street with trees in the right-of-way. Lunski added that she thinks some people put their fence to the sidewalk, they don't know where their property line is, so those would have to be moved, and she thinks it is a pool street, so how you would bike to the pool would be great too.

Kouba said that there are definitely pluses and minuses, and the Bike/Ped plan can help by having a focused look at those corridors and being able to have a lot more focused interaction with the people who live along the corridor, and those who are impacted by anything that happens along that corridor, but at the end of the day there is a certain point that the MPO can go and then it goes to engineering and engineering designs those things, and the plan doesn't always want to dictate what engineering is able to do within that area, we like to have them give their input, and just looking at it like this, quick level, they have an idea but once they actually start designing and getting into all the other aspects of what they need to do to eventually build

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 19, 2023

that things change from plan to design. Lunski asked if the study would address any of the issues, she only drove 13th and looked at that specifically, but will the study address it because it feels like the study, now, isn't really for 13th, it just doesn't apply to that street. Kouba responded that there are things that they can do but it is not for specific sections of 13th that could be things that we can't necessarily do on other sections that are being shown in those concepts, so she can understand that feeling of, well that won't work for what I see out here. Grasser commented that you are kind of getting into that next step, that maybe goes beyond planning and more of a preliminary engineering type step. He added that 13th would be, maybe similar to 20th where they brought in that last amendment to add the bikepath on the 20th Street reconstruction because they will be reconstructing the street, that could be one very good trigger point to say, okay, now that we are doing this maybe we should put in a bikepath, the problem is they don't have enough money so he doesn't know when we would get to specifically 13th, but again we can trigger that, if we wanted to fund the bikepath would be another trigger if we just said that we wanted to do that, we could take a look at it when we build, see what the impacts and cost would be.

Lunski stated that she isn't trying to be negative, but did we pay for a study that isn't applicable, because it just doesn't fit for that. Kouba responded that what generally happens with a lot of these region wide plans like we do with this bike and ped plan that we are looking at right now is further studies can come up from them, that is what happened with the Transit Development Plan that we have in our work program that we are going to look at micro transit for our region because the plan can't get into those details of that specific item but we can take it and get more information in a specific plan. She said that in working with Engineering we can do something along the lines of helping them with the pre-work of getting input and everything else so when they are working on more of their preliminary engineering for any section, we can go forward; do we possibly need some better wording in our document that says that triggers need to be happening, that might be something we need to discuss as well, if this is becoming a bigger issue that people aren't understanding.

B) MPO Updates:

- 1) Bridge Update – Halford reported that there was a kick-off meeting a week and a half ago where they just kind of did a high-level briefing, they didn't spend a lot of time on introductions, they briefly went over the project scope and different tasks that they are looking at doing. She referred to a copy of a presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and said that it is basically what they used. She stated that she did update them on our modeling timeline because they are very interested in that as well in order to have the most up-to-date information, and she let them know that we did get the Safe Streets For All grant and a few other plans that they weren't aware of because they are using that time right now to review what we have already on both sides of the river of plans and studies and doing a deep dive on the information they have already so they know how to move forward from there and what they are missing.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 19, 2023

Halford stated that there was also an update to the Grand Forks City Council a couple of days ago, they wanted to get an update on what the Kick-Off meeting was about, there were a few things brought up during that conversation, they didn't really have any questions about the scope of work per se, but they had concerns and questions on what happened at the Polk County meeting and why they didn't come up with 25% and are only doing 20%, even though the City of East Grand Forks is going to pick up the 5% difference, a point was made asking if this is kind of setting the stage of how, if we did build a bridge in the future for the community, if it is an inner-city one or one at Merrifield, this would be kind of setting the stage of how that funding would be and how the partnership would be, so they had concerns on that. She said that they also brought up concerns that 32nd was called out and how that is setting the stage for the conversation.

Halford said that those were kind of the bigger things that were brought up in that conversation, they also brought up maybe needing to re-vote on it and this is something she wanted to update you on, about this being brought back to this Monday's City Council meeting to look at revoting on it because part of the original motion was that each partner would provide 25%, so with Polk County not doing that is this something that should be voted on again. She stated that she hasn't heard if that is still being considered at Monday's meeting, but that was the general conversation at the last meeting.

Lunski commented that she thinks the big thing, too, was that Grand Forks didn't want 32nd and Elks on the documents, they want SRF to determine the best location, so they don't want to give them any suggestions, they will just come up with the best location on their own, so taking out all references until they tell us is how she took it, and she hasn't heard if the revote will be on the agenda or not.

Strandell stated that the reason why Polk County went with a 20% cost share instead of the 25% was because their County Engineer, Rich Sanders, recommended the \$20,000 share rather than the 25%, and the basis for that was that we had done a study some years ago in which a lot of this information is already there, and it is all going to be turned over to the consultant, so we already paid for it and we don't want to pay for it twice is what it amounted to. Halford said that there was reference to the minutes, so since nobody in the room had been at that meeting or knew how that conversation went, that was the question that was brought up, why did it arrive at what it is and nobody could answer that. Strandell commented that he thinks Grand Forks probably paid for part of that study in the past too. Kouba asked if he was referencing the Merrifield Road Feasibility Study. Strandell responded he was. Kouba stated that that study was done before her time, and a lot of that is, you're going to have to repay for a lot of that anyway, when you start getting into the environmental process, they aren't even going to consider any of that information, they will want to start the process completely over again unfortunately. Strandell said that as a board they were told that that wasn't the case, that a lot of information was

good and would be passed on. Grasser commented that the problem with those studies is that they are dated, and there may be good information there, but, by way of example, in his career with the City of Grand Forks, he is on at least his third environmental review of the 42nd Grade Separation Crossing, the first was a \$100,000, the second was \$250,000, the next was \$500,000, but they have a shelf life and it just is what it is, if you are moving towards that funding, and he isn't trying to disparage the engineer at all, but these things definitely have shelf lives and you just have to deal with it, it just is what it is. Strandell said that their engineer is part of the Technical Advisory Committee, and he is sure that he is up to date on all of this, and he is also a Crookston resident which kind of makes him an opponent.

Kouba said that she can kind of answer; with pulling out certain locations, both these areas will really have a totally different purpose, and she personally thinks they are just trying to point out that these two areas are definitely going to have a totally different purpose so they will be two different projects, and that scope will start showing that a lot more. Lunski stated that she thinks if we could just not reference it until SRF does that would be best. Halford responded that that is what they want, just to say the inner-city bridge, the by-pass bridge, so there is talk of two bridges, but the locations wouldn't be noted.

Larson stated that he understands the background on why we would want to do that, it is probably in everyone's best interest to use those terms, inner-city and by-pass. He asked what the process would be to address this, are we going to ask SRF to amend their proposal and resubmit meeting minutes; how do we get past this and not let this become a problem. Halford responded that before this meeting she actually printed off the contract, and that is something that will have to be brought up at the next meeting, and we should probably talk to Mr. Murphy about it as it is actually called out in the contract, it is on the first page where it says "Elks Drive/32nd Avenue, so she isn't sure, that will be something that Mr. Murphy will have to figure out how to address it and move forward; if it is an amendment or just going forward and it is going to be referenced different, she doesn't know how formal it needs to be so it is something that will need to be brought up since the City of East Grand Forks is the lead on this, how they want to move forward and what the consultant recommends. Larson stated that they can help with this as well since Mr. Murphy is leaving this week and they will be working with an interim City Administrator. Powers asked if there is a sense of urgency here with updating the contract. Halford responded that it is a quick timeline, they are talking about the end of this year finishing up the plan, so there is a bit of an urgency. Larson added that he thinks redrafting or amending the contract so that that language is proper, it is an unfortunate oversight that probably carried over from their proposal, and we all know it is a political issue and that is fine, but we should get the language right from the jump and move forward with that format, and we can make sure that SRF knows that as well, they just kind of stepped on a landmine that we didn't really need to step on essentially, so let's fix it and let's move on. He said that he is happy to help, as Mr. Murphy is leaving, working with

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 19, 2023

Megan Nelson to maybe amend that contract. Halford stated that her understanding is that Ms. Nelson was going to take over for Mr. Murphy on that, but she isn't sure what other staff she was going to bring on with her to help her with that conversation. Larson said that it might seem like semantics to people outside of the bubble, but he thinks it is really important that we don't get off on the wrong foot. Halford agreed, adding that she thinks that that was kind of the basis of the conversation on Monday was wanting to start off on the right foot.

- 2) May Executive Policy Board Agenda Items – Halford said that she usually doesn't spend much time on this item but it looks like there might be some healthy discussion on some things so she wanted to give you a heads up so you can start thinking about it because there will be lots of discussion happening at the next meeting.

Halford commented that the other two MPOs on the North Dakota side, Bismarck and Fargo, as well as our DOT partners are looking at changing a few things, one of them being going from our usual two-year contract to a one-year contract for funding. She said that the DOT also wants us to look at the funding formula. She explained that there is one pot of money that goes out to the MPOs and they want us to relook at our current formulas and have the three MPOs come together and hopefully agree on something, so they wanted us to go back to our boards and get input and come up with a few ideas of what that funding formula would be and how the money is distributed among the three. She said that she asked the question what if all three MPOs don't come back with the same idea, these are all just recommendations that the DOT will take into consideration of what we would like to do, if it is something we all agree on or if it is individual ideas of what we would like to do, but ultimately they will make the decision, they just want our input.

Halford stated that something to think about, Minot has been made the newest MPO for the State. She said that they have yet to get off the ground, they are having conversations, but they will start putting their hand in that pot of money next year, so lots of moving parts with that.

Halford reiterated that those are the two biggest conversations we will be having, the funding formula and moving from a two-year contract to a one-year contract, starting immediately, so the DOT is actually going to cancel our current contract and get us a new 2023 contract and then at the end of the year they will give us a 2024 contract, so big changes and big conversations coming.

Grasser said that he has a comment, he doesn't understand all the moving parts, but knowing the DOT and the federal funding process, if you are going to go to a one year cycle, we are going to have to have some agreements about when we submit, as the MPO, when we submit requests and how timely they get back our approval, we can't have a six month delay of getting back our requests and you're dealing with a one year cycle, two year cycles are a little more forgiving, that's got to be part of the

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 19, 2023

parcel to this thing so we don't create a monster that we just can't functionally deal with. Halford responded that their plan is when they come forward with the new contract is kind of a game plan, a timeline of this will be due this time, this is when we will have this to you, etc. Grasser asked if this will be in writing. Halford responded that we hope it is, and she is still a little bit leery, but in comparison, the Minnesota side does a one year contract, so it isn't unheard of for us to take that on, but North Dakota is our lead agency, where we get the bulk of our money, so it does become a little bit more concerning, and also our plans usually don't follow a January to December timeline, so there is that, what we've kind of looked at is carryover from year to year, this project has this amount of money and we are going to dedicate this much this year and then it goes into next year, so it will be a little bit of re-learning how we plan and do things.

Halford said that ultimately, the Federal Highway, in full disclosure, has come out and said that they have had enough, there is too much carryover money that isn't being spent. She stated that we have always spent our money, as an MPO, we have always kind been against the timeline, but Bismarck is basically sitting on \$1.5 million dollars right now, and Fargo has had the reputation of also not being able to spend all their money as well, but they have done better the last couple of years since Cindy Gray took over. She said that this year she had to resubmit our budget and basically zero out any carryover into next year, and the other MPOs had to do the same thing, and now we will have to resubmit an updated budget for next year.

Halford commented that there were questions brought up about the carryover money, what if the three MPOs come forward with what they think they can spend, and then something happens and we don't spend all our money we said we were going to spend that year, what happens to that unspent money and we were told that that leftover money will go back into the pot so there is opportunity to go back to them and then they will figure out a process for us to be able to apply for those moneys, so instead of waiting for an MPO to say give us money, which is how it has been in the past and what has been tied with a deadline, a quick deadline like hurry and do a study kind of thing, this might be a better way of doing it, there won't be any of that carryover, there won't be those years attached to pots of money. She stated that her initial reaction was what are you doing, but now she feels that it could work, so we will see what the process is they come up with. She added that she is hoping for more information and detail in the next month, but at the very least she will share the different budget scenarios and see which you like best, what you would recommend she goes forward with to the DOT; she might not have the contract yet but at least we can talk about the funding program.

Halford stated that there will be some T.I.P. updates and amendments; and hopefully the Bike/Ped Preliminary Approval, and maybe more on the Safe Streets For All grant on the agenda as well.

Halford said that a heads up, we are looking at late May to do a kind of basic MPO 101 presentations going to both city council and county meetings for a quick refresher. She explained that it has been brought to our attention as we are going through these processes this past year, the questions we have gotten has made us think that we need to do a quick overview of what our responsibilities are, what we would like to be for you, and just kind of what it all entails. She said that she thinks there is some misinformation out there, and people don't quite know what we do so a quick refresher on that would be helpful. Grasser commented that he thinks that would be a good idea.

C) Agency Updates:

1) Flood Outlook Update:

Strandell commented that Polk County's Emergency Manager was at their board meeting last Tuesday and he doesn't see any real problem situations in Polk County; there will be some overland flooding, but as far as the rivers and coulees and such, there will be high water but no real issues with flooding. He said that when he was driving to Crookston, he noticed that there really isn't much snow out there, there is a lot of bare land.

Powers asked how it looks to the south of us. Strandell said that he doesn't know what happens there, but they get it every time, and he doesn't know how or why because they do a lot of flood fighting so you would think they would have some long range corrections. Powers stated that every year Harwood gets pounded. Grasser commented that they have pockets of fairly significant snow, some of it isn't too far south of us, and then there is some in the southeastern corner of North Dakota, but he drove around the rural areas and made some pretty similar observations as Mr. Strandell. He said that there is almost less overland flooding that he would consider in a "normal" year, the soil really seems to have soaked a lot of that water up, precipitation is always an unknown of course. He added that the National Weather Service bumped Grand Forks up yesterday to about 43-feet, so they are digesting that and trying to figure out what if any additional actions they need to take on their side, most of the action at those elevations would be turning on pump stations and stuff like that. Strandell asked if those 43 feet is a worst-case situation. Grasser responded that it isn't. He explained that the weather service, in their mind, 43 feet means a band of 42 to 44 feet, they give themselves a foot on either side because that is how they think about it. He said that we always look at as a line, so no, and they bumped it almost a foot from what they had predicted a couple of days before; they did the same to a few others as well, but for us that is just teetering on whether we would need to do any bridge closures or not, but he is hoping we won't need to do that as 43 is about our trigger for closing them but if we are at a crest at that level we would consider that and probably not close them.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 19, 2023

Powers asked when the predicted crest is. Grasser responded that the curve is maxing out about next Tuesday or Wednesday. He said that it is pretty flat, it is going up pretty slowly and is staying pretty flat, and he thinks it will stay flat for most of next week. He stated that the Red Lake River, Crookston's crest will be coming though here shortly, and Fargo will have a pretty good size crest, but a lot of the Minnesota Tributaries will be well on their way down by the time that crest comes through. He said that it is an unusual sequencing of crests that we don't normally see so it will be interesting how it plays out, as long as the Red Lake River behaves, we are in pretty good shape. Powers asked if we would be out of the woods, then, in another week. Grasser responded that we are never really out of the woods with these darn things because there could be a two-inch rain coming, so we can never say never, but he thinks we will have a pretty good handle without any excessive precipitation because most of the flows will be in the system and a lot will already be through the system by next week.

Larson asked if the Point and the Sorlie have the same elevation and would they be closed together. Grasser responded that they are very close. He said that the low point on the Point is on the Minnesota side, and their ceiling is quite a bit higher than that, so if it weren't for the low point they wouldn't be triggering those closures quite that soon, but as it happens the two low points are within a foot of each other so most of the time if you are pulling the trigger on one of them you are pretty much pulling the trigger on the other as well.

Powers commented that he was driving over the Point yesterday, and he noticed that the approach on the Minnesota side has some real monster potholes, and he was thinking that if they do any kind of reconstruction on the approach that would be a good time to raise it. Strandell said that he thinks it was built that way for flood purposes, so the water can pass through. Grasser said that you can't just fill in those areas because it then blocks the water, and it may raise the flood profile. He added that he was surprised that they were able to get Highway 2 built up a couple of years back, for a pretty long stretch, it kind of surprised him, but in any event, there are other regulatory agencies involved four agencies involved in the whole process. Powers said that if you build it up you need to build it up high enough so that the water goes underneath it. Vetter stated that he often wondered that about the Point Bridge because the approach always seems to be settling and settling, why don't we take it all out and put another section of bridge in there so the water can flow underneath it rather than have a solid approach. Kouba commented that there is a soil slide at that location in 2026 they will be rehabbing it when they look at the bridge.

ADJOURNMENT

STRANDELL ADJOURNED THE APRIL 19TH, 2023, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:14 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted
Peggy McNelis, Office Manager

Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO
Transaction List by Vendor
 March 11 through April 14, 2023

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
AFLAC.							
Liability Check	03/27/2023	AFLAC	501	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-846.60
Alerus Financial							
Liability Check	03/17/2023	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-2,314.38
Liability Check	03/27/2023	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-2,447.18
Liability Check	04/14/2023	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,326.10
Business Essentials							
Bill	04/06/2023	Inv. #...	Platform Dolli...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-244.98
Bill Pmt -Check	04/06/2023	7392	Platform Dolli...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-244.98
Bill	04/06/2023	Inv.# ...	ViewSonic Co...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-199.99
Bill Pmt -Check	04/06/2023	7393	ViewSonic Co...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-199.99
Bill	04/06/2023	Inv. #...	ViewSonic Co...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-199.99
Bill Pmt -Check	04/06/2023	7394	ViewSonic Co...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-199.99
Cardmember Service							
Bill	03/14/2023	Acct. ...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		-SPLIT-	-2,153.15
Bill Pmt -Check	03/14/2023	7387	Charges For ...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-2,153.15
Bill	03/14/2023	Acct. ...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		530 · Educatio...	-2,698.40
Bill Pmt -Check	03/14/2023	7388	Charges For ...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-2,698.40
Constant Contact							
Check	03/14/2023	ConC...	Inv. #167766...	104 · Checking	X	517 · Overhead	-20.00
Check	04/03/2023	Const...	Inv #1680333...	104 · Checking		517 · Overhead	-20.00
East Grand Forks Water and Light							
Bill	04/11/2023	Inv. 4/...	1st Quarter 2...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-593.42
Bill Pmt -Check	04/11/2023	7396	1st Quarter 2...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-593.42
Forum Communications Company							
Bill	04/13/2023	Inv. #...	Public Open ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		545 · Transpor...	-529.99
Bill Pmt -Check	04/13/2023	7399	Public Open ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-529.99
Liberty Business Systems, Inc.							
Bill	04/07/2023	Inv. #...	Contract Bas...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-230.72
Bill Pmt -Check	04/07/2023	7395	Contract Bas...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-230.72
LSNB as Trustee for PEHP							
Liability Check	03/17/2023	PEHP		104 · Checking	X	216 · Post-Hea...	-123.75
Madison Nat'l Life							
Liability Check	03/17/2023	7384		104 · Checking	X	215 · Disability...	-61.88
MetLife							
Liability Check	03/17/2023	7385	5397942	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-252.39
Mike's							
Bill	03/15/2023		MPO Lunche...	206 · Accounts Pay...		711 · Miscellan...	-120.00
Bill Pmt -Check	03/15/2023	7389	MPO Lunche...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-120.00
Minnesota Department of Revenue							
Liability Check	03/17/2023	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-487.00
Liability Check	03/31/2023	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-515.00
Liability Check	04/14/2023	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-490.00
Minnesota Life Insurance Company							
Liability Check	03/17/2023	7386		104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-105.96
Nationwide Retirement Solutions							
Liability Check	03/17/2023	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-538.36
Liability Check	03/27/2023	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-538.36
Liability Check	04/14/2023	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-538.36
NDPERS							
Liability Check	03/27/2023	NDPE...	D88	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-4,792.26
QuickBooks Payroll Service							
Liability Check	03/16/2023		Created by P...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-6,440.75
Liability Check	03/30/2023		Created by P...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-6,806.54
Liability Check	04/13/2023		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-6,526.09
Stephanie Halford							
Bill	03/15/2023		Travel Reimb...	206 · Accounts Pay...		530 · Educatio...	-147.50
Bill Pmt -Check	03/15/2023	7390	Travel Reimb...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-147.50
Teri Kouba							
Bill	04/12/2023		Reimburse Tr...	206 · Accounts Pay...		530 · Educatio...	-465.15
Bill Pmt -Check	04/12/2023	7398	Reimburse Tr...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-465.15
The Exponent							
Bill	03/24/2023	Inv. #...	Public Notice ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		545 · Transpor...	-145.00
Bill Pmt -Check	03/24/2023	7391	Public Notice ...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-145.00
University of North Dakota							
Bill	04/11/2023	Inv. #...	Work On Traf...	206 · Accounts Pay...		565 · Special ...	-1,225.53
Bill Pmt -Check	04/11/2023	7397	Work On Traf...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-1,225.53