

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, September 20, 2023 - 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks Training Conference Room/Zoom Meeting**

CALL TO ORDER

Clarence Vetter, Past Chairperson, called the September 20th, 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: Brian Larson, Mike Powers, Clarence Vetter, Al Grasser, Tricia Lunski, and Ken Vein.

Absent: Warren Strandell and Mark Rustad.

Staff present: Stephanie Halford, Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Tyler Manske, GF/EGF Planner; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Vetter declared a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW MPO EMPLOYEE – TYLER MANSKE

Vetter introduced Tyler Manske and asked him to give the board a brief background of himself.

Manske said that today is his third day as the new planner for the MPO, and just to give you a short background he went to Valley City for a degree in Music Education, but the majority of his professional career has been in marketing, advertising, and communications. He stated that he worked for the Grand Forks Herald selling advertising for a few years, and his most recent employment was with Grand Forks Public Health, starting in 2020 so he got a crash course in communications, if you will, for the last three years, so he is excited to take those skills and passions for Public Health and translate it into the MPO.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 16TH, 2023 MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY LUNSKI, TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 16TH, 2023, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AUGUST 12TH, TO SEPTEMBER 15TH, 2023
BILLS/CHECKS**

***MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 12TH,
TO SEPTEMBER 15TH, 2023 BILLS/CHECKS, AS PRESENTED.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AUGUST 12TH, TO SEPTEMBER 15TH, 2023 LIST OF
ITEMS SIGNED AND APPROVED BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

Halford reported that this is just an item to make sure that we are doing what we need to do to ensure that all financial/business transactions are reviewed and approved.

***MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 12TH, TO
SEPTEMBER 15TH, 2023 LIST OF ITEMS SIGNED AND APPROVED BY EXECUTIVE
DIRECTOR.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ACTION ITEMS:

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATION TO THE 2023-
2026 T.I.P.**

Kouba reported that this was added with extremely short notice. She explained that the MnDOT asked us, literally a week ago, to update their T.I.P. information. She said that they had a reconstruction project on USHwy220 that had an estimate of \$19,000,000 and then their estimators came back and said that that was too high and that it should be \$15,500,000 so they requested this be changed in our 2023-2026 T.I.P.

Kouba stated that because of the short notice we had to do a special Technical Advisory Committee meeting via e-mail to get their approval of the amendment in order to get it on the Executive Policy Board agenda for action as well as to meet our policy and procedures requirements. She said that we did get approval with nine Technical Advisory Committee members giving their approval of the modification to the T.I.P. She added that the cost change is under 25% so it can be done with an administrative modification, and staff is asking for approval from the Executive Policy Board. Halford commented that there is no local share with this project.

***MOVED BY LARSON, SECONDED BY LUNSKI, TO APPROVE THE ADMINISTRATIVE
MODIFICATION TO THE 2023-2026 T.I.P., AS PRESENTED.***

Grasser asked, just out of professional curiosity, when is this going to be bid. Kouba responded that the bid opening is in October. Halford said that is why there was such a quick turnaround.

Grasser said that he is just really curious whose opinion, whose estimate is going to be closer. Kouba stated that Jon Mason is online, the audio isn't great, but in October they will be bidding this and moving forward. Mason said that he can answer any questions if anybody has any.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Strandell and Rustad.

NON-ACTION ITEMS:

MATTER OF STREET AND HIGHWAY UPDATE

Kouba reported that this is mostly to keep everyone up to date on the progress with our Street and Highway Plan. She said that HDR did give a presentation to both city councils, so this one is going to be pretty similar so those that attended one of those meetings will probably get a refresher. She stated that the only changes will be any kind of input we received from the city council members, it is pretty straightforward.

Kouba stated that they have the Travel Demand Model results, and they also managed to do future forecasting for those travel demand models, and they were doing some scenario planning for projects.

Kouba referred to the Model Run – No Build Results slide and reported that it shows the model results that they got just by doing a future forecast, so taking today's network and doing absolutely nothing with it, and you can see there are various areas with a high increase in traffic, particularly on Gateway, sections of Washington south of DeMers, as well as sections of Columbia south of DeMers. She said that as we move forward, they will also put in the 47th Avenue Interchange, so you can see an increase in that area as well, but it is mostly due to the fact that we are going from nothing to traffic using that interchange.

Kouba referred to the Strategy Types slide and stated that basically they have been presenting all of this information in the realm of these strategies of maintenance/state of good repair projects, keeping roads maintained in the best condition possible. She added that they are also looking at operations and safety, kind of looking at how we can use technology and other safer geometries as well as limited to no widening of roads, so on a roadway like Washington, it is difficult to widen it more than it already is due to the close proximity of buildings to the road. She said that in new areas we definitely want to look at widening roads and changing them from two lane no shoulder roadways to three or four lane roadways. She said that they are looking at new streets in new growth areas, as they are needed, and also looking at the possibility of how a south end bridge or a Merrifield Bridge will help move traffic around the cities much better. She stated that there is also paving existing gravel roads in growth areas and industrial parks.

Kouba referred to the Street and Highway Plan Draft Vision Plan slide and stated that this is the project list, kind of a universe of all the projects that might possibly be needed in the next

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 20, 2023

twenty-plus years, and of course we are looking at, as the city grows further south, that there might be some additional collector type roads that will need to be put in. She added that they are also looking at the gravel roads that might need to be built, as well as new roads in East Grand Forks, there is the 47th Avenue Interchange, and also there are the possibilities that we want to start looking at or thinking about as we move into the future as to how the railroad will interact with various roads that might be needed in the future that we want to plan for in the next twenty-plus years, as well as a few of the roadway improvements and signals and those types of things to move traffic a little bit smoother as well as to improve the safety aspect of those roadways as they become more congested.

Lunski referred to the map and asked what exactly the dark green means, operation/safety. Kouba responded that operation/safety, when we are looking at that we are looking at the traffic controls. She added that at some point the engineers are going to definitely decide which type of safety or traffic control is needed at an intersection, but we want to make sure that we are kind of putting it into the plan so they can make that decision at the time they feel it is needed, so whether they decide to use federal funding or local funding having it in this plan will ensure we have the availability of federal funding in the future. Lunski stated that this one is really confusing because if a bridge is built that makes great changes to those roads. Kouba responded that it can, but if we are looking at today's traffic there is still some congestion along Washington, especially south of DeMers, and sometimes that is just maintaining the signal timing and things like that, and you can use federal funding towards that as well. Lunski asked if this slide was in the presentation given to the city council. Kouba responded that it was but added that it might have been gone over as much, and it was not zoomed in on. Grasser added that, maybe expounding on that a bit, if we have to retime the corridor or whatever, say if we put in a new bridge, it will change all the corridors, it is at least an opportunity to potentially get federal funding to hire a consultant to basically come in there and reprogram corridors and things like that. He said that there of there was a change in federal law requiring pedestrian lead times or something like that, again it give us at least an opportunity then to get federal funding. Kouba said that the engineers, your city staff, are the ones that get to make the final decisions, we just want to make sure this plan incorporates kind of those possible ideas and how they choose to use or go after federal funding, although sometimes going after federal funding isn't necessarily cost effective, and we understand that as well, but we want to make sure that they have the ability to make that choice in how they spend their funding. Grasser commented that sometimes the individual programs may not be conducive to do some of the things that we might do but it would leave an open door here to have it be a possibility. Kouba agreed, adding that the biggest thing is having the possibility here would mean that we might have to do an amendment, but it still makes the process a lot quicker than just moving things around and making sure that everything is fiscally constrained in this plan.

Larson asked if he could ask that we look at a certain corridor. Kouba responded that she can zoom in on the map wherever you need her to. Larson stated that he is looking for county input, and asked if he could just show what he is questioning on the screen and pointed to where the potential future by-pass bridge would be located, at Merrifield. He referred to the map on the screen and pointed out that where this future bridge passes in Minnesota, the connection to Highway 2 is way back due to the angle of Highway 2, and he thinks the connection there is

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 20, 2023

missing from the overall study so he would like to suggest that if this is kind of a farm to market by-pass, a lot of trucks use it to get to American Crystal, other ways to get to East Grand Forks, that we include that in the study so that we can pick that up. He said that right now it is kind of mess, those different roads coming together in this general area, it isn't very efficient for truck traffic, so if you could get to 2 through 220, we don't want all these different movements here, and he doesn't want to miss that, he thinks it is an important corridor. Kouba responded that she thinks that in the overall planning they have it kind of as a straight shot, it is kind of hidden by this particular thing because this is highway 2 and it will come down, but we already know this is a pretty solid road, built so that no matter what she doesn't think the state would do any kind of improvements, it might be just kind of in signing and that type of thing. Larson stated that he thinks we need to look closely at where those roads all come together, it isn't practical that we can expect truck traffic will go down to Fisher and then come back to East Grand Forks, they are going to take the shortest path, or not use the by-pass, so if we miss this key piece of it he thinks we are missing the entire show, potentially. He added that he would agree that that north-south road is great, but where it splits into the pavement of 220, where we have that drainage ditch that cuts through there, he would make sure we look at that area, it would be ideal if that road just peeled into to 220, it would be a lot safer. Grasser said that it would be nice to have a tie that works itself better into the actual City of East Grand Forks also as opposed to everything routed out to Highway 2, which angles away kind of. Vetter asked if it was County 58 where the pointer is at. Kouba responded that it is, and pointed out that it is south of 220. Vetter said that trucks coming across the by-pass are going to go up 58th over to 220. Larson agreed and stated that he is just looking for a more efficient connection there right into 220 right by Simplot.

Larson asked Mr. Powers if there has been any discussion on the county side of streamlining the network out there. Powers responded that that would be a good question for Warren Strandell. He said that he knows they have talked about it. Larson stated that it is a bit of mess, you know we are used to a grid all the way across our rural area, this is not that, it all comes together awkwardly, and this would be the time to study it and look at property acquisition and make sure we that we get right to from a by-pass so this thing works, so if we could just pull that in so that that area is on the plan, he would appreciate it. Kouba responded that we would probably want to do an additional study just to make better connections, she doesn't believe we've moved forward with anything specific in any past plans, so it might be a good thing to study in the future. Larson said that he thinks it has to be part of the by-pass bridge, because if a by-pass bridge makes sense, this is why, we know all the trucks that aren't going through downtown Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, they are going to take this safe by-pass and keep going to this side of town. Halford stated that there is going to be a meeting with the consultant doing the bridge study in the next couple of weeks and that would be a good time to let them know about this and make sure that it gets on their radar.

Lunski asked if a bridge location will be included in the 2050 plan. Kouba responded that they are not planning on putting a location for a south end bridge, all they will reference is a south end bridge and just add a box because it will be somewhere in this area, but we don't know and it isn't in our purview to make that decision, it is a political decision, it is an engineering decision at the same time and we don't know what an environmental study will pull through that will have a far deeper engineering side to all of this then what we do on a planning level.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 20, 2023

Lunski asked about the meeting with the consultant in a couple of weeks. Halford responded that she saw the Doodle Poll that was sent out asking when people would be available for a meeting, but she doesn't know if they have decided on a date yet. She added that that was kind of a part of; depending on how far they go through that process, we will start highlighting, the engineering environmental to start pinpointing this is where you should put one or this is the most recommended spot, but it will still come down to both cities making a decision on whether or not they want to take that data or not and go with the data, and then there is always that political and/or emotional aspect on where we should put it.

Presentation continued.

Kouba referred to the 2035 Traffic Growth Compared to 2050 Traffic Growth slide and reported that one of the things they have done is, part of the reason why we are looking at traffic growth and things of that nature, is to also give our staff and TAC an idea of when we are seeing possible growth coming in so we can say that we don't need that type of project yet but we may need it by 2050, so they picked the halfway point which is 2035, and you can see where Belmont has increased traffic and by 2035 it is starting to increase even more, especially in the south end area. She said that, where Cherry hasn't started seeing a lot of increase in traffic, by 2050 we start to see more of an increase, we go from up to a 1,000 to 1,001 to 5,000, but we also see where Washington also starts to increase from 24th to the south and by 2050 we see even more of an increase in the area south of DeMers, where most of that area is more than 10,000 cars a day. She said that Columbia Road is another main roadway, and we see a lot of traffic at 17th, in that 10,000 range, and by 2050 it goes further north into the hospital area.

Kouba referred to the Model Run – Build Option 1 Results with Two Bridges slide and commented that knowing we are going to need some traffic operations, some calming, some different ways of looking at things, those are all projects that could be federally funded, so we looked into our projects and how some of the projects will work and we see some of that traffic volume, there is a decrease, the most decreases are shown in dark dark blue and those shown in the lighter blue are those with the least decreases. She pointed out that you do see decreases near both bridges and moving forward we have projects that we could possibly do to help mitigate any kind of other issues that are happening in the area. She added that what is interesting is that we see an increase, but it is comparing it to the base year she previously showed in the forecasted model.

Kouba referred to the Model Run – Build Option 2 Results with the Merrifield Road Bridge slide and stated that you can see traffic increasing, of course, along 58th, actually more onto Hwy220 as opposed to coming up further north. Vetter said that this one concerns him, especially with the traffic patterns on Byglund Road, Belmont showing a decrease with just the Merrifield Bridge, that is hard to swallow. He said that he would think that if you were going to have decreases on those roads the traffic would have to be going down to Merrifield and we don't see any increases on any of those roads going south, so he finds it hard to believe that those roads are going to see a decrease with the Merrifield Bridge. Kouba responded that it would be decreasing in relation to that future model; we have an increase but in comparison to that we wouldn't have as much of an increase so it would be kind of subtracting the main number that we saw minus what the

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 20, 2023

information is. She said that it is kind of confusing. Vetter stated that it is very confusing. Halford commented that it looks like Merrifield is solving all our problems but if you really look at the data it is 2050 numbers, what the volume is going to be, and those numbers would be decreasing by the amount shown, so if you compare that number to what it is now, it could be very similar to the volume we are seeing now or it could be a little bit more, but it is a decrease from the 2050 predicted volumes. Vetter asked what the heading is on this page. Kouba responded it is just the build the Merrifield Bridge, so basically, we are taking what we forecasted in the volume, which is the light beige number, and the purple number is what we have with all the traffic that increased without doing anything and the full build would be everything built and then with just the Merrifield Bridge, and then they subtracted it. She referred to the map and said that she can't zoom in any further, but that purple number subtracted is that number so when you subtract you get 4,800 so you are looking at. Vetter stated that most people, when they look at these, ask, where we are at now, what is projected out to 2050, and if we build a bridge what happens to those figures, and that isn't clear on this. Lunski agreed, adding that she thinks it is dangerous to put this out there because you are saying that if we build this Merrifield Bridge everything is going to go down and it's not. She added that she sees where you are coming from, but it isn't coming across. Larson said that he isn't 100 percent clear, is this compared to the do-nothing scenario, is that why we are seeing things get better than no bridge. Kouba responded that that is correct. Larson stated that that just flips the way you have to look at it, because there is the no bridge scenario where everything gets worse and then this is showing how it gets better if you add one bridge in this slide. Kouba responded that you subtract the number that you saw in the no build in 2050 and then subtract it from the amount of traffic that will come down that road, if there was a bridge there, and you end up with 2,000 less a day. Larson stated that he thinks we should look at how it is communicated for sure, it seems like it is too complicated, we have to reference back to a similar base line. Halford said that she picked that up when we presented it to the Grand Forks Council, and she is glad you guys brought it up because she was going to bring it up. Lunski stated that to go from dark red to real red because it isn't 10,000 it is 8,000, or whatever those numbers are, because now it looks like agreed that it looks Merrifield solves all our problems. Vetter agreed, so we don't need an inner-city bridge we can just do the Merrifield one. Kouba stated that the decrease is only between 1,000 and 4,999, and when you subtract the numbers, it is roughly 2,000 less in comparison.

Lunski asked, what if you did it the way everyone else interrupted it, so not the numbers it could be but the numbers from do nothing to just having the Merrifield, she thinks those numbers would still be red, it would just maybe be one shade lighter, she thinks that would be easier to understand. Larson said then you would be referencing back to today's numbers, so the no-build versus today, the two bridge versus today, and the one bridge versus today. Lunski commented that she thinks they are forecasted for 2050, right, so the forecasted numbers are for 2050, if you build the Merrifield bridge Belmont and Washington are still going to increase. Kouba referred to the map and pointed out how the changes occur and said that she can see that.

Grasser commented that he agrees that there may be better ways of graphically showing this, but it looked like it was, essentially the way he interprets partially some of this is that the Merrifield Road would offset the increase that was otherwise going to happen, it doesn't do anything to the traffic today, per sei, but it kind of offsets what otherwise would have been an increase, generally

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 20, 2023

speaking. Kouba responded that that is correct, in general, what ends up happening is that a lot of the changes that happen will end up offsetting a certain amount of the traffic that gets increased.

Vein stated that he thinks what makes this one confusing is, he doesn't know if they used this type of scenario five years ago or ten years ago, but he doesn't remember this level of confusion before, it seemed to be more straightforward, and if you have to go through this level of explanation to explain it he thinks people will misread it the way it is presented.

Kouba thanked everyone for the great feedback.

Kouba referred to Model Run – Build Option 3 Results South End Bridge slide and said that it is a similar scenario of just a south end bridge. Lunski asked if that is the same as just the Merrifield. Kouba responded it is the same explanation and this is where it is going from. She added that where you see the most difference is between the interior usage of Grand Forks between the south end bridge and the interior of Grand Forks and just a south end bridge. She said that that is kind of where we are looking at, the political and engineering will decide whether or not, what the south end bridge will look like, but we are looking at the traffic inside, if nothing happens at all somehow we have to mitigate the traffic on the interior system and that will case different projects, different choices and different priorities then, and at what point that is that is kind of what we are looking at the 2035 interim period for projects. Lunski said that she would suggest that we make the same changes, it it's not labeling, somehow to the south end bridge map as we talked about for the other map to make it a little clearer.

Vetter asked if it is clear what we are looking for, if staff understands what they are looking for. Kouba responded that she does, that it is definitely clear what they are looking for in trying to make things easier to understand and they will work on that as well.

Kouba referred to the State of Good Repair slide and stated that basically, just due to the funding amounts that were, the estimates that we are looking at into availability of federal funding, from North Dakota and Minnesota, they are kind of looking at that state of good repair, just maintaining roads and things like that. She stated that they did do a pavement management study, just to kind of look at, based on what City Engineers are looking at for how they evaluate the road system in each city, this is what they came up with into the future of how we want to budget for everything, but there is always something, this is not something we look at as this is a must in anything it is just good information for the engineers to use especially into the future of when to maintain roads or when to take an extra look at a road for maintenance purposes. Powers asked why there is such a big disparity in the amount of funding between the two states. Kouba responded that a lot of it is just the amount of roadway within each city, it is mostly looking at each city so there are a lot of roads in Grand Forks itself whereas East Grand Forks does not have as many in comparison, but it also looks at what can be used for federal funding alone, which are roads that are larger, collector roads like Bygland and Rhinehart in East Grand Forks and 3rd and 4th in Grand Forks, some of those bigger roads that we use to get to places outside of your residential areas.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 20, 2023

Kouba referred to the Draft City of Grand Forks Priorities slide and stated that one of the biggest things we are looking at, and they have been working with city staff on this as well, is to look at short-term projects. She said that short-term period is between 2028 and 2032, and we are trying to get an idea of what projects are priorities for the community, community wide not just one locale or another, so we want to make sure that people have a chance to give input on whether or not we got it right on a staff level so we have projects listed in the short-term, mid-term, and long-term periods beyond our current transportation improvement program.

Kouba referred to the list of projects for Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, and the funding available to both cities, and went over them briefly.

Larson commented that at the last meeting he had mentioned the Bygland Road project, the location of Rhinehart is great but there are a few other potential intersections updates that should be included. Kouba responded that she thought they had included that slide in here, but she knows that they had included them, it might be further in the presentation. Larson stated that he just wants to make sure that that is broad enough for them to work on that master plan with enough council support to get something done. Kouba said that she knows that they were looking at like 13th as well as just off the Point Bridge, and another location, and she thought that that the map had been updated. Larson asked if they could update the text just to support Bygland Road Intersection Improvements rather than just to focus on Rhinehart, he doesn't want to get pigeonholed and get stuck where they were before. Kouba responded they could do that and added that actually in one of the maps that they presented they kind of have ranking for the public meeting and it is included as East Grand Forks intersection improvements so it isn't just Bygland Road area, but it also would include the one up at River Road and 17th. Larson asked, then in the previous slide you will change the text. Kouba responded that she doesn't think they have it, she is trying to remember, she thinks they have some listing, but the biggest thing they are trying to get out is kind of a generic grouping of what are strategies these types of projects will fit into for public input so are these types of projects more important or are they third or fourth in priority for each individual giving input. Larson pointed out that under the location it says at Rhinehart Drive, and what he is saying is should that be rewritten to be vaguer, like Bygland Road Intersection Improvements, Minnesota Avenue to 13th, or something in that nature. Halford said, then, that he is looking for like the final draft of the document to have more of that written in there. Larson responded that that is what he is looking for, that he wants to make sure that that's in there. Kouba said that once they have that final list, because they want to make sure that city staff is agreeing, and they want to make sure that the public is getting their input in that, and they will take it back to city staff as well, and that is when they will have a final and final costs as well.

Powers asked if there was any kind of timetable for projects, for instance Rhinehart Drive, when it would happen. Kouba responded that they have city subtarget funding in 2026. Vetter stated that the 2026 subtarget funding is scheduled to be used for work on the Point Bridge. Kouba said, then, that the next available subtarget funding would be 2030. Vetter said that that is the next argument to have. Powers said so the one will happen when the bridge happens, like Rhinehart Drive will be done with the bridge. Vetter responded that the earliest Rhinehart Drive would be done would be 2030. Halford added that it would be 2030 if we use city subtarget

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 20, 2023

funding for it, but there are other pots of money we can go after. Vetter said again that that is the next argument. Powers said that the reason he is asking is because he had a farmer ask him this summer, who was putting in a culvert on Rhinehart Drive, and making it extra big for big trucks, and he said that he was going to hate it if they were going to tear this up in a couple of years. Vetter asked if this was out past city limits, like where a bridge would come across. Powers responded that it is closer than that, barely beyond the city limits. Vetter stated that that road isn't scheduled to be urbanized on anyone's plan yet, maybe if a south end bridge would go in. Kouba added that the closest it would get to be urbanized is from 13th to Brandon Boulevard, and she doesn't even see that happening for quite a while. Vetter added that the rest of that stretch wouldn't happen until we get a south end bridge, then we would start looking at that. Kouba said that it would first have to be inside city limits too.

Kouba referred to the Street and Highway Contents slide and stated that it highlights everything for the plan itself, kind of the chapters we are going to go through.

Kouba referred to the Remaining Schedule slide and said that we will be holding a public meeting tomorrow from 4:00 to 6:00 p.m. at the River Cinema, and everyone is invited.

Grasser said that this may be a separate discussion, it should probably be a separate discussion, at for Grand Forks, on financial constraints and funding. He stated that with the recent actions they are moving forward on an interchange and an underpass and now they have to figure out how to incorporate those, and on a local side, in their capital budget, the six-year CIP they are looking at doing some bonding, so obviously that is going to impact future revenue availability for other projects. He said that the other thing he isn't sure how to represent is within their sales tax income, and he is sure you include the Prairie Dog money right, that is coming from the state, but the state definitely seems to have a tendency of putting that pot of money at a disadvantage he would say; it is optimistic to assume that that will continue probably at the same level all the way out into 2050, so he doesn't know how to do that because you can't really predict, but there is some risk, unusual risk he thinks on the income level side that we should at least talk about, and he doesn't know if you would put ranges in there instead of a dollar amount or what, he doesn't know how to deal with it but it is probably, because of the recent change and etc., that that probably is an optimistic number. Kouba commented that some of this is generally looking at federal funding and assumed programs like the urban roads program, or they have taken a general average over the years and kind of set a lower dollar amount taking out some of the higher dollar valued projects out of that average just because it skews the average, that is what they have kind of assumed as well as some of the other programs, and she doesn't know if they have ever really looked at the Prairie Dogs specifically because she thinks that is a state program. Grasser said that if we can get the federal side because if you get into full financial constraints on the local, like a local bid probably you would only have matching funds, etc. He added that federal funds are always going to be a prioritized match he believes, but when you get probably into the study where you get even more of a local street that is going to be a problem. Kouba responded that yeah, we don't necessarily, like she said we are looking at where federal funding, those streets that federal funding could be used on as kind of our breaking point of all of that. Halford added that we aren't looking at all the pots of money out there, so that is why we kind of looking at that state of good repair, there are other pots of money out there that you could go

after and put towards a project. Kouba added that that is also the reason why the Illustrative Project list tends to be a little bit more because of all those other pots of money, if they need to be moved in, we can update the plan.

MATTER OF NDDOT TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVE (TA) PROJECT SOLICITATION

Kouba reported that this is a solicitation. She said that basically we received a notice that the State of North Dakota started their Transportation Alternatives (TA) project solicitation at the beginning of September. She added that we also know that Minnesota is also starting their process here for the 2025 to 2028 T.I.P./S.T.I.P. cycle so they will be doing their Alternative Transportation (TA) solicitation starting on October as well, so we just combined everything and started our 2025-2028 T.I.P. process of solicitation as well. She said that they did let staff know about this so they can start their process of looking at funding availability and projects that they may want to submit, so we will be working with them into the future, so hopefully we get some good applications.

MATTER OF 2024-2025 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM UPDATE

Halford reported that she didn't want this to just drop off, the original plan was to come forward with a final work program this month for approval, but they had a North Dakota MPO Director's meeting last Friday, and she was really hoping to get more of a concrete answer on our funding amounts, with Minot coming in as an MPO, one of the things we were going to discuss was the funding formula between all the MPOs so instead of going back and amending the program she wanted that hard number to know what we are playing with the next couple of years, but all they would release to us was what our base amount is, and in the past our base was \$120,000, and our base was increased to \$300,000 so she knows that, and that is good news, but that just means a little bit less to be distributed based on population between the three MPOs. She stated that we do have extra money on that side, they communicated that we don't have anything to worry about, what we already proposed in our current work program they are fine with, and she knows that some of the other MPOs aren't spending everything, so there will be a process of re-obligating that extra money to the MPOs, however they haven't determined how that process will work yet, so she is just going to move forward with what we want to do, and present it to them, so she will have a final draft next month for you. She added that, even though we have a 2024 work program approved, she wanted to act more like how we do our TIPs, with that rolling two years, so it will be a 2024-2025 work program, so she is just going to move forward with our plan and what our partners and the MPO want to move forward with and present it to them after it has gone through the Technical Advisory Committee and the Executive Policy Board in October and they will approve it or they will have comments and we will handle them then, but that will be the plan.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

There was no one from the public present for comments.

OTHER BUSINESS

A) 2023/2024 Annual Work Program Project Update:

- 1) Bike and Pedestrian Plan Update – Halford stated we have completed the Bike/Ped Plan.
- 2) Street and Highway Plan – Halford said that she knows some of our partners are feeling the squeeze on this because there is a quick turnaround, we had kind of a hiccup in our timeline in the middle but as with any plan you gain a lot of momentum at the end, so that is where we are at. She stated that, as Teri pointed out, we will see the final in probably December to get to our Federal partners in January, so the next few months we will start to see a lot of final drafts of things.
- 3) Aerial Imagery – Halford reported that we have shared the data with our partners, we are just kind of buttoning that up with the contract side of things, but all of our partners should have that, if you don't, please reach out to us.
- 4) Safe Streets For All – Halford stated that we did get our grant agreement signed so we can now move forward with Safe Streets For All so she will start drafting an RFP for that so that will go out and we can start moving forward on that, so that is exciting, as well as she will also be working on the Grand Valley Study RFP as well because we have a new person so we have more hands on deck.

Lunski said that she just has a request. When you presented the Street and Highway Plan to the Grand Forks City Council, the slides were a bit different than what we are seeing today. If they do change would you shoot us a message. Halford responded that what they did, and probably moving forward they will do it differently, but they are using our Technical Advisory Committee as the Steering Committee for the Street and Highway Plan, most everyone on the Technical Advisory Committee would be on that Steering Committee, so we looked at it and what was done in the past, so when we looked at this one, to kind of respect everyone's time as we know staff is very busy so we were kind of like, well, we are going to see them anyway so we might as well present it to them, but then it kind of gives that message of confusion that we are telling different committees different things, and that is not our intent, so probably moving forward we will just have to have a separate meeting and use that just as a Steering Committee and not double dip on the Technical Advisory Committee for that, but she knows it did create some confusion but we aren't trying to hide information.

Grasser commented that he thinks it might be helpful, in the groups, if you were to lay out schedule of what the subject matter is and when it is that it might be presented to the councils so people can plan in advance what to expect. Halford responded that they can work on that.

B) MPO Updates:

- 1) October Technical Advisory Committee Agenda Items – Halford stated that some things we are looking at for our October Technical Advisory Committee agenda include introducing Tyler; hopefully looking at the ITS Architecture scope-of-work, that will be a 2024 project, but we would like to start getting feedback and start

looking at it and doing some prework so we aren't starting it in January, so then in January we can tell ATAC to start instead of starting it a few months into the year; put an RFP together for Safe Street For All and for the Grand Valley projects; she is sure we will have a Street and Highway Plan update; and the final draft of the Unified Planning Work Program; and who knows, we will probably have TIP amendment too because that is what we always have – Kouba stated that we will have TIP amendments. Halford said that it will be a pretty full agenda.

C) Agency Updates:

- 1) Future Bridge Discussion – Vein asked for an update on the Future Bridge Study, he said that he knows it is on-going and he doesn't think much is going on right now but hopefully it will be. Halford responded that that is her understanding. She said that she wasn't at the last meeting, but there will be another meeting in the next couple of weeks because they did send out a Doodle Poll to get an idea of everyone's availability. She stated that it is her understanding that they will be coming forward with an update in the near future, because it is going to be buttoned up by the end of the year, is how she remembered it, that they will bring it forward by the end of the year so she would assume we will get some kind of an update in the next few months. She said that she can also bring this up at the next meeting, she asked if he was looking for an update, or wanted one. Vein responded that what he is looking for is, the update is great, but he would just like to, hopefully that there is action happening, that there is actual follow through with that, but he knows that there has been some transition and some delays, but just kind of some understanding of what their timeline is going to be and how that fits with what we are doing, especially with the transportation plan. Halford stated that we will still go forward and have ours approved, if there is any kind of decision or anything like that it will happen after the Street and Highway Plan is approved, and we would just go back and do an amendment, but we aren't going to wait for any decision that might be made with the bridge study. Vein said that he understands that it is just that he is hoping we will get an action out of them, sooner rather than later. Halford stated that she will let them know that there are some individuals that are looking for that feedback.

ADJOURNMENT

VETTER ADJOURNED THE SEPTEMBER 20TH, 2023, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:03 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager

Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO
Transaction List by Vendor
August 12 through September 15, 2023

| Type | Date | Num | Memo | Account | Clr | Split | Amount |
|-----------------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------|-----------------------|-----|---------------------|------------|
| AFLAC. | | | | | | | |
| Liability Check | 08/18/2023 | AFLAC | 501 | 104 · Checking | X | -SPLIT- | -564.40 |
| Alerus Financial | | | | | | | |
| Liability Check | 08/18/2023 | EFTPS | 45-0388273 | 104 · Checking | X | -SPLIT- | -2,304.14 |
| Liability Check | 09/01/2023 | EFTPS | 45-0388273 | 104 · Checking | | -SPLIT- | -2,304.00 |
| Liability Check | 09/15/2023 | EFTPS | 45-0388273 | 104 · Checking | | -SPLIT- | -2,304.16 |
| Bolton & Menk | | | | | | | |
| Bill | 09/06/2023 | Inv #R... | Retainage Du... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | 545 · Transpor... | -11,980.58 |
| Bill Pmt -Check | 09/06/2023 | 7469 | Retainage Du... | 104 · Checking | | 206 · Accounts... | -11,980.58 |
| Constant Contact | | | | | | | |
| Bill | 08/23/2023 | | Monthly Char... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | 517 · Overhead | -23.00 |
| Check | 09/05/2023 | Const... | Monthly Char... | 104 · Checking | | 517 · Overhead | -23.00 |
| Elan Financial Services | | | | | | | |
| Bill | 08/23/2023 | Acct. ... | Charges For ... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | 517 · Overhead | -366.18 |
| Bill Pmt -Check | 08/23/2023 | 7465 | Charges For ... | 104 · Checking | | 206 · Accounts... | -366.18 |
| Bill | 08/23/2023 | Acct. ... | Charges For ... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | -SPLIT- | -533.63 |
| Bill Pmt -Check | 08/23/2023 | 7468 | Charges For ... | 104 · Checking | | 206 · Accounts... | -533.63 |
| Empire Arts Center | | | | | | | |
| Bill | 08/15/2023 | Inv. #... | Rental Costs ... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | 545 · Transpor... | -660.00 |
| Bill Pmt -Check | 08/15/2023 | 7457 | Rental Costs ... | 104 · Checking | | 206 · Accounts... | -660.00 |
| Forum Communications Company | | | | | | | |
| Bill | 09/08/2023 | Inv. #... | Public Notice... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | 555 · TIP | -749.97 |
| Bill Pmt -Check | 09/08/2023 | 7471 | Public Notice... | 104 · Checking | | 206 · Accounts... | -749.97 |
| HDR Engineering, Inc. | | | | | | | |
| Bill | 08/23/2023 | Inv. #... | Work On St/H... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | 545 · Transpor... | -29,992.77 |
| Bill Pmt -Check | 08/23/2023 | 7466 | Work On St/H... | 104 · Checking | | 206 · Accounts... | -29,992.77 |
| Bill | 09/12/2023 | Inv. #... | Work On St/H... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | 545 · Transpor... | -26,591.91 |
| Bill Pmt -Check | 09/12/2023 | 7476 | Work On St/H... | 104 · Checking | | 206 · Accounts... | -26,591.91 |
| Liberty Business Systems, Inc. | | | | | | | |
| Bill | 08/15/2023 | Inv. #... | Base Rate Fo... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | 517 · Overhead | -261.62 |
| Bill Pmt -Check | 08/15/2023 | 7458 | Base Rate Fo... | 104 · Checking | X | 206 · Accounts... | -261.62 |
| Bill | 09/08/2023 | Inv. #... | Contract Bas... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | 517 · Overhead | -261.62 |
| Bill Pmt -Check | 09/08/2023 | 7472 | Contract Bas... | 104 · Checking | | 206 · Accounts... | -261.62 |
| LSNB as Trustee for PEHP | | | | | | | |
| Liability Check | 08/18/2023 | PEHP | | 104 · Checking | X | 216 · Post-Hea... | -123.75 |
| Liability Check | 09/15/2023 | NWR... | | 104 · Checking | | 216 · Post-Hea... | -123.75 |
| Madison Nat'l Life | | | | | | | |
| Liability Check | 08/18/2023 | 7460 | | 104 · Checking | | 215 · Disability... | -61.88 |
| Liability Check | 09/15/2023 | 7473 | | 104 · Checking | | 215 · Disability... | -61.88 |
| MetLife | | | | | | | |
| Liability Check | 08/18/2023 | 7461 | 5397942 | 104 · Checking | X | -SPLIT- | -252.38 |
| Liability Check | 09/15/2023 | 7474 | 5397942 | 104 · Checking | | -SPLIT- | -252.39 |
| Mike's | | | | | | | |
| Bill | 08/16/2023 | | MPO Lunche... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | 711 · Miscellan... | -74.00 |
| Bill Pmt -Check | 08/16/2023 | 7463 | MPO Lunche... | 104 · Checking | X | 206 · Accounts... | -74.00 |
| Bill | 08/16/2023 | | MPO Lunche... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | 711 · Miscellan... | -16.00 |
| Bill Pmt -Check | 08/16/2023 | 7464 | MPO Lunche... | 104 · Checking | X | 206 · Accounts... | -16.00 |
| Minnesota Department of Revenue | | | | | | | |
| Liability Check | 08/18/2023 | MNDOR | 1403100 | 104 · Checking | X | 210 · Payroll Li... | -485.00 |
| Liability Check | 09/01/2023 | MNDOR | 1403100 | 104 · Checking | | 210 · Payroll Li... | -485.00 |
| Liability Check | 09/15/2023 | MNDOR | 1403100 | 104 · Checking | | 210 · Payroll Li... | -485.00 |
| Minnesota Life Insurance Company | | | | | | | |
| Liability Check | 08/18/2023 | 7462 | | 104 · Checking | X | -SPLIT- | -179.96 |
| Liability Check | 09/15/2023 | 7475 | | 104 · Checking | | -SPLIT- | -179.96 |
| Nationwide Retirement Solutions | | | | | | | |
| Liability Check | 08/18/2023 | NWR... | 3413 | 104 · Checking | X | -SPLIT- | -538.36 |
| Liability Check | 09/01/2023 | NWR... | 3413 | 104 · Checking | | -SPLIT- | -538.36 |
| Liability Check | 09/15/2023 | NWR... | 3413 | 104 · Checking | | -SPLIT- | -538.36 |
| NDPERS | | | | | | | |
| Liability Check | 08/15/2023 | NDPE... | | 104 · Checking | X | -SPLIT- | -4,979.26 |
| Liability Check | 08/24/2023 | NDPE... | D88 | 104 · Checking | X | -SPLIT- | -3,194.86 |
| Liability Check | 09/06/2023 | NDPE... | | 104 · Checking | | -SPLIT- | -4,979.26 |
| QuickBooks Payroll Service | | | | | | | |
| Liability Check | 08/17/2023 | | Created by P... | 104 · Checking | X | -SPLIT- | -6,388.79 |
| Liability Check | 08/31/2023 | | Created by P... | 104 · Checking | X | -SPLIT- | -6,388.87 |
| Liability Check | 09/14/2023 | | Created by P... | 104 · Checking | | -SPLIT- | -6,388.77 |

Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO Transaction List by Vendor August 12 through September 15, 2023

| Type | Date | Num | Memo | Account | Clr | Split | Amount |
|-----------------------------------|------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----|-------------------|-----------|
| Stephanie Halford | | | | | | | |
| Bill | 08/15/2023 | | Travel Reimb... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | 530 · Educatio... | -444.25 |
| Bill Pmt -Check | 08/15/2023 | 7459 | Travel Reimb... | 104 · Checking | X | 206 · Accounts... | -444.25 |
| Bill | 09/06/2023 | | Reimburse Tr... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | 530 · Educatio... | -474.63 |
| Bill Pmt -Check | 09/06/2023 | 7470 | Reimburse Tr... | 104 · Checking | | 206 · Accounts... | -474.63 |
| Bill | 09/12/2023 | | Travel Reimb... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | 530 · Educatio... | -38.13 |
| Bill Pmt -Check | 09/12/2023 | 7477 | Travel Reimb... | 104 · Checking | | 206 · Accounts... | -38.13 |
| University of North Dakota | | | | | | | |
| Bill | 08/23/2023 | Inv. #... | Work On GF ... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | 565 · Special ... | -1,223.82 |
| Bill Pmt -Check | 08/23/2023 | 7467 | Work On GF ... | 104 · Checking | | 206 · Accounts... | -1,223.82 |
| Bill | 09/12/2023 | Inv. #... | Work On Traf... | 206 · Accounts Pay... | | 565 · Special ... | -1,222.10 |
| Bill Pmt -Check | 09/12/2023 | 7478 | Work On Traf... | 104 · Checking | | 206 · Accounts... | -1,222.10 |