

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, November 15, 2023 - 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Warren Strandell, Chairperson, called the November 15<sup>th</sup>, 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: Mike Powers, Clarence Vetter, Tricia Lunski, Warren Strandell, Ken Vein, Al Grasser, Brian Larson, and Mark Rustad.

Absent: None.

Guest(s) Present: Jason Carbee, HDR Engineering and David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering.

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**

Strandell declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 18<sup>TH</sup>, 2023 MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 18<sup>TH</sup>, 2023, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 14<sup>TH</sup>, TO NOVEMBER 10<sup>TH</sup>, 2023 BILLS/CHECKS**

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY LUNSKI, TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 14<sup>TH</sup> TO NOVEMBER 10<sup>TH</sup>, 2023 BILLS/CHECKS, AS PRESENTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 14<sup>TH</sup>, TO NOVEMBER 10<sup>TH</sup>, 2023 LIST OF ITEMS SIGNED AND APPROVED BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

Halford reported that this is the matter of approval of the October 14<sup>th</sup> to November 10<sup>th</sup>, 2023, list of items signed and approved by Executive Director. She explained that this is one of those items that when we did our audit every year the auditors would point out that doing this would be good practice for us to do, so this is just showing that we are continuing to review and sign the financial business transactions.

***MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE OCTOBER 14<sup>TH</sup>, TO NOVEMBER 10<sup>TH</sup>, 2023 LIST OF ITEMS SIGNED AND APPROVED BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**ACTION ITEMS:**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF TITLE VI PLAN UPDATE**

Halford reported that this was an interesting one that we just recently got a couple of weeks ago. She reminded the board that we just recently updated, thankfully, our Title VI plan, so really what they were looking for from us was just to update the signatures and dates on some of the documents in the plan, and to make any changes to employee, board, committee member information that occurred since the update. She added that this is so that all of the MPOs are all on the same timeline with their Title VI updates in order to help them streamline things so that we aren't all ending and starting at different times.

***MOVED BY LARSON, SECONDED BY RUSTAD, TO APPROVE THE TITLE VI PLAN UPDATE, AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: None.***

**MATTER OF PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE STREET AND HIGHWAY PLAN**

Kouba reported that this is the preliminary approval for the Street and Highway Plan. She stated that we have been updating you at various times throughout this process and have gone to both City Councils and Planning and Zoning Committees for both cities and are just moving forward. She added that they did receive some input but would also like some input from this body as well.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 15, 2023

Kouba said that Jason Carbee, HDR, is online today to give a brief presentation today and added that we do have a list of the schedule itself as part of the document to show where we are at, what we have done already, and we still need to complete.

Carbee referred to a slide presentation and commented that he would like to really quick just talk through the general contents of the Draft Street and Highway Plan; ten chapters, a lot of background work, talk through the planning process, talk about the MPO, talk about how we engaged with the community.

Carbee stated that we then get into some of the technical, the trends, how the system operates, safety and all that and kind of the direction we are going, and then we kind of get into looking at where the system is today and into the future, and what sort of options and strategies do we have, how should we spend the constrained transportation money that we expect in the future, and so they came up with a range of strategies through some of those more detailed studies that each community has done or interactions with the public and staff.

Carbee stated that maintenance is really an important thing, so focusing on keeping the streets we have in a state of good repair. He said that we have operations and safety type strategies that we show as options in the plans; widenings, new streets and new bridges to address the growth in the community, and new bridge alignments, potentially, over the Red River and over railroad tracks, and paving gravel roads when the urban area continues to grow, how do we transition those rural roads into urban roads.

Carbee said, then, that we have this list, and he thinks you have had a chance to see this, that have a range of different alternatives shown as potential projects that they considered for inclusion in the plan, again, with all those different strategies, we talk about a lot of maintenance type projects as well are considered, and you will see when we get into the fiscally constrained plan that we do include a really heavy emphasis on maintaining our existing system.

Carbee commented that this is a federal requirement the MPO needs to update every five years, and part of that is to go through what we call a “fiscal constraint” process, and come up with kind of a conservative approach to all of the reasonably expected transportation system revenues and then look at what our needs are, and so, based on that evaluation we really determine the jurisdictions really need to focus on using those limited fiscally constrained funds to focus on a state of good repair plan, and he thinks this is consistent with recent plans in the area. He stated that essentially, we have mostly maintenance projects on the list, and then there is opportunities to build kind of a vision or illustrative project list where we might have some expansion alternatives.

Carbee said that we do have what we are considering committed projects. He stated that they aren't necessarily in the plan because we consider that they will probably be built or start construction in the next five years and you can see some of those highlights, including the grade separation on DeMers and 42<sup>nd</sup> in Grand Forks, and then the 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Interchange on the slide.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 15, 2023

Carbee referred to the 2050 Street and Highway Projects – Urban Roads Program (Grand Forks) slide and commented that on the project list you can see that we, through working through this process and talking with each city staff and DOT staff, identified the range of projects that fit with each of the funding categories that we anticipate, and so on the North Dakota side, with that Urban Roads Program on the federal aid eligible system, we identified a range of short-term, mid-term, and long-term projects in green, blue and red from each of those periods, and then in orange some really key short-term illustrative or vision projects. He pointed out that you can see with the Urban Roads program, really focusing on reconstruction and pavement repair type projects. He said there are some projects on Columbia, South Washington, and that is really what the focus is with these limited fiscally constrained funds.

Carbee referred to the 2050 Street and Highway Projects – Urban Grant Program Target List (Grand Forks) slide and said that this program is very discretionary from the State and so this is more of a target list of projects that would qualify for that more urban downtown focused program.

Carbee referred to the 2050 Street and Highway Projects – City-Sug Target (East Grand Fork) slide and stated that on the East Grand Forks side, using those MnDOT City-Sub Target funds that are allocated to East Grand Forks every four years, we identified a program that really focused on some safety needs and operational needs at the intersection of Bygland and Rhinehart, what sort of short-term improvements can be made at that intersection. He said that also with some of the mid-term, in blue, you can see focus on starting to really fix up the street in the Industrial Park, 10<sup>th</sup> Street and then 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and just making sure we have reconstructing and paving some of those streets to really support that part of town and then also identifying the need for intersection improvements at River Road and 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.W. and 17<sup>th</sup> Street.

Carbee stated that was kind of what the real priorities look like for those particular funding programs, then the States also provided their projects that are needed to maintain the state system in each community and the next three slides kind of go through the NDDOT program, and you can see they basically have a lot of surface repair and some reconstruction type projects for each of the corridors on the state system, a lot of them you see have two different treatments over that time period between now and 2050, just maintaining the state system, and same on the Minnesota side on the state system, again a lot of resurfacing and repair type projects on the pavement, and a lot of them you see, such as with Highway 2, they go through in the short-term and the long-term and do those treatments, in two different passes just to keep it in a state of good repair.

Carbee commented that he can say that some of the feedback that they received would be to add some additional illustrative projects, not necessarily tied to any funding pot. Kouba added that basically through this process, right now, we are asking if they missed anything, especially with those project lists so we make sure we are getting all the information into the plan for the communities to really build off of. She said that the requests they have heard so far is to make sure we highlight that Southend inner-city bridge, as well as Merrifield between the two cities and then for East Grand Forks Rhinehart Drive from 13<sup>th</sup> down to the city limits, that would be

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 15, 2023

an urbanization of that roadway; River Road paving from 23<sup>rd</sup> north to 30<sup>th</sup>, which would also be an urban road paving; and then a backage road between where the Middle School and Elementary School are located, between those and the floodwall; and those will be put into a separate map that highlights that they are, along with the other illustrative projects that are already listed, projects that we can look at and hopefully work towards getting extra funding for in the future.

Vein asked if Teri could explain the process; you said that this is, where is the MPO Executive Board in the process, maybe you could explain that. Kouba responded that right now we are asking for preliminary approval of this draft plan, and then, because both cities have our main plans, our Bike and Pedestrian Plan, our Transit Plan, as well as the Street and Highway Plan, in their Comprehensive Plans, and those Comprehensive Plans are part of ordinance, they have to adopt these plans through ordinances as well so it goes before both city councils through their normal process of updating or changing their ordinance, and then from that point forward it will come back to the MPO Executive Policy Board for approval and at that point in time we will also have a draft summary document of all of these plans to be able to, basically a resolution saying that this is considered our Metropolitan Transportation Plan. She said that it is available on line right now, that draft summary document, but really it does rely heavily on the already adopted plans as well as this current plan that we are going through the adoption process on, it will have the same list of projects going forward, it is listed out in the short-term, mid-term, long-term as well as illustrative projects.

Vein stated that he thinks he understands the process, he is probably trying to understand, you know he appreciated this at City Council on Monday night in Grand Forks and the additional comments on the inner-city bridge and the Merrifield Road bridge. He said that, obviously, the inner-city bridge is something that will be addressed through the two communities of East Grand Forks and Grand Forks, and in-fact there is a committee that is being led by the City of East Grand Forks, about trying to devise, address or understand what the path forward is, if he remembers right, what is happening there. He stated that the Merrifield Road bridge is, of course, in the county, and that would be something on each county, he thinks, as they would work back and forth together to decide the prioritization of that bridge, is that accurate. Kouba responded that that is correct.

Vein asked, then, what part does either the inner-city or the Merrifield bridge; obviously we saw that they aren't in the next five- or six-years funding, so they are in one of the out-years before that would happen and there are processes to go through for both of them. He said that previously, in previous studies, we did a fair amount of traffic analysis of the bridge and some locations, he thinks, and that is also a part of this plan. Kouba responded that it is part of our traffic demand modeling. She said that we do evaluate this, and it is also in our plan under future trends and needs. She added that in our traffic demand model we look at, we use our socio-economic information; our jobs, our housing, estimates of what we think will grow out using the land use plans, and then we move forward with that information, putting it into the model and getting kind of where are the congestion points, where are we going to start needing to widen roads, and things like that, bringing it into an urbanized road system. She stated that right now we have some outer roads that are further south of Grand Forks and East Grand Forks that need

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 15, 2023

to be widened and put in curb and gutter and that type of thing, but we also see where those congestion points are, we know that there is still going to be congestion at DeMers and Washington; Washington is still going to get more congested as we move forward, some of the suggestions we have in this plan is to do more operational type of improvements along Washington and Columbia, but we know that that impact, when we start looking at if we put in a bridge, when we put in a south end bridge, we know that that congestion at Washington and DeMers does reduce, we do know that the congestion along Washington kind of spreads out and reduces a little bit in certain areas, but moving forward how does each city want to answer those questions, and so far we see that one of the answers to help is the bridge, but if that is not something the communities wish to do, at some point in time we are going to have to start looking at those larger projects on Washington; are we going to do a counterflow intersection at DeMers and Washington, are we going to do a Diamond Intersection at Washington and DeMers, all these things are happening in Grand Forks, East Grand Forks would not help participate in them like they would a bridge.

Vein said, then, that he thinks Teri described some, but there are alternatives, right, to improve congestion, and one that has been around for a while has been that south end bridge, it has been more specific in other earlier studies, but he thinks we kind of resolved that knowing that the engineering study will actually determine the exact location, not the planning study. He stated that what he was trying to understand is that type of verbiage would be something that we would state in here without specifying a location, is that right, that is kind of what was talked about at city council, and he thinks that for him that would be very helpful that it is not just not shown anymore, or identified at a specific location, at least it is verbalized, or in writing it describes that, and that would be one of the things he thinks you were going to tweak and include, is that correct. Kouba responded that she guesses you wanted to see specific language of the reasoning why we are saying a south end inner-city bridge as opposed to a specific location, as has been done in previous plans. Vein responded that he thinks that they don't, as you've shown, we just show a location for a south end bridge. Kouba said that that is correct. Vein stated that he just wants to make sure that people will understand if they look at this that that was addressed, or is a part of the study, and obviously there are advantages to it but it isn't being proposed at a specific location. Kouba said that they do reference other studies, like the Future Bridge Study that was most recently done, and while, in a planning study like that we can't specify a location, we can only specify the cost benefit analysis that was done at that time, it does state one location as a better cost benefit ratio but, as we've always stated, it has to be the two communities that support a bridge at a location, a planning document cannot do that.

Rustad commented that as this process goes forward, something just to keep in the back of your mind is that he thinks there is a very very good chance that Highway 25 is going to get surfaced, and that will probably beef up the traffic, and it will be a two county collaboration, and he thinks there is a greater than 50% chance that it will happen in the very near future, there is positive momentum. Strandell asked where Highway 25 is located. Rustad responded that it splits Grand Forks County and Walsh County, so half the road is ours and half is theirs, but putting pavement on it he thinks it will be utilized even more than it is now, so when we are talking traffic studies this is something to keep in mind because he thinks it will happen sooner rather than later.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 15, 2023

Kouba stated that one thing they did notice is that a lot of the county roads are starting to get a lot more usage, closer to the City of Grand Forks. She said they have a feeling that what is happening is the people who are living in Grand Forks are going out to Grand Skies, out to the Airbase. Rustad commented that that project is about to explode too, he thinks they are adding like 400,000 square feet so the traffic out there is only going to become more and more bottlenecked and congested, and he highly doubt all those folks are going to want to live in Emerado. Kouba said that that is some of the feedback they have been getting when they talked to people out near the Airbase, they had some focus groups along that line to the Airbase and businesses. Rustad stated that the Grand Skies expansion, which is underway, could also possibly impact future missions at the base as well, they are kind of adjuncts to one another, so something to just keep in mind.

Lunski asked, if both cities approve this, then this document becomes kind of locked, right, no changes. Kouba responded that it can be amended, it is locked until any amendments are made to it. Lunski said, then, in six months, when it is estimated that the bridge study will be completed, and she is just estimating that timeline, will this document be updated or will you wait until 2027 or 2028. Kouba responded that it would depend on how far along that study is going, if there is a settled location we can definitely make some amendments such as changing wording from a south end bridge to a specific location, but it will just depend on what that study says as well as what needs the study finds, how far along in the environmental document are we going to get into, and things like that. Halford responded that we would also need a formal request from both cities asking for an amendment to the plan as well.

***MOVED BY LARSON, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO GIVE PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT 2050 STREET AND HIGHWAY PLAN UPDATE, AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE SAFE STREETS FOR ALL (SS4A) RFP**

Halford reported that there isn't really anything new or earth-shaking that you haven't seen before, adding that we have seen this RFP a couple of times. She stated that there were some tweaks and clarifications made to the language in the RFP; and we did send it out to Federal Highway to get their feedback. She said that they only had some minor tweaks and are good with it. She added that we also received a few minor comments from the tack and our partners as well, so only a few tweaks were needed here and there, but basically what you saw before hasn't changed much. She said that of course, they also updated the dates as originally, we were looking at getting approval a month earlier than this, so all the dates were adjusted as well as we start heading into the holiday season, so there is a little bit more wiggle room as we know people will be busy and it will give people more time to review things.



PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 15, 2023

Halford commented that we are hoping to get approval here today, after which she will send it out and hopefully, we will start hearing back from consultants. She added that a couple of firms have already reached out to us, so people are eager to get their hands on this one and get going, as are we.

***MOVED BY RUSTAD, SECONDED BY LUNSKI, TO APPROVE THE SAFE STREETS FOR ALL RFP, AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Grasser.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE GRAND VALLEY RFP**

Manske reported that similarly to the Safe Streets For All RFP, you have seen the Grand Valley RFP a few times now. He said that a lot of input that you provided has been incorporated into the document, and we got a lot of good feedback from the Technical Advisory Committee as well.

Manske stated that there were some notable changes that were made to the document including increasing the study area all the way to 47<sup>th</sup>. He said that there were a few things that you might not have caught in the document that were added last time that included engineering from Grand Forks that added a few tidbits that might be helpful to the consultants putting together a proposal; they added a map, and they changed all the dates to better reflect to the actual timeline of the project.

***MOVED BY LUNSETH, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE GRAND VALLEY RFP, AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Grasser.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF SAFETY TARGETS**

**PM-1 Safety Targets**

Kouba reported that just to let you know the PM-1 Safety Targets, we had a couple of questions, there was a question of why ten years aren't there, with the five sets of five-year rolling averages, why there wasn't ten years, and she couldn't answer that at the time, so they requested it be tabled to research the question.



PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 15, 2023

Powers asked how you get a percent or a fraction of a percentage on a serious accident, how are you measuring that. Kouba responded that they have a listing of all the serious, as well as the fatal injuries, all the crashes, and we do have non-motorized as well, so that would be bikes and pedestrians, and we take those and add them up for a five-year average, which is where you start getting your fractions of a person, so even though you have 2007 to 2011, you have a solid number, by the time you add them up and divide by 5 you get a fraction. Powers asked why there is a discrepancy between 2015 and 2016, it went from 20 to 3, and then it went back up to 13. Kouba responded that they aren't sure why there was such a difference.

Strandell asked if the numbers are for the two cities or strictly for the MPO area. Kouba responded that they are for the MPO area. Strandell said, then, that it could be a matter of two out of town somewhere, and then he sees the fatalities there. He asked where they were. Kouba responded that she doesn't know off the top of her head. Strandell said that he knows there was one by Central High School, one of the students. Kouba stated that there was also one downtown, especially when you are getting down into 2021, it was a bad year for fatalities.

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY LARSON, TO APPROVE TABLING THE PM-1 SAFETY TARGETS TO THE DECEMBER 20, 2023, EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD MEETING TO ALLOW STAFF TO FURTHER REVIEW THE TABLES.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Grasser.***

Transit Safety Targets

Kouba reported that the Transit Safety Targets basically fall under, you have to review the Transit Safety Targets based on the following safety performance measures, which are:

1. Total Fatalities
2. Rate of Fatalities
3. Total Injuries
4. Rate of Injuries
5. Total Safety Events
6. Rate of Safety Events
7. System Reliability

Kouba said that this is based off of both the fixed route and the paratransit. She added that they discussed the targets with Cities Area Transit, as well as Nancy, who handles the East Grand Forks side, and they both agreed to keep the targets basically the same as the previous year, so that is the recommendation of the Technical Advisory Committee and MPO Staff.

***MOVED BY LUNSKI, SECONDED BY LARSON, TO APPROVE THE TRANSIT SAFETY TARGETS, AS PRESENTED.***

***Voting Aye:*** *Strandell, Powers, Vein, Lunski, Larson, Rustad, and Vetter.*  
***Voting Nay:*** *None.*  
***Abstain:*** *None.*  
***Absent:*** *Grasser.*

## **NON-ACTION ITEMS:**

### **MATTER OF URBAN GRANT PROJECT SOLICITATION**

Kouba reported that the North Dakota Department of Transportation released their Urban Grant solicitation. She explained that the deadline for project submittal is December 29, 2023, and we did let our partners know about the solicitation and that they need to get their applications to the MPO by November 29<sup>th</sup> so that we can move it through our approval process.

Kouba stated that she knows that Minnesota also has a Protect Grant solicitation but we did not receive any applications for it. She added that we are also waiting for the deadlines for the Transportation Alternative (TA) program as well as the Transit programs.

Information only.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

Kuharenko said that if you want to know more information on the projects, he is more than happy to elaborate. Strandell said that we have time so if he wants to elaborate that is fine.

Kuharenko stated that they currently have two projects that are programmed under the Urban Grant Program; the first one is the roundabout at the intersection of Belmont and 5<sup>th</sup>, and he believes they are targeting construction in 2024; the second project, which they are currently putting together and RFP for to get an engineer on board for, is actually right in front of Central High School on North 4<sup>th</sup> Street; and the project that is currently working through City Council, that they are hoping to get approval on, is the next block on North 4<sup>th</sup> Street in front of City Hall.

Powers asked how the construction project is going in front of City Hall and is it impacting the school. Kuharenko responded that they are still maintaining two-way traffic, it is just narrower, and no parking is allowed, but so far it seems to be working alright. He added that they are hoping that they will be able to get things backfilled, and then they can scoot the fence over a little bit more because when winter comes, we all know those curb lines get a little bit closer and a closer.

Strandell commented that they should be starting some of the sitework for the new Climax Bridge yet this fall, and he doesn't know how they are projecting it, but they think it might be open by late 2024. He said that there is a lot of sitework that needs to be done on the North Dakota side. He asked if that was in Traill or Grand Forks County. Rustad responded that it is Traill. He added that he would also like to correct what he said earlier, when you asked where

that Highway 25 was and he incorrectly said it was in Walsh County, it is actually in Traill County. Strandell stated that this is a \$17 million dollar project and it will be built north of the current bridge.

Strandell said that he doesn't know what the status is on the Nielsville Bridge at this point, there are some people that are still looking on funding there, but Traill County is not in support of that bridge but the State of North Dakota is.

Information only.

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

A) 2023/2024 Annual Work Program Project Update – Halford commented that we are getting to the end of the year and have completed some projects including the Bike/Pedestrian Plan Update, the Aerial Imagery, and are finishing up the Street and Highway Plan.

- 1) Bike and Pedestrian Plan Update – Halford stated we have completed the Bike/Ped Plan.
- 2) Aerial Imagery – Halford stated we have completed the Aerial Imagery and have shared the data with our partners.
- 3) Street and Highway Plan – Halford stated that we just talked about this and we will be presenting it for final approval in December and then send it off to our State and Federal partners in January.
- 4) ITS Regional Architecture – Halford stated that even though we are talking about that right now we aren't going to start work on that until January. We are talking about it now so we get a head start by starting to get feedback and things like that now instead of waiting until January, so we are doing the leg work now and then we can start the project in January or February instead of eating some of the year up doing the leg work.
- 5) Land Use Plans – Halford stated that we will begin the Land Use Plan updates in 2025 and 2026.
- 6) Grand Valley – Halford stated that we have already discussed this project.
- 7) Safe Streets For All – Halford stated that we have already discussed this project.

B) MPO Updates:

- 1) December TAC Agenda Items – Halford stated that we will be looking at the Final for the Street and Highway, which we already talked about a couple of times, as well as the MTP Final Summary. She said that we may or may not have some TIP amendments, we don't have any as of now but there is still some time to get those in. She stated that we will also see the PM-1 Safety Targets back as well.
- 2) 2050 MTP Summary – Kouba stated that we are looking for comments on the 2050 MTP Summary, that you can find on the MPO Website: [www.theforksmpo.org](http://www.theforksmpo.org),

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 15, 2023

either by the end of the month or at our December meeting, when we bring it forward as a draft. She stated that it will need to be approved, there is some wiggle room, we can approve it in January but we generally approve the Executive Summary Document at the same time as when we adopt the Street and Highway Plan.

- 3) Minnesota has extended the deadline for their 20-Year Highway Investment Plan to November 27<sup>th</sup>.

C) Agency Updates:

None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***STRANDELL ADJOURNED THE NOVEMBER 15<sup>TH</sup>, 2023, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:47 P.M.***

Respectfully Submitted,  
Peggy McNelis, Office Manager

# GF/EGF Metropolitan Planning Organization

## Bills and Applied Payments

October 14 - November 10, 2023

DATE	TRANSACTION TYPE	MEMO/DESCRIPTION	NUM	AMOUNT
<b>City of East Grand Forks</b>				
10/30/2023	Bill Payment (Check)		7491	-2,684.30
10/27/2023	Bill			2,684.30
<b>East Grand Forks Water and Light</b>				
10/30/2023	Bill Payment (Check)		7492	-843.87
10/27/2023	Bill			843.87
<b>Forum Communications Company</b>				
10/30/2023	Bill Payment (Check)		7493	-599.98
10/27/2023	Bill			599.98
<b>Grant and Contract Accounting</b>				
10/30/2023	Bill Payment (Check)		7494	-6,297.39
10/27/2023	Bill			6,297.39
<b>HDR Engineering, INc.</b>				
10/30/2023	Bill Payment (Check)		7495	-49,048.35
10/27/2023	Bill			49,048.35
<b>Intrado Interactive Services Corporation</b>				
10/30/2023	Bill Payment (Check)		7496	-4,260.00
10/27/2023	Bill		Inv. #386240	4,260.00
<b>Liberty Business Systems, Inc.</b>				
10/30/2023	Bill Payment (Check)		7497	-261.62
10/27/2023	Bill		Inv. #517938	261.62
11/08/2023	Bill Payment (Check)		7501	-261.62
11/08/2023	Bill		Inv. #520998	261.62
<b>Madison Nat'l Life</b>				
10/30/2023	Bill Payment (Check)		7490	-97.01
10/27/2023	Bill			97.01
<b>MetLife</b>				
10/30/2023	Bill Payment (Check)		7489	-294.62
10/27/2023	Bill			294.62
<b>Mike's</b>				
10/18/2023	Bill Payment (Check)		7488	-84.00
10/18/2023	Bill			84.00

MN Withholding

# GF/EGF Metropolitan Planning Organization

## Bills and Applied Payments

October 14 - November 10, 2023

DATE	TRANSACTION TYPE	MEMO/DESCRIPTION	NUM	AMOUNT
10/27/2023	Bill Payment (Check)		MNDOR	-485.85
10/27/2023	Bill			485.85
Nationwide Retirement Solutions				
10/30/2023	Bill Payment (Check)		NWRS-DC	-538.36
10/27/2023	Bill		NWRS-DC	538.36
NDPERS				
10/30/2023	Bill Payment (Check)		NDPERS-RET	-4,101.42
10/27/2023	Bill			4,101.42
Peggy McNelis				
10/30/2023	Bill Payment (Check)		7498	-83.66
10/27/2023	Bill			83.66
University of North Dakota				
10/30/2023	Bill Payment (Check)		7499	-1,314.50
10/27/2023	Bill			1,314.50