

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, May 17, 2023 - 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks Training Conference Room/Zoom Meeting**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Warren Strandell, Chairperson, called the May 17<sup>th</sup>, 2023, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:01 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

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

Absent: Al Grasser and Mark Rustad.

Guest(s) present: Tim Finseth, NWRDC and David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering.

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 APRIL 19<sup>TH</sup>, 2023 MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY LARSON, TO APPROVE THE APRIL 19<sup>TH</sup>, 2023, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF APRIL 15<sup>TH</sup>, 2023 TO MAY 12<sup>TH</sup>, 2023 BILLS/CHECKS**

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY LUNSKI, TO APPROVE THE APRIL 15<sup>TH</sup>, 2023 TO MAY 12<sup>TH</sup>, 2023 BILLS/CHECKS, AS PRESENTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**INTRODUCTIONS**

Strandell introduced Tim Finseth and stated that he is the new Transportation Planner with the Northwest Regional Transportation Development Commission.

**ACTION ITEMS:**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE URBANIZED BOUNDARY**

Kouba reported that we did discuss this briefly at our April meeting and since then she distributed updated maps for review and comments and did receive some comments from various partners.

Kouba commented that the map is kind of a combination of East Grand Forks and Grand Forks and shows two options. She explained that Option B is the preferred option for East Grand Forks, from a staff level, and Option A, with a couple of changes, is the preferred option for Grand Forks.

Kouba referred to the maps and went over them briefly.

Kouba stated that one other thing they are looking at is to also change the MPO Study Area to include the area to the north, and while it isn't shown here, the airport did purchase a large amount of land and are planning to build a new runway up to the road. She said that they also purchased some property on the west side of County 17 in order to have some space for safety purposes, but it is still going to be technically airport so the State and County are moving the road, so we are suggesting we include the bump out shown, but, again, because this is a preliminary draft we are being asked by the State of North Dakota to get a preliminary draft to them by June 1<sup>st</sup>, and so it is kind of a little bit of a rush to get this preliminary draft out to everyone.

Kouba commented that, just so you can kind of see, we do have a current adjusted boundary, there are a few changes to that, some additions, because of more of a contiguous city boundary, where it makes sense to connect the two urban areas.

Kouba referred to Map C and stated that it is the draft that the Technical Advisory Committee recommended be approved and submitted to the State of North Dakota, and that is what we would ask this board to approve today as well.

Strandell said that the urbanized boundary can be adjusted but the MPO area is pretty much locked in isn't it. Kouba responded that the urban area, shown in the green is locked in because that is established by the census every ten years. She said that what happens is that, as you can see, it isn't necessarily quite in the city limits or anything like that it is really based on population and how dense housing is in those areas, so you don't necessarily get all of the city boundary, but you don't necessarily need all of the city boundary. She stated that in previous years the airport, as you can see, where we had our urbanized area, where we have the adjusted urbanized area before, the airport was inside that area because it was also kind of a formula for, as well as showing kind of where people are going to and coming from, and of course the airport is part of that because a lot of people are going to the airport between the city and that area, so that is one

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 17, 2023

of the reasons why the census also included that area. Strandell said that is fine, but the MPO area, that doesn't change. Kouba responded that generally it doesn't, but because we have this one area of city owned property outside of our study area now, it is prudent to bring it inside our MPO study area as opposed to leaving outside our study area, and that is also the reason why we kind of pushed out our MPO study area to the airport as well.

Vein asked, on the boundary, especially to the north with Epitome Energy development going in, is that encompassed in that boundary. Kouba responded that she isn't quite sure where that is located. Vein said that he knows it is closer to that interchange off the interstate. Kuharenko commented that from what he can recall it is located to the landfill, so he believes it is included but he isn't 100% sure, unfortunately. Kouba stated that it would be included in our MPO study area, but it wouldn't necessarily be considered urban, it wouldn't necessarily need to be urban for the city to be planning into that area. Vein said though that there will be annexations, all of that is coming, there will be right-of-way, there will be access, access off the interstate, access off of Highway 2, and all the pieces of that will be evolved here quickly, so should that be in the MPO study area. Kouba responded that she has a feeling it is in the study area because that far north interchange is within our study area now and will continue to be with the adjustments.

Vein said that Map C is the one that the Technical Advisory Committee recommended, correct. Kouba responded that it is. She pointed out that it has the adjusted MPO study area boundary as well as the adjusted urban area boundary and is what is being recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee. Strandell asked what the action today is, to pick one of these three. Kouba responded that if you would like to make changes to this draft, this particular draft, that would be it but we don't really have any other, we had a couple of other options that we presented to the Technical Advisory Committee members and staff so we could get an idea but it is up to this board as to what you want to approve to send to the State. Strandell commented that Mr. Vein and Ms. Lunski are more affected by this than the Minnesota side. Kouba said that there was only a slight change in the far south area for the City of East Grand Forks.

Kouba referred to the letter from the State of North Dakota in reference to this item. She said that one of the things they say is to please note any adjustments made to the planning boundary will not have any effect on either your annual federal aid allocations or change current maintenance responsibilities, so this won't impact road maintenance, which was a concern of Mr. Grasser's.

Lunski commented that she thinks that Epitome Energy; because it is not connected to the city is it important to include that. Kouba responded that it is important to include it in the MPO Study area, probably, but it not necessarily important to include it in the adjusted urban boundary at this time, but we will double check that as well.

Kouba reiterated that this is a preliminary draft so we will get comments from the State and bring those comments back to the Technical Advisory Committee and yourselves, in order to incorporate a final document so there is still time. Vein said that he thinks that would be helpful to be able to do that, just make sure that we aren't missing anything, because he thinks his only

question is on the MPO Study Boundary, did that just go far enough, because he is pretty sure there will be significant annexations because in order to deliver utilities up there it will have to be annexed into the city, so he thinks that map for us is going to change a lot for us in the next few months. Kouba stated that the annexation that came in with the Fufeng has been included in the adjusted urban boundary because the city limits come up just south of the drain way as well, those are the city boundaries so those have been included currently in this map.

***MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO GRANT PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT MPO STUDY AREA BOUNDARY AND ADJUSTED FEDERAL AID URBAN BOUNDARY, SUBJECT TO REVIEW AND COMMENT BY NDDOT AND MNDOT.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Grasser and Rustad.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2023-2026 T.I.P. AMENDMENT #3**

Kouba reported that there were a couple of requests from NDDOT and also one from MnDOT, and two additional projects due to the new Carbon Reduction funding, so all these projects are new projects in our T.I.P. She stated that some will be put into FY2023 and there are few into FY2024 because of the differences between the calendar year and the fiscal year and between the state and federal, as well as if any project needs to be bid in FY2023 and constructed in FY2024 it also needs to be put into the T.I.P. an our newest T.I.P. will not be adopted in that timeframe.

Kouba referred to the information in the packet and said that she will go over the projects briefly.

Kouba commented that North Dakota has a project on University at the Railroad Tracks by the Red Pepper. She said that they are going to do a surface rehabilitation project and install new signals there as well. She stated that the actual resurfacing is going to be done in FY2023 sometime, but they aren't sure yet when the signals will be done as they don't know when the funding to do so will be available so they are putting it into FY2024 but if it changes, we can do an administrative modification.

Kouba reported that in Minnesota there is a new Carbon Reduction Program through IJJA, and there is basically a certain amount of formula funding of that group, and East Grand Forks has a dedicated source for that area. She stated that they put in two applications in March, and they were approved by this body. She explained that one was for FY2023 and the other was for FY2024 funds, and MnDOT approved those applications.

Kouba commented that in FY2023 the CRP project is to purchase 11 Preemption Emitters for the Fire Trucks. She added that between the Technical Advisory Committee and today we also have updated to include the project number, previously we did not have a project number until now so that will be part of the approval as well.

Kouba stated that another project for the State is on Minnesota 220, just north of 23<sup>rd</sup>, where they are doing reconstruction of the roadway. She said that, again, we have a project number, and some slight changes were made to the wording of the project. Strandell commented that he thinks that project was originally scheduled for this summer, but he heard that MnDOT changed the project from an overlay bituminous to a concrete repair, and it is going to be quite a project. Kouba agreed, adding that we had it updated in the 2024 T.I.P. but they wanted it updated in this T.I.P. because they are planning on getting bids this year and they can't do that until the project is included in the T.I.P.

Kouba said that the newest Carbon Reduction Program is a FY2024 project to do a sidewalk and trail along 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.W., but if they want to release bids for that it needs to be in the T.I.P. She stated that between the Technical Advisory Committee meeting and today we got more descriptive wording for the project as well as a project number since Minnesota needs project numbers included in our T.I.P. as well.

Kouba commented that both staff and the Technical Advisory Committee are recommending approval of the 2024-2027 T.I.P. Amendment #3, as presented.

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY LARSON, TO APPROVE AMENDMENT #3 TO THE FY2024-2027 T.I.P., AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Grasser and Rustad.***

### **MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2024-2027 DRAFT T.I.P. PROJECTS**

Kouba reported that this is our newest T.I.P. process, it is for FY2024 to FY2027. She stated that some of the projects we just adopted will be included in this document as well.

Kouba commented that a public hearing was held on this item at the May 10<sup>th</sup> Technical Advisory Committee meeting and there was no public present for discussion, nor were any comments submitted prior to the meeting.

Kouba said that she will say that we are changing the look of our project listings, both how we present the information as well as to try to group similar things together, such as transit projects for each City, both State projects, and for both counties.

Kouba stated that this is the draft listing of projects, we are looking for approval, but they may change between now and when the final T.I.P. document is adopted. She said that pretty much all the Minnesota projects are set, and they will have their State S.T.I.P. ready to turn in in August. She added that we have not yet heard from North Dakota when exactly a draft State S.T.I.P. is going to be released, so stay tuned for that, but we will move forward with our

document to ensure that we have something adopted and then sometime in August we will adopt a final document.

Kouba reiterated that there may be changes and/or additions necessary between now and when we adopt a final document. She stated that both staff and the Technical Advisory Committee recommend approval of this draft document.

Lunski asked, with the round-a-bout at confusion corner, at Belmont and Division, are we still in the study mode for that or has that been approved and is actually going to be constructed. Kouba responded that it is an actual construction project. She stated that currently, and she is sure Mr. Kuharenko can explain where they are at with the designing of the project, but they have received federal funding for it, and they have the local share as well. She said that they can put it out for bids at any time. Kuharenko explained that right now the project is in the preliminary engineering stage, so they do have a consultant on board, and they are doing the initial environmental document and they will be moving into the preliminary design stage, and they are hoping to have it bid out this fall or winter for construction next year. Kouba stated that it is also in our current T.I.P. as well. Lunski asked, and she realizes that we are backing up, but how come this goes to the MPO and not just to the city. Kouba responded that it goes to the MPO because of the federal funding that is attached to it, we are the regional body that approves these things, and we are mandated to have studies, they have to have transportation plans and they have to match with what the cities are bringing forward, or the counties, or even the DOT, so that is why we coordinate with the DOTs and all these partners so that we know what they are wanting to do into the future and so when it comes to federal funding availability we are looking at it as there is a reasonable expectation that, yes, that that federal funding will be available and everybody can find their local share, whether it is 100% local, whether you plan on doing a private partnership, or you are looking at other entities. She said that it is kind of allowing people to see where that funding is kind of coming from, and in our document we do explain in a little more detail, which is one of the reasons why we changed the upper format, especially, so that people can understand where it is located, both to and from, and give a description as well to understand where the state and local funding is coming from so they can give comments on it.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY LARSON, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT FY2024-2027 T.I.P. PROJECTS, AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Grasser and Rustad.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE RECOMMENDATION TO THE NDDOT OF THE FUNDING FORMULA**

Halford reported that she did give a little heads up at our last meeting that this was coming up. She stated that we don't have the amended contracts, it is just looking at the funding formula,

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 17, 2023

and she wants to point out that this is a recommendation to the DOT, all three MPO's are going back to their boards and committees and making this staff recommendation, and then we are all submitting it to the DOT, and they can either approve or disapprove of it, but they wanted to hear the MPO's opinions. She said that it may not be what they go with but at least they've heard our voices. She pointed out that this is just for the North Dakota side since we are a bi-state MPO.

Halford commented that probably, a good nine months, she has been having regular meetings with the other two MPO Directors, Rachel with the Bismarck MPO and Cindy, who just recently retired, with the Fargo MPO to talk about numerous different topics, and kind of picking each other's brains, but the last few meetings they have had have really focused on the funding formula and they thought it would be best, and that is what the DOT was hoping for, was to come to an agreement on a formula so we show a more united front, they wanted us to be on the same page, so that is what we did, they had some discussions, and the tables included in the staff report show what we came into agreement on.

Halford referred to the staff report and went over the information briefly, pointing out the total amount of funding per year, the current formula, and the proposed formula.

Halford stated that the first table shows the total approved allocated numbers for past years, as well as how much each MPO got, so it gives you an idea of what we had to work with in the past. She said that the second table shows how we got to the North Dakota funding side, and how they use a base amount of \$120,000 for each MPO, and then the rest remaining in the pot of money is allocated based on population, and this formula that they have been using.

Halford said that a couple of reasons we are looking at the funding formula is because Minot will be coming an MPO, they are having discussions, so instead of three MPOs there will be four MPOs going after the annual pot of funding, but not until 2024, so this year it is still the three MPOs, but since Minot will be coming on-line, and; and this has happened before, where the other two MPOs had trouble spending their money, and that is the case now with Bismarck. She explained that we don't get all the money at once, it is kind of a promised allocation, and right now Bismarck is sitting on \$1.5 million dollars, so as pointed out in the chart, we get a promised allocation of funding annually, and she thinks they just finished spending their 2020 money so they are a couple of years behind, so FHWA, with Minot coming on, and then funding not being spent, they only like to have two, at most three years open at a time so because Bismarck is just finishing up their 2020 funding, we have always been good at spending out money and are looking at opening 2023 funding, FHWA won't open it until everyone is kind of in that same grouping, if that makes sense. She added that in the past Bismarck and Fargo have given us money so we could spend up to current time or it has been taken away from them but it always comes with strings like having to hurry and come up with a study and spend money and then there is also the issue of coming up with the local match, so with that and with Minot coming on board they want us to look at the funding formula.

Halford stated that what the MPO Directors came up with is Bismarck and the GF/EGF MPO will start with a base of \$300,000, Fargo is becoming and TMA as their population has grown so

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 17, 2023

much, they will have more responsibility than the normal MPO, so their base will be \$500,000, and then Minot is just getting started, so they will get around \$400,000 to \$500,000.

Halford commented that we all agreed with this new formula, that it makes sense, but Bismarck is a little hesitant of just going with that one option, so they are also presenting to their board another option where everyone gets a base amount of \$200,000 and Bismarck and Fargo would get more money and Minot and us would get less.

Halford said that staff and the Technical Advisory Committee are recommending we forward the proposed option shown in green to the NDDOT. She added that the DOT did point out that if not all the money is spent there might be opportunities to request some additional funding from the remaining funds, so when we do amendments to our work program next time we might want to look at adding some illustrative projects in there so we have the option of going after some more funding if any is available and this would allow us to do that.

Powers asked how Stephanie feels about this. Halford responded that she thinks it makes a lot of sense. She said that what she struggled with through the whole process, and she pointed it out many times, is that we are all three so different. She stated that we are required to do the same amount of stuff even though our populations are different, but it is our overhead that makes us so different. She said that Fargo is completely separated from the City of Fargo; Bismarck is very ingrained in the City and we are kind of in-between, so that really kind of, the day-to-day overhead, we talk about attorneys, or their HR, or accounting, or your leases or rental or utility costs, all that stuff and the way they factor on your budget, so when they look at that for Bismarck, they are within the City, very much ingrained, they don't have to really put in their budget when they need an attorney or account, they just work with the City, we don't have that, and Fargo budgets that. She said that she feels better with this scenario, but that was what she struggled with, that it is so hard to treat us the same because we aren't, just because of the makeup of how each of MPOs are so different, but she didn't feel good with the other scenarios at all.

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY VEIN, TO APPROVE FORWARDING THE FORMULA THE THREE MPO DIRECTOR'S AGREED ON TO THE NDDOT, AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Grasser and Rustad.***

**NON-ACTION ITEMS:**

**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 the Bike/Ped Plan is in its final stage, we are looking at buttoning up the final draft and moving forward through the approval process in June and July on both sides, and then giving it final approval in August.
- 2) Street/Highway Element Update – Halford reported that we did get the modeling done, and it is currently being reviewed and we will be giving updates to the City Councils on both sides.
- 3) Aerial Imagery – Halford reported that they were able to get the imagery done this past weekend. She said that she is excited to see it as there will be a little bit of green in the imagery so it will look good, it won't look so brown. She commented that there is such a fine line with the imagery, it can't be too green, the water can't be too high, and it can't be too cloudy, so she is happy it all worked out.

B) MPO Updates:

- 1) Bridge Update – Halford reported that there hasn't been much discussion on the future bridge update unless someone has anything to add.
- 2) Safe Streets For All (SS4A) – Halford reported that we did get the template for the agreement and she filled it out, giving it kind of a rough overhaul, and sent it to Federal Highway yesterday asking them about the follow-up questions on it, so that will hopefully start moving forward with it.
- 3) Transportation Planner/Senior Planner – Halford reported that we did open up for a Senior Planner, so if that is something that interests you, or you know someone that might be interested send them or way.
- 4) NWRTC Update – Finseth reported that the NWRTC Technical Advisory Committee will be meeting in June. He said that they have several projects but none of them directly affect East Grand Forks.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***STRANDELL ADJOURNED THE MAY 17TH, 2023, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:50 P.M.***

Respectfully Submitted,  
Peggy McNelis, Office Manager

**Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO**  
**Transaction List by Vendor**  
 April 15 through May 12, 2023

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
<b>AFLAC.</b>							
Liability Check	04/28/2023	AFLAC	501	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-564.40
<b>Alerus Financial</b>							
Liability Check	04/28/2023	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-2,326.08
Liability Check	05/12/2023	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,318.64
<b>Bolton &amp; Menk</b>							
Bill	05/01/2023	Inv. #...	Work On Bike...	206 · Accounts Pay...		545 · Transpor...	-4,839.95
Bill Pmt -Check	05/01/2023	7410	Work On Bike...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-4,839.95
<b>Business Essentials</b>							
Bill	04/28/2023	Inv. #...	Office Furnitu...	206 · Accounts Pay...		535 · Equipment	-11,250.06
Bill Pmt -Check	04/28/2023	7413	Office Furnitu...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-11,250.06
Bill	05/01/2023	Inv. #...	Office Chair	206 · Accounts Pay...		535 · Equipment	-447.00
Bill Pmt -Check	05/01/2023	7411	Office Chair	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-447.00
Bill	05/12/2023	Inv. #...	Office Supplies	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-39.54
Bill Pmt -Check	05/12/2023	7416	Office Supplies	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-39.54
<b>Cardmember Service</b>							
Bill	04/21/2023	Acct #...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		530 · Educatio...	-1,775.85
Bill Pmt -Check	04/21/2023	7405	Charges For ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-1,775.85
Bill	04/21/2023	Acct #...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		-SPLIT-	-1,642.70
Bill Pmt -Check	04/21/2023	7406	Charges For ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-1,642.70
Bill	05/12/2023	Acct #...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		-SPLIT-	-710.50
Bill Pmt -Check	05/12/2023	7415	Charges For ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-710.50
Bill	05/12/2023	Acct. ...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		-SPLIT-	-471.20
Bill Pmt -Check	05/12/2023	7417	Charges For ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-471.20
<b>Constant Contact</b>							
Check	05/04/2023	Const...	Inv. #168292...	104 · Checking		517 · Overhead	-20.00
<b>Environmental Systems Research Institute</b>							
Bill	05/12/2023	Inv. #...	ArcGIS Deskt...	206 · Accounts Pay...		575 · GIS Dev...	-707.00
Bill Pmt -Check	05/12/2023	7418	ArcGIS Deskt...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-707.00
<b>Forum Communications Company</b>							
Bill	05/12/2023	Inv. #...	Public Notice ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		555 · TIP	-479.98
Bill Pmt -Check	05/12/2023	7419	Public Notice ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-479.98
<b>Grant and Contract Accounting</b>							
Bill	04/28/2023	Inv. #...	Work On Trav...	206 · Accounts Pay...		545 · Transpor...	-27,460.95
Bill Pmt -Check	04/28/2023	7414	Work On Trav...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-27,460.95
Bill	05/01/2023	Inv. #...	Work On Traf...	206 · Accounts Pay...		550 · Corridor ...	-8,584.30
Bill Pmt -Check	05/01/2023	7412	Work On Traf...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-8,584.30
<b>Liberty Business Systems, Inc.</b>							
Bill	05/12/2023	Inv. #...	Contract Bas...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-261.62
Bill Pmt -Check	05/12/2023	7420	Contract Bas...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-261.62
<b>LSNB as Trustee for PEHP</b>							
Liability Check	04/28/2023	PEHP		104 · Checking	X	216 · Post-Hea...	-123.75
<b>Madison Nat'l Life</b>							
Liability Check	04/28/2023	7407		104 · Checking		215 · Disability...	-54.15
<b>MetLife</b>							
Liability Check	04/28/2023	7408	5397942	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-252.42
<b>Mike's</b>							
Bill	04/19/2023		MPO Lunche...	206 · Accounts Pay...		711 · Miscellan...	-115.00
Bill Pmt -Check	04/19/2023	7404	MPO Lunche...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-115.00
<b>Minnesota Department of Revenue</b>							
Liability Check	04/28/2023	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-490.00
Liability Check	05/12/2023	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-488.00
<b>Minnesota Life Insurance Company</b>							
Liability Check	04/28/2023	7409		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-105.95
<b>Nationwide Retirement Solutions</b>							
Liability Check	04/28/2023	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-538.36
Liability Check	05/12/2023	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-538.36
<b>NDPERS</b>							
Liability Check	04/28/2023	NDPE...	D88	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-3,194.84
Liability Check	05/12/2023	NDPE...		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-4,329.78
<b>QuickBooks Payroll Service</b>							
Liability Check	04/27/2023		Created by P...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-6,494.45
Liability Check	05/11/2023		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-6,457.81
<b>Stephanie Halford</b>							
Bill	05/12/2023		Travel Reimb...	206 · Accounts Pay...		530 · Educatio...	-405.00
Bill Pmt -Check	05/12/2023	7423	Travel Reimb...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-405.00

**Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO**  
**Transaction List by Vendor**  
April 15 through May 12, 2023

---

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
<b>University of North Dakota</b>							
Bill	05/12/2023	Inv. #...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		565 · Special ...	-2,840.96
Bill Pmt -Check	05/12/2023	7421	Charges For ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-2,840.96
Bill	05/12/2023	Inv. #...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		565 · Special ...	-1,225.23
Bill Pmt -Check	05/12/2023	7422	Charges For ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-1,225.23