

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, June 21, 2023 - 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks Training Conference Room/Zoom Meeting**

CALL TO ORDER

Warren Strandell, Chairperson, called the June 21st, 2023, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:00 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 Ken Vein.

Absent: Mark Rustad.

Guest(s) present: Jeremy Williams, HDR; Alex Sick, HDR; Jason Carbee, HDR; Cody Christianson, Bolton & Menk; Anna Pierce, MnDOT; and Brian Opsahl, Brady Martz.

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 MAY 17TH, 2023 MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE MAY 17TH, 2023, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF MAY 13TH, 2023 TO JUNE 16TH, 2023 BILLS/CHECKS

MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE MAY 13TH, 2023 TO JUNE 16TH, 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 MPO 2022 AUDIT

Brian Opshal, Brady-Martz was present to give a brief overview of the 2022 MPO Audit (a copy of the audit report is included in the file and available upon request).

Opshal referred to a May 3, 2023, handout and explained that it is an Audit Committee letter that is required communication with those charged with governance at the end of the audit. He said that, it is really just a high point indicating that there are no new accounting policies that affected the MPO, there are a couple of estimates within the financial statements that are not new, but that can change from year to year based off of actuarial assumptions, so when we get into the audit report there is a net pension liability and a net OPEB (Other Post-Employment Benefits) liability so those things can swing quite bit based of actuarial changes, and we will get into that more in the audit report, but again no changes, those things have been there for a few years now. He added that there were no difficulties performing that audit, no disagreements with management, and at the end of this report you will see the adjustments that were made after they received the trial balance.

Opshal referred to a letter to the Board of Directors of the MPO and said that it is the management report. He stated that as we go through the audit there are some things that they came across that they feel are, probably best practices would be a good way to put them, they aren't material in nature, but they do think they would be ideas to help strengthen your internal controls, we bring those up in this letter and all three of them are kind of the same idea for internal controls, and it really stems from separation of duties issues that inherently you are going to have for a small organization.

Opshal commented that the first one is just the fact that the signature stamps should be maintained by the person whose name is on the stamp otherwise that control on the checks doesn't really do a lot if the same person is signing it and stamping with someone else's name, so that is just an overall suggestion. He said that the second one is the bank reconciliations, once those bank reconciliations are done, they should be provided to someone else who review and approves them, really looking for things that might be odd items, you know banks now have more electronic items that don't require the normal checks and balances that checks do, so that is kind of what they are looking for there. He stated that the last one is general entries, and they have this comment often, if there is one person handling all the records and they are making all the adjustments, they should be reviewed and approved by somebody and if that person doesn't understand them then we are asking questions because the adjustments should be known by everyone as to what is going on, so those are the suggestions that they have, again just best practices.

Opshal referred to the audit report, Pages 1-3, this is the actual Independent Auditor's Report, and they have issued a unmodified opinion on the financial statements, so that is considered a good or clean opinion that they are fairly stated in accordance with GAP (Government Auditing

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Standards). He said that it is management's responsibility for the financial statements, including all the footnotes, and it is their responsibility to come and ensure that those numbers are accurate. He added that when we get to the back of the financial statements you will see that we do have a finding related to the auditor's preparation of those financial statements, and it is really indicating that we do help put these together, but at the end of the day they still have to be reviewed and approved by MPO management before they actually sign off as auditors.

Opshal referred to Pages 4-9, Management Discussion and Analysis Section, and stated that it has some cadent information with some comparative information; maybe the easiest spot to read a snapshot of how it went, Page 6 for example is kind of a nice way to look at your income and expenses from one year to the next, obviously it can kind of swing up and down based of the types of projects that you have each year, typically if you get more grants you will have more revenue but also more expenses, so those are the kinds of things that you are going to see here.

Opshal referred to Page 10 and commented that this is the first audited financial statement. He explained that the way this statement works is it is actually combining what would be known as your governmental funds statement, your general fund, and then it adjusts to the statement of net position, which is like a full accrual financial statement, so if you look at the bottom of the general fund statement on Page 10, you are going to see two lines from the bottom the total fund balance in the general fund is \$80,570.00, so that would be the number that we are looking for, and when we get to the next page you will see how that changed for the current year. He said, then, that the adjustment column is bringing in things like the net pension liability, the net OPEB liability, your compensated absences, etc., so the number you see in the bottom right corner is your statement of net position total net position; that is a deficit primarily because of that net pension liability, etc, and as he said in the past it is a really caused by the pension plans that are considered unfunded at the state level, and so you basically just put your piece of the pie in the financial statements, it is an accounting exercise more than anything else so you still budget according to what the rates are, etc, so no changes there other than it makes that number a pretty large deficit.

Opshal referred to Page 11, general fund, once again is that first column, and about four lines from the bottom the overall change was a deficit \$75,913 dollars, we will check to see how that compared to the budget that was issued as well, and it did include some compensated absences that were paid out this year as well, then there were adjusted where we adjusted the compensated absences and the pension activity and it brings the statement of activities balance, three lines from the bottom, to a deficit \$40,425 dollars.

Opshal said that the next section of the financial statements, which would be Pages 12-28, or the footnotes of the financial statements, has your accounting policies, some additional information on the pension liability, compensated absences, etc. He stated that we can certainly circle back to that section, but for right now we will go to Page 29, the budgetary comparison schedule for the general fund, so the bottom right corner is where you will see the overall difference between what you expected versus what it came in at, so you actually, for the final budget, are \$19,381

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 21, 2023

dollars better than you had projected. He said that revenues, at the top, as you can see were pretty close, about \$2,000 dollars more than expected and expenses, about a quarter of the way from the bottom, were \$17,318 dollars better than expected, so overall \$19,381 better. Opshal referred to Pages 35 and 36, and stated that these are the government auditing standards letter, high level overview of your internal control structure, and they had three repeat findings which virtually most entities your size are going to have, and a couple of them he already touched on, so two of them are related to the auditor preparation of the financial statements, as well as material adjusted journal entries, and the other is separation of duties, and so those are the things they are recommending, you do have controls in place for review and approval of the financial statements before they are issued, and as far as reviewing and approving checks and disbursements, they do think you have quite a bit in place and that is where the management letter brought up some other ideas to strengthen that, so no changes from prior years on those comments.

QUESTIONS:

Grasser said that some of the recommendations here on bank reconciliation and journal entries, is that something that should be done, he is assuming that most of these statements come out monthly, is that something that should be done monthly, quarterly, or semi-annually. Opshal responded that the bank reconciliations should be done monthly, as the bank statements come out, so once the bank reconciliation is done somebody should approve it in a timely manner, how that it done is up to your discretion. He stated that the journal entries are a little trickier because it kind of depends on how many journal entries you have, and how tedious the process can be, so if you are making just a handful of journal entries a month, how you do them probably doesn't matter, you can approve them on a daily basis if you want to, if you have a handful and it gets to be a lot for a month because of electronic transfers or those kinds of things; he has seen where an organization will print off a journal entry report monthly and provide that to the Executive Director, for example, and they will approve it monthly. He said that he thinks once you start getting quarterly or semi-annually out there, he thinks maybe that is too much time passed to actually catch something in time if there was a mistake made, and he usually says monthly would be their suggestion if feasible as well.

Grasser stated that what he is wondering, and we don't have to decide today, is that if we have had, and in this case it sounds like a monthly report from the Executive Director saying, and you don't even have to summarize the details, something like "this month I reviewed and approved these journal entries, so there are minutes, there is a record they have been approved and they can be audited and whatnot, maybe that is more than we need but he is just thinking it would be a quick monthly report by the Executive Director just noting they have approved those things each month. Halford asked if he wanted something added to the bills and checks information that you approve. Grasser responded that whatever works best, mechanically to get that done, he is just, again, thinking that it would then it would be officially reviewed and approved, and the board is aware of it. Opshal said that that is a good idea, auditors always love extra checks and balances so he wouldn't ever say that is a bad idea. He added that when they come through, they are looking for bank reconciliation review or journal entry review, they are needing some kind of signature on it otherwise they can't tell that it was done, so that would just add another level that

the board would also know that it was done. Halford stated that Peggy and she can discuss how to do this. Grasser said that that would hit a number of these recommendations at one time.

Report Received and Filed.

MATTER OF PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF BIKE/PED UPDATE

Halford reported that she will just give a little update on this then will turn it over to Cody Christianson from Bolton and Menk to give a brief presentation and overview of the plan. She said that we are going through the preliminary approval process for the Bike/Ped Update, and it has been presented to Grand Forks and East Grand Forks Planning and Zoning Commissions, Grand Forks and East Grand Forks City Councils, and it has gone really smoothly, very little questions and a lot of positive feedback, so it has been a smooth process so far, and people have been excited about the plan.

Cody Christianson, Bolton and Menk, Transportation Project Manager introduced himself and referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and stated that he will give kind of a brief overview of the presentation, just kind of going over the vision that was created for Greater Grand Forks; their view of the vision that was created for Greater Grand Forks, their view of existing conditions, public outreach and what they heard from the community and how that transpired into how they are recommending building the recommendations, what are the recommendations, and then what are the plans for implementation.

Christianson stated that, again, through the work of the Study Review Committee they developed the vision for Greater Grand Forks; Greater Grand Forks is a community where year-round walking and walking are safe, comfortable, convenient, common, and enjoyable for people of all ages and abilities. He said that how they kind of guided how they were developing the plan was to look at six guiding principles; 1) Improving Safety, 2) Improving Mobility, 3) Increasing Walking and Biking Rates, 4) Replacing Private Vehicle Trips, 5) Developing a Plan that is derived from the Community's Needs, and 6) Investing the Community's Money Wisely.

Christianson commented that he just wanted to give a background on what they got from the Greater Grand Forks Community. He referred to the split pie chart on the slide and explained that it shows how people are commuting to work today. He said that you will see that walking and biking are about 5% of the total population commute mode, so that is where they really started off on how they can better improve that with the Bike and Ped Plan, knowing that 30% of workers have a commute that is shorter than 10 minutes and 50% have a commute that is shorter than 15 minutes and that 15 minutes window is really kind of the key to being a bikeable commute.

Christianson referred to a slide showing "Who is Walking in Greater Grand Forks?" and said that, just to note, there is around 7% of households that don't have access to a vehicle for one reason or another, whether that is affordability, ability to drive, choice, so there are a number of those households within the community and then 40% are single vehicle households as well. He

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 21, 2023

said that not only is this vital for recreational business, but also includes the Safe Routes to School and then the commuting as well.

Christianson said that on the cycling side of it we have the national or nationwide bike user profiles on the upper left of the slide, where around 50% of folks are in the interested but concerned bike ability where they are more comfortable at slower speeds, separated from vehicular traffic, and even a preference to be separated from pedestrian traffic; and then 10% to 15% are somewhat confident or highly confident, those are the folks that are comfortable riding with traffic in the street and that prefer to go at higher speeds. He said that an interesting finding they had when they did their community surveys was finding that there was roughly a 50/50 split between those that are interested but concerned or enthusiastic and confident, so quite a bit of folks from the Greater Grand Forks Community are really comfortable out there biking for more than just recreation. He added that there is a large percentage that would take more biking/walking trips if they felt the network was safer.

Christianson referred to a slide and said that looking back at the crash reports over a five-year period from 2017 to 2021 there were just under 60 reported bike crashes, and just over 60 pedestrian crashes, including one fatal bike crash and 2 fatal pedestrian crashes, and you can see where those are located on the map on the right side of the slide, so really focusing on those critical areas where we see some of the highest need.

Christianson said that they got over 700 comments at their public input/public outreach opportunities throughout the study period through various forms. He stated that they held two open houses, and also got a lot of feedback from their advisory committee, which is made up of a number of local agencies, residents, and advocates. He said that they held a community biking audit where they went out in the community with community members and biked along some of the less comfortable bike networks throughout the community and did a number of surveys and used an interactive mapping tool for people to provide their comments and responses. He stated that there was also the project website, and project emails and direct mailers that went to their priority corridors identified by the City's of Grand Forks and East Grand Forks.

Christianson commented that what they got from all those opportunities was an overwhelming amount of people telling them they supported investments in walking and biking in Greater Grand Forks, and almost 90% preferred living in walkable/bikeable communities and neighborhoods, and then on the flip side almost 50% said the Greater Grand Forks networks weren't good for walking and biking. He referred to a slide showing what the public told them and pointed out that in the bottom right corner there is a list of the high priority issues identified by the including East-West Connectors through Grand Forks, the barriers of bridges and railroad crossings, increased signage and wayfinding, and better education on the rules of the road.

Christianson referred to the next slide and commented, again, that they had two open houses and the first open house was early on in the study phase, really asking the public what their safety issues were and what they were looking for out of the plan and then the second open house was last fall and they got feedback on those network recommendations for both biking facilities and pedestrian facilities within both cities, and asking for feedback on how to prioritize those projects and how we can better plan for growth on the outskirts of both cities.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Christianson commented that part of their outreach was actually holding a couple of corridor specific stakeholder meetings. He said that they put together five priority corridors, three in Grand Forks and two in East Grand Forks, and they sent out project mailers to those neighborhoods and held some public meetings discussing some various alternatives to get those proposed pedestrian/bicycle facilities implemented so they got some good feedback on those, and they are all included in the appendix of the plan.

Christianson stated that part of how they put together the proposed networks was to look at more than just connectivity, to also look at areas of poverty, employment density; and then, specific to the bike plan, to look at the current bicycle level of traffic stress, so that is measured by the adjacent roadway traffic volumes, traffic speeds; is there any separation for bicyclists today. He pointed out that green is good, red is not so good, and you will see the Interstate is red because bikes aren't allowed on the interstate.

Christianson reported that their recommendations came out with about 130 miles of recommended facilities, most of those being bike facilities, the pedestrian sidewalk network is relatively complete, there are a couple of gaps that are noted in the plan, and just some overall more safety improvements at intersections for the pedestrian plan. He stated that the bike connectivity was the bigger one, especially noting those east/west connectors, especially in the middle core of Grand Forks, as well as far north and South sides of East Grand Forks.

Christianson stated that there is also a design guide for implementation that kind of goes down the various street facility types and what those recommended bicycle and pedestrian facilities would look like in a typical street configuration.

Christianson referred to the Sidewalks and Pedestrian Facilities slide and pointed out it shows what sidewalk gaps look like, and what they are finding, and then what some of those crossing barriers can be, including some of their work with the Safe Routes to School mapping which is included in the plan.

Christianson referred to the On-Street Cycling Facilities slide and pointed out it shows some of the various bike facilities that are recommended including bike boulevards, which are shared lanes; conventional bike lanes; and then the buffered bike lane which has that additional striping and spaces between the bicyclists and general vehicular traffic.

Christianson referred to the Off-Street Facilities slide and stated that their off-street facility recommendations would be shared use path, similar to what is around both cities, including the greenway system; but then also it could be a cycle track or side path depending on how the community moves forward with those projects.

Christianson referred to the next slide and stated that here is an example of those Design Guidelines, this example is the local street and how those shared bike lanes or bike boulevards would look in that street configuration.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Christianson stated that on the implementation side, as he mentioned they did a Safe Routes to School portion, providing updated maps for all of the elementary and middle schools in the community. He said that they were developed with a Safe Routes to School Committee and were developed to be easily identifiable and also easily updated. He added that they were assembled using Microsoft Powerpoint with a Google Map background so that as things are updated and implemented the schools themselves can go in and update them relatively easily. Christianson said that, as he mentioned, they got into project prioritization, looking at various quantitative as well as qualitative analysis, looking at the existing conditions as well as number of other factors that come in, again looking at the schools' regional barriers, environmental justice populations, and where the communities can prioritize the various projects that were identified.

Christianson stated that there are 11 top priority projects in Grand Forks and 13 projects in East Grand Forks, and through that they got to the near term key improvements of University Avenue from North 3rd Steet to North Columbia Road, 13th Avenue from South Columbia Road to the Greenway, and 17th Avenue from South 20th Street to Belmont Road in Grand Forks and River Road from River Road to 21st NW to Levee and Rhinehart Drive from Bygland Road to Greenway Boulevard in East Grand Forks. He said that these are projects that they held individual Stakeholder meetings to get feedback on those concepts.

Christianson commented that also included in the plan are some of the cost estimates, helping to develop the projects into the CIP by giving not only capital costs but annual operations and maintenance costs for the various facility types of safety recommendations included in the plan.

Christianson stated that lastly, they did a bit of policy and program review just to provide some recommendations outside of capital improvements on how the Greater Grand Forks area can improve their bike and walk friendliness.

QUESTIONS:

Lunski said that she is a little bit confused on this, and she is speaking specifically to 13th because it is in her ward, but people were very upset about what came out, it just doesn't fit the street, but this study is never going to be completed. Halford asked if she meant that corridor. Lunski responded she did. Halford explained that any plans that come out of the MPO office are plans, they are recommendations, it is up to the cities if they want to implement them. She added that they moved all of the corridor study parts to the appendix because of some of those comments they got and not have it as a main focus in the main plan. Lunski stated that she is just trying to figure out how to explain this to people in her ward because she is a little bit fuzzy; so, the recommendations for 13th, it just doesn't fit on 13th, so she just doesn't know how to explain this to people. Halford said that she would probably tell them that this is what came out of the study, it is up to the cities to implement it, but it is probably something that we need to study further and find out what the proper fit would be, that the next step would be to look at it and study it further. Lunski said this is a study to see if we need a study. Halford responded that sometimes that happens; a meeting to have a meeting. Kouba added that a lot of times these long-term plans end up presenting additional studies, more focused areas because this is a large

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 21, 2023

view of the whole area, as a region not necessarily just one location, and plans don't get as far as engineering designs go.

Larson commented that he has a similar area on the East Grand Forks side. He said that there are specific areas where he is interested in learning more about enhancing bike ability on the roads, Bygland Road in particular, as well as the Louie Murray Bridge. He stated that he is trying to take the zoomed-out view, of course this is a Master Plan, but what is the process after this is finalized for the city or the MPO to start looking at specific areas or connections or trail extensions that would start to march us towards an engineered drawing at the end. Halford responded that there are a couple of different ways you can look at the opportunities when you are about to rehab or construct a street project or something like that, or you can also look at how can we accommodate all users and abilities and put that infrastructure in, that is usually the cheaper way, or take a project out of this plan and look at it as something we can implement and it is either getting a suggestion to City staff that you want to look at it further as something we can do in the near future and then start looking at it, but as it comes to the MPO, we could either look at something and further study it for a corridor like we did, and have those public input opportunities and do a study but when it starts going to the drawings and things like that that would be up to the cities and their staff to take it to that level. Larson said that he is just getting put to speed on the transition from MPO to the City, where that dividing line is, so this is helpful.

Vetter said that this is just a preliminary document so we will come with a final document that will have things like here is a corridor that we are recommending a bike path or a walk path or something along those lines, or we are recommending connectivity in the greenway from this point to this point, that is going to be in the final document correct. Halford responded that what we have right now on-line is the final document, the final final unless as we go through these different committees a big change is necessary, but as of now this is the final draft unless we hear otherwise. Vetter asked if we are approving anything today then. Halford responded that this is just preliminary approval of the draft final plan, but it will come back for final approval in July at which time you will hear of any changes that might be made as it goes through the process. Vetter said that he hasn't had time to look at it on-line, is it something different than what we are seeing today. Halford responded that it is the same as what you are seeing today. Vetter stated, though, that this doesn't really give us specific recommendations for corridors. Halford responded that this is a high-view of what is in the document, the document is a couple hundred pages, and it has the Safe Routes to School maps in it, and the different studies at the different schools, so there is more information, this is a really high-overview presentation so she would encourage you to look on the website and look through the document. She added that there is really good information, what they have been hearing is a lot of positive feedback, including from city staff from both sides being part of the conversation, so it has been a really good collaboration, a lot of people joining in the conversation. She said that this was the first time we used a consultant, it has always been done in-house with MPO staff, so she thinks it has been a good first-time kind of giving it a really good scrub and getting some other good input.

Christianson said, then, that the plan that is on-line has all those maps, it has the proposed bike network; what is existing, where we are proposing filling gaps, what we've proposed those gaps

to be whether it be a shared use path on the side of the road, or a sidewalk, or some sort of on-street bike lane, so that is kind of where this plans stops, at that high-level based on a number of factors, this is what we suggest, and then it falls on the cities to say that these are our top three priority ones, either we have a plan to go ahead and get this done or we need to study this to figure out exactly what this corridor is going to look like.

MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY LARSON, TO GRANT PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE GRAND FORKS-EAST GRAND FORKS BIKE AND PEDESTRIAN PLAN UPDATE, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Rustad.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2023-2024 T.I.P. AMENDMENT #4

Kouba reported that as you know we can adopt a T.I.P. and then there are changes made to projects in that document that require an amendment be made.

Kouba stated that MnDOT came to us and said that they had been looking over things and were starting their process to do some improvements along DeMers Avenue, specifically to the signals on 2nd and 4th, and found that changes were necessary to the project description and cost estimates.

Kouba explained that earlier there were some ADA roadway improvements and things like that, but they didn't update the signals at the same time. She said that this project had originally included those, the costs for those actual updates, so they reviewed this and as they were going through it they realized that they had already done those projects, so we need to adjust the cost of that particular project itself, so that is what we are doing today. She said that they asked us to change the cost from \$1.2 million dollars to \$700,000 just for the signal improvements.

Kouba stated that the reason we are going through a full amendment process is because the change in cost is over the 25% limit for cost changes we are allowed in order to do just an administrative amendment.

Kouba said that the project will be done in 2024, but MnDOT wants to bid the project in 2023, so that is why we are doing the amendment now. She added that the request is to just make that change in our T.I.P. and the Technical Advisory Committee recommended approval of the change.

Strandell asked where the money comes from for this project. Kouba responded that most of the funding will be federal dollars, as well as some state and local dollars. She commented that the local share will be higher due to the legs being on the local side. She explained that the way

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Minnesota does it is they bill the locals for their share, which are the legs that aren't on the Minnesota State roadway. Strandell said then that this is not a city project, it must be a state project. Kouba responded that it is a state project; the city does take part financially in the project though.

Vetter commented that there are four lanes, if you want to look at it that way, two are the states and two are the cities and we are picking up a hefty share of the bill, how does that work out. Kouba responded that she isn't sure exactly how they split the costs, she can definitely have your engineer talk to the District Engineer. Vetter asked if we could switch these dollar amounts and approve it that way. He asked who came up with the dollar amounts. Kouba responded that MnDOT is the one who came up with the dollar amounts, they have their formula that they follow, but we definitely can talk to the District Engineer. Vetter stated that he wouldn't approve it this way; from an MPO standpoint he understands, but he is also a city representative, and he can't approve it this way, so if we vote on it today you will get a no from him. Kouba said that she will let MnDOT know.

Larson asked if we are acting on this. Kouba responded that the recommendation is to approve the change to the T.I.P., which is the change in cost from \$1.2 million to \$700,000. Powers said then that the change is to actually decrease the cost of the project. Kouba responded that that is correct. She explained that the cost is decreasing because they have already made the ADA improvements, so they are updating the project to just the cost of the signals. Larson said he has a question on the process; Mr. Vetter has it right, it is a bad deal for the City of East Grand Forks, but if this fails, yet to be determined, what happens after that, do you go back and renegotiate and then bring it back to this board. Kouba responded that staff can discuss that with the state, but as she said, this has generally been the formula they use for how they deal with all these projects that have city legs onto their roadways, but this will definitely be part of her letter to the state when we let them know what happened here. Larson said that he understands that you don't know how the state is going to respond, that is very fair; have we ever gone through this before where we decline to approve an amendment, and we get feedback from the state. Kouba responded that we have never had that happen, but there is always a first time.

Vetter asked what kind of timeline we have; can we table it and then go back to them to look at those costs and bring it back to us without denying it. Kouba responded that she doesn't see why we can't do that, but they are wanting to let this project in August, so it has to go through the state process as well, so that is also a month-long process, so it is already cutting a fine line for letting it in August.

MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY LARSON, TO TABLE THE 2023-2026 T.I.P. AMENDMENT #4 TO JULY.

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

Voting Nay: Strandell.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Rustad.

Grasser suggested that he thinks what he is hearing, where some of the problem might be is that the City of East Grand Forks is already made an investment that they have to redo, and it maybe fits outside the norms of how the state sometimes does their calculation, but it sounds like the city should receive a credit for work that they previously did. He stated that they have some of the same frustrations sometimes on the other side where they think they have 80% of the system ADA compliant and some judge makes a ruling someplace and all of a sudden he is back to being 20% compliant on his ADA ramps, and who has to bear the burden. He said that he thinks that if he is interpreting or hearing things right, he thinks that that might be part of the issue, so it might be a gray area, and he is suggesting that in the Minnesota DOT process maybe they might be open to exploring some of that.

Kouba commented that MnDOT is looking at the project itself and the cost of overall projects, so they deducted that cost of all those ADA updates already, that is what this particular change is about, that those costs were already done so they are only looking at the signal portion of the project now. She added that MnDOT has been doing some interesting things, there are some other issues with the transit that she is sure Nancy Ellis has brought up, which are similar to what we are talking about in the cost division as well.

Strandell commented that he mis-voted in case you want to know that.

Powers said, then, that the amendment process will need a public hearing, that will happen in probably August. Kouba responded that this particular item had a public hearing at our Technical Advisory Committee meeting, so it has had a public hearing already and there were no comments on the change. Grasser stated, though, that the Technical Advisory Committee wouldn't probably be delving into all the financial pieces of it, right. Kouba responded that is correct, even though this is technically a financial change in the T.I.P.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF A.T.A.C. CONTRACT AMENDMENT

Halford reported that we amended this contract at the beginning of the year to extend this contract out a couple of months, but really should have extended the contract out to the end of the year. She explained that this extension allows for A.T.A.C. to help us with the finalization of the Street and Highway Plan. There is no additional cost to the amendment, we just wanted them to be available to help with the Street and Highway plan.

Halford stated that she did share this with the Technical Advisory Committee as an informational item only and they agreed that this was a good move, but we do need approval from the Executive Policy Board.

MOVED BY LARSON, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE A.T.A.C. CONTRACT, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Rustad.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF NDDOT CONTRACT AMENDMENT

Halford reported that the NDDOT has been doing two-year contracts. She said that on the Minnesota side they have been doing one-year contracts, and now the NDDOT wants to start doing one-year contracts as well so that is what this amendment is for.

Halford commented that currently we started a two-year contract and now they want to go back and do an amendment so this is a new contract for FY 2023 and in a couple of months we will see a contract for FY 2024, so that is what the amendment is for.

Halford stated that the Technical Advisory Committee did see this as well, so they are aware of it, and on the MPO side, for staff this is nothing new as Minnesota has been doing one-year contracts as well.

Halford said that she does need Warren's signature on it in addition to hers so that is why we need to approve this item. Strandell asked if we have that document now. Halford responded that it will be done on Docu-Sign.

Halford commented that she does have a clarifying point; we are going to continue to do a two-year work program, we won't change that to a yearly thing, and it will probably be done more like how we do our T.I.P.s, where it will be a rolling two years, but we won't finish one out for two-years but every year we will update it so it is always a continuous two years looking to the future, so that won't change, but the financial contracts will be yearly now.

MOVED BY LUNSKI, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE NDDOT CONTRACT, AS PRESENTED.

Grasser said that he has a comment, just a preference maybe himself, he would prefer to see, if it ends up on the board as an action item, that it is consistent with the Technical Advisory Committee, he is a little uncomfortable with information only on one side and action on the other, he would just prefer to see it consistent through the process. Halford responded that staff can do that.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Rustad.

NON-ACTION ITEMS:

MATTER OF PROTECT GRANT SOLICITATION

Kouba reported that this is one of the new sources of funding, of federal funding, it is the Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-Saving Transportation Program, so that is where we get PROTECT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Kouba said that Northwest Minnesota Area Transportation Partnership, or ATP-2 announced on May 19th that they were soliciting for projects for FY 2024 and FY 2025. She stated that each year has \$500,000 available. She pointed out that she did attach the application itself and she has additional information available to help staff if they see things, but she wanted the board to know about it, especially what types of projects are eligible, which are listed in the staff report. She added that they are looking, as well, at evacuation routes and emergency routes as well, so making sure the transportation network is as resilient as possible for moving people in and out of hazardous areas or any kind of mitigation areas that are needed to be happening.

Kouba said that the applications are due to the MPO by July 26th so that we can have it through our August meeting. She added that the projects would be ranked or prioritized in this process, but then once it gets to the ATP it will then be re-ranked with all the other projects throughout the ATP area. She stated that they are looking at an August 18th deadline for submittal of applications to the ATP.

Larson stated that this made him think of some of the flooding that we had in the spring of 2022 on the north end of East Grand Forks where we had quite a few local streets inundated, and some major roads as well. He said that he doesn't know if Jason and their engineering department have been involved in this or not yet, but there is a very short timeline here, do you know what needs to be in the application, he would assume they aren't looking for engineered drawings at this time. Kouba responded that she can't remember off the top of her head, but she did include the application itself, which has a lot of information. She pointed out that you do need to be able to put in some information as to why you are doing it, and what you are trying to achieve as well. She said that there is a 20% local match, so there is that as well, so balancing out the cost of everything you need before you get the actual project, and your staff will definitely investigate it. Powers asked what exactly is this referring to. Kouba stated the bottoms of the bridges. Powers asked if they didn't just do some of that, on DeMers. Kouba asked if he was talking about on the bridge. Powers said he was. Kouba responded that they did rehabilitations, some painting, things of that nature on the Sorlie Bridge. Powers stated that they did something on the Sorlie a couple of weeks ago, but maybe it was the North Dakota side. Kouba responded that it might be something different that they were doing, it might have been emergency repairs as well for what happened during the flood.

Larson asked if this short timeline is fairly common. Kouba responded that it isn't common but because it is a new program we are still feeling it out and it is also one of the reasons why we are having two years of funding available out there so that we can jump start the program and then the idea is that we can then have a consistent time-frame to be able to get those projects together in a timely manner. Halford asked if he was asking about grants in general, the quick timeline, because they can be quick. Larson said he was, that it just seemed tight to get this together if it has to be approved by the City Council and whatnot, it has to go pretty quick. Halford said that that is why as soon as we get ahold of it and know that it has to go through our process, we try to let you know as soon as we can, we don't sit on it. Kouba added that they do let the staff know about it as well so they can at least start the process.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON STREET/HIGHWAY PLAN WITH MODELING

Kouba reported that we are working our way through our Street and Highway Plan, and Jason Carbee with HDR is present today to give a brief overview of where they are at with the Street and Highway Plan Update. She added that we finally got our modeling information, and we also had pulled together a few other informational items and we wanted to present it to various bodies. She said that at the Technical Advisory Committee they had a slightly modified version of the presentation, delving more into the model itself, just because they have a more technical background, but we hope to give a good overview of what we talked about at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

Carbee referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request).

Carbee said that he will give a quick update on where they have been with the plan so far, and where they are heading. He stated that he will talk a little bit about the Travel Demand Model, keeping it high level, but if you do have questions they can get into a little bit more detail, and then talk about what the model is kind of telling us.

Kouba commented that, as you know, our Metropolitan Transportation Plan is updated every five years, and in the past we have always kind of chunked it out into three separate projects; the Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan, the Transit Development Plan, and the Street and Highway Plan, and then all of them are kind grouped together and that is what creates our Metropolitan Transportation Plan, and in that plan we are always referencing these individual plans.

Carbee stated that there has been a lot of, Cody was talking about the Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan, there has been a lot in the Transit Development Plan, lots of corridor studies on both sides of the river, things to look at that gives us little bit more detail and a more complete picture on where the system is now so they've reviewed those other plans and have gone through all the data that is available on both sides to get an idea on safety, mobility, connectivity, where the system is today. He said that they are working on incorporating the federal guidance in, and they did have a public meeting in November, but that first set of input and evaluations really helped them frame goals and objectives that are going to help drive and be the framework for how they develop the Street and Highway Plan.

Carbee said that they did have that first round of public engagement with their Stakeholder Group and a public open house as well, both of them were held at the East Grand Forks Public Library in November. He stated that key things that they heard from both groups were that safety was a priority, that we need to focus on efficiency and reliability so when we are going from Point A to Point B we know exactly how much time it should take because it is important for businesses and for residents. He said that they then did hear on the Street and Highway Plan that bicycle and pedestrian connections were important as well.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Carbee referred to the Goals and Objectives slide and said that he isn't going to go into all the detail here just to say that we've got five goal areas, and he will go through those really quick, but with each of those goal areas they kind of developed objectives to kind of help them measure which projects might be more successful in meeting our goals from both a local perspective and making sure we are hitting those federal perspectives as well. He stated that those five goal areas are: 1) Efficient and Reliable System; 2) Safe System; 3) Connected and Accessible; 4) Preserve and Maintain to take care of what we have out there today; and 5) Sustainability and Resiliency and we were just talking about the PROTECT Program so clearly that is a priority not only here locally but at the federal level as well.

Carbee referred to the Baseline Conditions Progress slide and commented that he talked about some of this but basically they have gone through kind of that baseline of okay, where is the system today, what condition are things in, where do we have crash and safety issues, where do we maybe have a little bit of congestion or a little bit of reliability issues, but then we are going to look at the future growth and identify how that growth might, in the long term, affect where we are going to run into some transportation system issues we might want to start planning for and getting ahead of.

Carbee stated that he is going to do a really high-level overview of the Traffic Demand Model. He said that essentially the Travel Demand Model is a decision making tool, it is based on national best practices but then it takes local data and tries to simulate how the transportation system and land use, where people live, how many people live in those places, where they work, it tries to simulate all that interaction and so what they do is they go through and see how this model does representing what is happening out there today, we know how much traffic is on DeMers right outside the building here, with that model how well we are doing so we kind of turn some knobs and make it like a locally tailored model, and then it allows us to look at "what if" scenarios. He said that what we are really worried about is as we grow where do we need to start thinking about where are we going to run into issues, where are we going to start making investments and where do we need to prioritize that. He added that the MPO kind of maintains the model that A.T.A.C. builds, and we are using it for the Street and Highway Plan.

Kouba referred to the Growth in MPO Area Households and Employment 2020-2050 slides and stated that what we are looking at here is housing and job growth. She said that this is the information that they received from working on the Land Use Plans. She added that the Land Use Plans, from a city perspective, help guide where the City is going to grow into the future, but for the MPO that population, where they are expecting population, how much population is expected, as well as how much job growth is expected, and where it will be located throughout the region.

Carbee stated that with all that growth that we are anticipating, referring to the MPO Area Forecasted Traffic Levels Future Year 2050 slide, he thinks it is probably beneficial to look at where we have the most growth. He referred to the map and stated that the darkest lines, the brownest, are growing by 10,000 vehicles a day, is what they are projecting, so it lines up really well with the land use Teri is talking about, with the growth in households, a lot of it to the south and southwest portions of Grand Forks and then some of the employment growth they have all

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 21, 2023

along the western fringe and then over on the eastern portion of East Grand Forks and some of that housing growth a little bit on the north and south sides of East Grand Forks.

Carbee said that you can see some corridors are anticipated to grow by 10,000 ADT a day, just for reference kind of the highest volumes in the metro area today are about 25,000, maybe up to 30,000 ADT typically, and so you see all that growth, including 12th Avenue South, or Merrifield Road, where we are looking at some pretty high volume growth all the way down to Merrifield Road, and we are seeing DeMers growing, over across the bridge into East Grand Forks.

Carbee referred to the MPO Area Forecasted Level-Of-Service Future Year 2050 slide and explained that the red and orange lines are areas where we have some pretty serious congestion during the peak hour in the future and so we see a lot of those roads that today are rural two-lane roads and this is, again, a scenario where we don't make any improvements beyond what we are anticipating are programmed over the next five years. He added that we see a lot, especially in the south Grand Forks area, a lot of congestion if we don't do anything about it, and we do see growth on 47th Avenue South, again we have some congestion on DeMers through the downtown across the bridge, on 4th Avenue South across the Point Bridge, and then Washington and Columbia Roads both continue to the south and Gateway to the north.

Carbee stated that this is a kind of high-level overview of what they are seeing from the model. He referred to the 2050 Street and Highway Plan Schedule slide and said that from here on out they are basically, from now to the end of the year, spending time finalizing the plan. He stated that there is an open house over at the Empire on DeMers, hoping to get some folks to give them ideas, they've got some strategies, you know give folks the "hey, given the information we are showing you what do you think works, what is your preferred option for kind of dealing with some of these issues we are pointing out", and then kind of developing those alternatives in the next couple of months, look at what does the project list look like, where are our priorities, and the financial part of this is important, this has to be fiscally constrained, but then we are going to make a list that is also going to include things that we don't necessarily think federal dollars can pay for but are still local priorities, things that are important to both communities.

Carbee pointed out that in October they will have another open house that will show some of these preliminary ideas to get feedback, and then they will wrap up the plan by the end of the year.

Carbee stated that, again, just to plug the open house, and the MPO has been doing a good job of getting the word out on that, great space over at the Empire for folks to drop in, open house format so 4:00 to 6:00 p.m., pretty flexible, they have some boards with some information and some activities to kind of get input from those that are able to attend. He added that the materials will be on the website as well.

Information only.

**MATTER OF MINNESOTA CARBON REDUCTION STRATEGY
PRESENTATION**

Anna Pierce, MnDOT, was present for a brief presentation on Minnesota Carbon Reduction Strategy. She said that she is going to just give, in the interest of time, a brief overview of what the presentation is, and she thinks that Peggy said that she was able to send out the presentation to the board to watch on their own time, is that accurate. Halford responded that it was e-mailed out to the board earlier and she hopes they had a chance to review it.

Pierce stated that she just wants to give a very high overview of kind of what you can expect. She introduced herself, stating that some may know me or met her through the MPO Coordinator role she was previously in with MnDOT, but right now she is working at the Interim Sustainability Program Lead in the Office of Sustainability of Public Health and she is also the Carbon Reduction Program Coordinator, and what that means is that her responsibility is to be work with each of the MPOs on the development of the Carbon Reduction Strategy, that guides how we program carbon reduction program funds as well as interstate funds to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions from surface transportation, and at a high level the strategy document is a required document that is due to Federal Highway so each DOT is preparing one of these and it is due no later than November 15th of this year, and as such our engagement timeline is super super tight, and they are trying to work with each of the MPO Policy Boards to really gain some insight from each of you at a policy level on how they should be moving forward and reducing carbon in the State of Minnesota.

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

Pierce referred to the Agenda slide and commented that you will see the agenda in the presentation, which is fourteen and a half minutes long, but there will be a brief background that will provide you the Carbon Reduction Strategy Public Engagement they are doing and the approach, most of which will be wrapping up here on July 14th, and then it talks about our next steps for where we are going with things as well as then it will walk you through the Carbon Reduction Strategies and the Categories, for which she will provide very key points, and then it wraps up with the Mentimeter activity, which will only take about five minutes, there are only seven questions, but it will provide them with some insight as to how your area wants to prioritize projects that reduce carbon emissions.

Pierce referred to the Key Points slide and said that she really just wants to focus on these for each of you, so if you take away anything from today, the document is a required document, Carbon Reduction Strategy and it is due by November 15th, and it will identify how we reduce carbon emissions from the surface transportation sector, and they are doing engagements with the MPOs as it is a requirement of the program and also it is really key for them, in Minnesota we think of you as partners, and they want to make sure they are consistent between their regional and statewide approaches to reduce carbon emissions.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 21, 2023

Pierce referred to the next slide and commented that this is a very high-level outline of what the Carbon Reduction Strategy document kind of lays out. She said that they have a high-level goal of reducing transportation emissions, then they are breaking it out by three categories, as illustrated by Category A, B, and C. She stated that these, then, they are getting from that Mentimeter Activity, your input will help identify what those categories are; right now it is looking like at least one of them will be electrification as a high level category, and then a second one will be travel choices which will cover bicycle and pedestrian and transit improvements, as well as mode shift away from single occupancy vehicles, and then the third category that you will see in the Mentimeter Activities really are looking at more maintenance activities and the construction, and we can look a system preservation potentially, so trying to get your input on that.

Pierce stated that each category will identify two or more strategies, illustrated by the purple drop-down boxes. She said that there could be anywhere up to even seven strategies to reducing carbon emissions that support those overarching categories, and then following the identification of those strategies, they are creating methodologies for calculating carbon emissions that will really help them guide and understand how they are impacting the total transportation emissions from each of those categories in their sector.

Pierce said that, finally, as part of this each of the strategies will then also identify what project types would support the strategies and subsequently those high level categories, so if you think about a project like say a transit hub improvement, say they want to see one in East Grand Forks, how would you be able to theoretically compare that project to lets say the purchase of an electric fleet vehicle for the City of East Grand Forks, how would you be able to compare those projects for their reduction of transportation emissions. She said that the electrification category may fit the electric fleet vehicle and so those types of projects would be able to be weighed against each other versus having a transit hub improvement, you could look at that compared to potentially a shared use path type of project or something along those lines that would fit more along travel choices as a category, those are just a couple of examples, but then each of the projects would identify if it would be eligible for carbon reduction program funds, lets say NEVI funds, PROTECT funds, Surface Transportation Block Grant funds, or Transportation Block Grant funds, or Transportation Alternative funds, or other types of funding that might be available, so any one project may be eligible for one of many types of funding sources, so ultimately the hope is that you would be able to, as a Board, and your Technical Advisory Committee would be able to help you make recommendations as to how you would program those projects with the best possible pots of funds.

Pierce stated that that was her super high-level overview of key points, and she would ask again that you please take like fifteen minutes to review the presentation and answer those quick questions on the Mentimeter. She said that the specific link and code for your area is: <https://www.menti.com/bloww52i29mn>, Code: 9805 7991; and she can provide those results back to Stephanie so she can share them with you as to what you all prioritize for your region, so as you are selecting projects you can refine them to be more specific to you. She stated that she would be providing an update as they get further into this project, but the draft plan is anticipated to be ready in early August, and then it will go through their review process for input as well.

Pierce shared her contact information and the Carbon Reduction Strategy Website Link:

Anna.m.pierce@state.mn.us

<https://talk.dot.state.mn.us/carbon-reduction-strategy>

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

A) 2022/2023 Annual Work Program Project Update:

- 1) Bike and Pedestrian Plan Update – Halford stated we already discussed this item.
- 2) Street and Highway Plan/MTP – Halford stated we already discussed this item.
- 3) Aerial Imagery – Halford reported that they are looking through the data that we have received and it is on track for delivery in August.
- 4) Safe Streets For All – Halford stated that we have been going back and forth with our Federal Partners on the Agreement/Contract. She said that we currently have a good draft agreement, but she wants to meet with Nancy Ellis with East Grand Forks and David Kuharenko with Grand Forks because they were big players on putting this application together in the beginning, she wants their eyes on it too before she signs anything. She said that what she heard is that once we pass that on to our Federal Partners there will be around a thirty-day timeline before we see it again, or we will get a contract that starts and then we can put an RFP out and start doing that whole process for our Safe Street For All plan and Safety Action Plan for the MPO area.

B) MPO Updates:

- 1) Mid-Year Review – Halford reported that we do have our Mid-Year Review next Monday, that would be with some DOT and Federal Partners, and we will sit in a room for half a day and kind of go over some stuff, so she will provide an update on how that goes at your next meeting.
- 2) Transportation Planner/Senior Planner – Halford reported that we received eight applications and she reached out to three people to do an interview, and so far she has had two responses, one declined as they already took another job, one responded and said they are interested in doing an interview, and the third hasn't responded. She said that she has reached out to a couple other partners to keep pushing it out because she did put in the announcement that it would be left open until filled, so if we can't find someone in this round we will just keep pushing.
- 3) July TAC Agenda – Halford stated that we will be looking at final approval of the Bike/Ped Plan Update, UND Intern update on the study he is doing, Urban Boundary Map Update, approval of MPO Self-Certification.

C) Agency Updates:

- 1) City of Grand Forks – Grasser said that you probably saw the announcement that Grand Forks received a \$30 million dollar grant to help fund the 42nd Street Grade Separation Crossing. He said that those are always sometimes a good news/bad news thing, they got what they asked for but now they wonder how they take care of what they asked for. He stated that financially it is going to be a big strain the process, they are also moving positively forward on an interchange. He said that they received some communication just a couple of days ago from the DOT, and you can already see how they are starting to rearrange major projects in Grand Forks around, he is assuming part of what they are doing is trying to make their cash flow work out absorbing this big project, to move others around and spreading them out a little bit, and we are probably going to have to do some of the same, so there will be some amendments coming through he is sure in the near term and that is what is going to drive a lot of these things being shifted around to try to accommodate timelines and funding issues.

Strandell asked if the \$30 million will cover the cost of the project. Grasser responded that it will probably cover a good share of the construction, but the problem with any of these projects, especially federal projects, is that you've got almost as much invested up front in getting things to a point of getting and constructing, as the actual project itself. He said that you probably heard him say before, like on bike paths, they have gone with their own internal analysis, and by the time you add all the administrative things that go on in asking for bike path money, they can almost do it locally themselves at about the same local cost. He stated that the big one on the underpass is going to be do we affect the golf course, do we impact the gas station; we are going to impact them both, do we more impact the golf course or do we more impact the gas station, and that is one of the things the city council will have to decide.

Grasser said that this is just a heads up, it is big news for them, and it will get a project off the books that has been on there for a million years, hopefully.

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

STRANDELL ADJOURNED THE JUNE 21ST, 2023, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:25 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager

Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO
Transaction List by Vendor
 May 13 through June 16, 2023

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
AFLAC.							
Liability Check	05/26/2023	AFLAC	501	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-564.40
Alerus Financial							
Liability Check	05/26/2023	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-2,311.70
Liability Check	06/09/2023	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,318.56
Bolton & Menk							
Bill Pmt -Check	05/17/2023		VOID: Adjust...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	0.00
Brady Martz							
Bill	05/23/2023	Inv. #...	2022 MPO Au...	206 · Accounts Pay...		515 · Financial...	-8,000.00
Bill Pmt -Check	05/23/2023	7428	2022 MPO Au...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-8,000.00
Constant Contact							
Check	06/01/2023	Const...	For 6/1/2023 ...	104 · Checking		517 · Overhead	-20.00
Elan Financial Services							
Bill	06/14/2023	Acct #...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		-SPLIT-	-859.63
Bill Pmt -Check	06/14/2023	7435	Charges For ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-859.63
Bill	06/14/2023	Acct #...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		-SPLIT-	-566.39
Bill Pmt -Check	06/14/2023	7436	Charges For ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-566.39
HDR Engineering, Inc.							
Bill	05/23/2023	Inv. #...	Work On St/H...	206 · Accounts Pay...		545 · Transpor...	-10,013.52
Bill Pmt -Check	05/23/2023	7429	Work On St/H...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-10,013.52
Bill	05/23/2023	Inv. #...	Work On St/H...	206 · Accounts Pay...		545 · Transpor...	-7,788.13
Bill Pmt -Check	05/23/2023	7431	Work On St/H...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-7,788.13
Liberty Business Systems, Inc.							
Bill	06/07/2023	Inv. #...	Contract Bas...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-261.62
Bill Pmt -Check	06/07/2023	7432	Contract Bas...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-261.62
LSNB as Trustee for PEHP							
Liability Check	05/26/2023	PEHP		104 · Checking	X	216 · Post-Hea...	-123.75
Madison Nat'l Life							
Liability Check	05/26/2023	7425		104 · Checking	X	215 · Disability...	-61.88
MetLife							
Liability Check	05/26/2023	7426	5397942	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-252.39
Mike's							
Bill	05/17/2023		MPO Lunche...	206 · Accounts Pay...		711 · Miscellan...	-110.00
Bill Pmt -Check	05/17/2023	7424	MPO Lunche...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-110.00
Minnesota Department of Revenue							
Liability Check	05/26/2023	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-487.00
Liability Check	06/09/2023	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-488.00
Minnesota Life Insurance Company							
Liability Check	05/26/2023	7427		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-105.95
Nationwide Retirement Solutions							
Liability Check	05/26/2023	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-538.36
Liability Check	06/09/2023	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-538.36
NDPERS							
Liability Check	05/26/2023	NDPE...	D88	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-3,194.84
Liability Check	06/09/2023	NDPE...		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-4,329.78
QuickBooks Payroll Service							
Liability Check	05/25/2023		Created by P...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-6,383.22
Liability Check	06/08/2023		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-6,459.52
Stephanie Halford							
Bill	06/13/2023		Reimburse Mi...	206 · Accounts Pay...		530 · Educatio...	-65.00
Bill Pmt -Check	06/13/2023	7433	Reimburse Mi...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-65.00
University of North Dakota							
Bill	06/13/2023		Work On GF ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		565 · Special ...	-1,225.52
Bill Pmt -Check	06/13/2023	7434	Work On GF ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-1,225.52
Urban SDK, Inc.							
Bill	05/23/2023	Inv. #...	Annual Softw...	206 · Accounts Pay...		570 · Plan Mon...	-24,500.00
Bill Pmt -Check	05/23/2023	7430	Annual Softw...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-24,500.00