

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

CALL TO ORDER

Warren Strandell, Chairperson, called the December 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: Mike Powers, Clarence Vetter, Tricia Lunski, Warren Strandell, Ken Vein, Al Grasser, Brian Larson, and Mark Rustad.

Absent: None.

Guest(s) Present: Matthew Voigt, Grand Forks Herald; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Reed Huttunen, East Grand Forks City Administrator; Mark Schill, Praxis Strategy Group; and Wayne Zacher, NDDOT.

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

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY LUNSKI, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 15TH, 2023, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 11TH, TO DECEMBER 15TH, 2023 BILLS/CHECKS

MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY VEIN, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 11TH TO DECEMBER 15TH, 2023 BILLS/CHECKS, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 11TH, TO DECEMBER 15TH, 2023 LIST OF ITEMS SIGNED AND APPROVED BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Halford reported that this just an item that you will continue to see on a normal basis on our monthly agenda, it is just staff letting you know that we double and triple checking what is being moved around and what is coming through, what has been reviewed and/or signed by herself.

MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 11TH, TO DECEMBER 15TH, 2023 LIST OF ITEMS SIGNED AND APPROVED BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF 2023 HOLIDAY BONUS HOURS

Halford reported that the MPO follows a lot of what the City of Grand Forks does when it comes to more of the HR realm of things, and she doesn't know how many years they have been doing it, but in December they bring forward to their City Council a recommendation to approve a bonus four hours for staff to use in the next six months, but in our world, and how things work that makes it a little harder to track and do and we heard, and got some feedback, that it would be better to have this as a standing policy, or not to it at all, so staff felt that rather than to have to wait to see what the City of Grand Forks does with this each year, and to try to work it into how we do things here, that it would be better to just have a more permanent thing and move forward with that and we chose Good Friday to have a half day or four hours off, then it is a policy and we don't have to follow the City of Grand Forks.

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY LARSON, TO APPROVE A HALF-DAY (4 HOUR) HOLIDAY ON GOOD FRIDAY FOR MPO EMPLOYEES IN PLACE OF A FOUR-HOUR HOLIDAY BONUS EACH YEAR.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

ACTION ITEMS:

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF 2024 UPWP CONTRACTS

Halford reported that this is something that we have definitely seen before if you have been on the board for at least a year. She said that Minnesota has been doing a yearly contract for a while, and now North Dakota is doing a yearly contract as well, before we would just see this every other year, so there isn't anything out of the ordinary for this, and now for the foreseeable future we will be seeing both these contracts about this time of year.

MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY LUNSKI, TO APPROVE THE 2024 UPWP CONTRACTS, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF FINAL APPROVAL OF THE STREET AND HIGHWAY PLAN

Halford reported that with this item, we are at the finish line; this is something that we've been working on for over a year and a half; we've come to you with a handful of updates and input with this. She said that this is something that we've been doing every five years, and the following agenda item is the MTP, which wraps up all the plans into one package and it is a summary of the Bike and Pedestrian Plan, the Transit Plan, and the Street and Highway Plan, but right now we are looking at the Street and Highway Plan, we usually have these together, so this is kind of bringing it back.

Halford stated that where we have come so far, this is the final stop, and again this is just a plan to kind of wrap things up, and as a community where we are looking at moving forward to 2050, but again this comes back five years from now.

Halford said that they have gone to both City Councils, both Planning and Zoning Commissions, and they have all done their recommendations and motions, and she can definitely give an overview of those if you like, but now we are here at the Executive Policy Board asking for approval of the 2050 Street and Highway Plan as is, which is what our Technical Advisory Committee recommended at their December 13th meeting.

Lunski asked that she give an overview of the recommendations and motions made by the various entities.

Halford reported that the approval process was as follows:

November:

Grand Forks Planning and Zoning Commission – Preliminary Approval of the 2050 Street and Highway Plan, as is.

Grand Forks City Council – Table the preliminary approval of the 2050 Street and Highway Plan to have more time to review a summary comparing the 2045 and 2050 Street and Highway Plans.

East Grand Forks Planning and Zoning Commission – Preliminary Approval of the 2050 Street and Highway Plan, as is.

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

East Grand Forks City Council – Preliminary Approval of the 2050 Street and Highway Plan, as is.

Technical Advisory Committee – Preliminary Approval of the 2050 Street and Highway Plan, as is.

MPO Executive Policy Board – Preliminary Approval of the 2050 Street and Highway Plan, as is.

December:

Grand Forks Planning and Zoning Commission – Final Approval of the 2050 Street and Highway Plan, as is.

Grand Forks City Council – December 4 meeting – Preliminary Approval of the 2050 Street and Highway Plan subject to removal of all reference of an intercity bridge between the Point Bridge and 47th Avenue South.

East Grand Forks Planning and Zoning – Final Approval of the 2050 Street and Highway Plan, as is.

East Grand Forks City Council – Final Approval of the 2050 Street and Highway Plan, as is.

Technical Advisory Committee – Final Approval of the 2050 Street and Highway Plan, as is.

Grand Forks City Council – December 18 meeting – Final Approval of the 2050 Street and Highway Plan subject to removal of an intercity bridge from the Illustrative Project List.

Halford stated that there was also a Management Presentation given to both NDDOT and MnDOT; it was just a presentation, they weren't really asked for approval, more of just a blessing that we were on the right track.

Halford commented that really the only change, and what we heard, was the Grand Forks City Council's motion to approve subject to removal of an intercity bridge from the Illustrative Project list, but reference to an intercity bridge throughout the document would remain in the plan, as is.

Halford said that, again, this is the final stop, this is just a planning document, this doesn't tie either City's or County's hands, they would still have to implement it, but this is what goes forward to the DOTs and the Feds, saying that as a community this is what we are looking at doing, and you will see us back in three and a half years to start this all over again.

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

Rustad asked what is the harm in removing it out of the illustrative project list, which is what the council recommended on Monday; is it a big long process or is that something fairly easy, because to move forward with the plan as East Grand Forks City would like it, but not the way Grand Forks City would like it, almost seems like planning a wedding for a woman that isn't interested in you, to him, so he is just curious if they recommended to leave it in just for the document's purpose, but then to take it out of the long-term, it seems to him that would make the most sense if half of the people that are supposed to pay for it aren't interested. Halford responded that she gets where he is coming from, so with that it is definitely one of the easier corrections in the document of all things that could have been motioned and done. She said that the initial request of removing all reference to an intercity bridge would have totally changed the document, and definitely would delay it, but this is just basically deleting a line from a chart in the document, and then also making a correction in the summary, so it is definitely one of the easier changes. She added that kind of to paint more of a picture; MPO staff, the consultant, and staff that worked on this were under the impression that everyone was okay with including the intercity bridge, specifically calling it an intercity bridge and not noting a specific location, because we knew that no one was ready to make a decision on a location, and MPO staff, the consultant, city staff, and everyone involved, didn't want to have a location included, or as part of the discussion, so just having it as just an intercity bridge, made sense. She said that the past plan did call out 32nd Avenue and a couple of other locations, so this is the first time we are calling it intercity and not calling out a location, and then it give the opportunity to all counties and cities to have that discussion and have that study, that bridge study kind of play out and have that discussion instead of almost having the cart before the horse and say, hey we have the street and highway plan and you have to decide now, but all these other things were in motion, so that is what we moved forward with, and that is what we have here now.

Strandell asked how all of this affects a Merrifield Bridge possibility. Halford asked if he is referring to having it removed. Strandell said no, the whole plan, Merrifield is in the plan. Halford responded it is, and added that it just keeps the door open to have that conversation, just as with the intercity bridge, it isn't telling either City or County that they have to do it, but when they start looking at it and studying it, or even to put in an application for a grant, it is definitely more favorable to have it in the plan, if you don't, we have noticed that usually it doesn't sit very well with the grant application selection.

Grasser commented that he isn't that familiar with the East Grand Forks side, on the Grand Forks side they have the bridge listed as an illustrative project, does East Grand Forks put together a similar list. Halford responded that this is both community's plan, so it would be on their list too. Grasser said, then that the fact that it is listed in the plan is because both communities have it on the illustrative list. Halford responded that that is correct because they each would be adopting this plan on their own. Kouba stated that we definitely take the past projects that were in the last plan, review what has been done, and move forward or, mostly consult with all of the entities;, both cities, counties, as well as their staff to determine if these projects are still where you want them to be, do they need to be shuffled around, do they need to be moved up or down or put into an illustrative list, they do review the illustrative list as well.

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

Grasser asked, then, if we want to do an intercity bridge and it is on the illustrative list, what is the first thing that we have to do as an MPO. Halford responded that it depends on where the process is, if you are just looking at the study then it is fine there but if it starts looking at dates and money then you will want to start moving it into different lists. Grasser asked how would that be done. Halford responded that you would need to amend the plan. Grasser asked, if it isn't on the list, and we decided we wanted to do an intercity bridge, what would be the first step. Halford responded that you would have to amend the plan. Grasser said that that is why, from a practical standpoint you have to do the same thing whether it is on the list or not on the list. Halford responded that that is correct. She added that no matter what, right now it is on kind of a pie in the sky list, for example the grade separation and the 47th Interchange projects, those were both on the illustrative list from way back, and were on it for a while, and it is just when things start lining up, it makes it easier, and there is also that timeline showing that as a community we have been looking at this, this is something that has been a need and a want for a while and it helps with those applications too.

Vein said that from the City of Grand Forks City Council's perspective, not Planning and Zoning or anybody, they had a Committee of the Whole meeting and the vote coming out of that meeting was to approve the plan with elimination of any discussion or reference of an intercity bridge, the vote was four to three to approve that, and that is what came to the City Council this past Monday night, that recommendation from the Committee of the Whole. He stated that, and maybe you are aware, a lengthy conversation about that and talked about the pros and cons, the potential freezing of federal monies and what that means to all of our T.I.P. projects, which are substantial, and that we needed to come to some kind of consensus about how to move forward, so the motion that ended up passing was kind of a compromise, it approved the plan with the elimination of the intercity bridge as an illustrative project, and as they understood, and it was just explained, you can't just remove the mention of the bridge from the plan without having to revise the whole plan through the process, so he thinks we can; this was a motion that would allow the plan to proceed, but would remove, again, the specific identification of it as an illustrative project, so, with that modification he thinks it passed unanimously through the City Council, knowing that they were going to remove that. He added that to him it was really preferable than the original motion from the Committee of the Whole to remove all reference of the bridge from the plan, so that is where they are at and of course they are in a bit of a dilemma because they represent the City Council, and again, as he would say, and he think everybody would concur it is a compromise, not everybody liked it from either side, but the motion eventually passed out of their City Council and they were the only entity that had something other than unanimous support. Strandell said that you are talking about an intercity bridge, not a specific location. Vein responded that that is correct.

Vein stated that he was here five years ago, as were you Mr. Strandell, when we had a specific location identified; and it had been his hopes that by taking out a specific location, and just identifying it as an intercity bridge, we would resolve the issue because there were people that were in favor of the Elks Drive Bridge, but more in favor of the 32nd Avenue Bridge, and they had quite a few discussions on that, so he had hoped that that would be the resolution, but that didn't satisfy a number of council members, and they wanted complete elimination of it. He added that he thinks we learned throughout this process that no matter where you select, it is

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

going to involve an environmental impact statement that will review them all anyway, it doesn't matter if you select one or you don't, so it was easier for them to be able to put something in that was non-committal, knowing that a location would be fixed later under any circumstance. Halford added that there really wasn't a reason to put a location into the plan; not only could the communities and leadership not decide and come to an agreement, but also that is part of the process when you go through the NEPA and PEL processes, they basically start at ground zero, and then they start looking at locations and putting some of the other things into effect that really as a community, looking at a location, picking one is almost a moot point because it still needs to go through that process and so many other entities, so that was another reason to just use the term intercity bridge because there are just so many other things that haven't come into play, that there is no reason to site a specific location, but we know that it is viable option to help with congestion, there will just be some other things that we will need to look at in the future.

Vetter shared that it has come to light, in the last month or so, that there are some grant opportunities for planning, so if the intercity bridge isn't on the illustrative list, that may jeopardize that grant, is that what you are telling us. Halford responded that it could, although she can't say for certain. Vetter said, though, that having it on the list would definitely help, correct. Halford responded that it would.

MOVED BY LARSON, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE 2050 STREET AND HIGHWAY PLAN, AS IS, WITH NO OMISSIONS FROM THE ILLUSTRATIVE PROJECT LIST.

Vein said that he fully understands where you are coming from, one of the things that has been helpful for him to understand is we have this committee between Grand Forks and East Grand Forks already that is looking at the process, correct, and it has been out there for well over six months or longer, and we were going to try, together, to figure out what is the best avenue to proceed, it was more of a procedural, in some ways, but we have never heard back on what that status is on that, do we have anything more; you talked about a potential planning grant, which would obviously be good. Halford added that she thinks you are referring to the Raised Grant that is due in February. Vetter stated that he is not on that committee. Larson commented that he can maybe take Mr. Vein's question if you are directing it to him or maybe Ms. Larson as well. He said that they have been going through the planning process with SRF Consulting Group, understanding the opportunities to apply for additional federal funding for the environmental study, which, and there is another process that follows the same or similar pathway, called a PEL, they are very involved federal processes that this project will have to follow in order to ever qualify for federal funds, so if we seek federal funds for this bridge in any capacity, which he believes is necessary to ever even fund the design of this, we are going to have to follow these very regimented process set forth by the federal government, FHWA and the Corps of Engineers, etc.. He stated that some of the feedback that they received directly from SRF related to the bridge location has been that if we came into this plan with predetermined locations for a bridge, it would most likely work against us in the eyes of the authorities that would determine who would get funds. He said that they want the process to work itself independent of local; call it political or previous planning efforts, to make sure that all of the opportunities are properly assessed, and everything is looked at holistically, so from that

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

approach, and to follow up on Mr. Vetter's comments as well, kind of generically identifying this location of the need of an intercity bridge, what is the benefit for us to receive future grants, and be able to continue this process. He added that it is also very wise that we are not determining a specific location, that would work most likely against us in the eyes of the reviewing bodies.

Vein stated that he does think we also, since the last MPO study, did do our own hydraulic study, which was done also to make sure it capable of being built and meet hydraulic standards, and that was completed with the anticipation of potentially moving it forward from the previous, from the current study because we don't have a new study until we have our current plan that is in place right now. Kouba commented that there is the Future Bridge Traffic Study that was done after the hydraulic study, just so we would have an idea of a full feasibility.

Grasser said that he just wanted to say maybe a couple of things; he agrees with all of the statements that were made, he thinks that when we get into the NEPA process it will go back and start almost from square one, it is going to redo the hydraulics, it is going to redo the locations, it is going to do traffic modeling, and they will probably look at everything from 17th Avenue South all the way to probably Merrifield Road, that is just the way the process works. He stated that they went through that, as an example, with the interchange on 47th Avenue South, going back two years ago, and they evaluated three or four interchange locations, they looked at a couple of overpass options; the point being it is very very extensive and it kind of takes it all the way back to the beginning, so he does agree, because they heard under that process they are not real wild about the locals trying to predetermine an outcome, so again he believes that is also consistent. He added that he would like to, if you could go back to the motions, Planning and Zoning in particular, under that bullet Planning and Zoning voted to keep reference of the intercity bridge in the Street and Highway Plan, but at that time there was a motion from City Council to remove that reference in its entirety; Planning and Zoning didn't agree with that, but the final motion from the City Council took that reference of eliminating all of that out of the motion, and so, being a Planning and Zoning representative he sees the Planning and Zoning and the current City Council motion as being compatible, and he just wanted to say that as a representative of Planning and Zoning.

Lunski asked if staff could talk about the two SRF studies, well the one SRF study, what we can expect from this study, and what we would expect from the next study that we obviously haven't approved or gotten the funds for yet. Halford responded that she can help a little bit with that, and then yourself and Mr. Larson also sit on that, but they are kind of finishing up what they are calling the "first" phase and it is basically a checklist of what it is going to look like, the steps to move forward, and one of the things they are looking at are the different grants, so they are already kind of looking at, well part of Phase 2 is applying for the Raise Grant in February, and they have already been having conversations with FHWA and the DOTs that they are looking at doing this, are there any hesitations with it, so they have been doing that on the side while we have been having this street and highway discussion. She added that those are kind of the immediate future things that she sees and then depending on who participates and how we want things to look like, so it could be either waiting until we get the Raise grant if we want to have that help pay for the planning part of it, or have SRF continue on with what they are doing down the path and then using those planning funds for something else, that is yet to be determined how

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

that will play out but she knows there has been some thoughts of maybe waiting until you get the grant to move forward.

Lunski stated that she thinks one of her biggest frustrations is that people in Grand Forks are arguing about placement, and how that will look; will either of these grants get us to a place where people could actually see where this bridge would be located. Halford responded that that would go along with how much money you get from the grant, and how much the entities want to put toward it and how far they want to take it, because, here, as the MPO body we can only take it to a planning level. She said that to take it any further, and to start looking at locations, you start going more into the engineering realm, which is outside of our scope, but that is where the studies will take you when you start looking at the PEL and NEPA process.

Grasser said that he is going to go down a rabbit hole a little bit here, and this question might be for Mr. Zacher, if he chooses to answer, or if he can. He asked, so in the illustrative projects there is a dollar amount, and to his knowledge that dollar amount is basically would be design and construction; he doesn't believe that that estimate would have included two, or three or four iterations of planning in front of it, so maybe his question for Mr. Zacher, if those statements are correct, and being there was no planning dollars in the illustrative line item anyway, would that preclude us from doing planning activities related to a bridge, those dollars were never in the illustrative dollar amount to begin with. Zacher responded that he gets what you're saying but he would assume it is more for construction and project development, however on 40th, the planning dollars were included with that process in it., but that the illustrative project list is more of a wish list line item as well. He said that he understands that you maybe you need to change the costs for bidding, more probably would end up coming with the amendment, so like if that project were removed from the illustrative list and put it into a project list, then you have to go through the process again, but they will generally look at the construction and preliminary engineering costs, or, I should take that back, construction and right-of-way costs unless it is a new interchange like 47th Avenue, then we wouldn't necessarily have those costs either, so now their new process is for new interchanges is they have to have each project phase identified, whether it is right of way, utilities, etc., and when those funds will be authorized, so, again, it is a plan, the illustrative list is not funded, and as Stephanie stated earlier, it is a pie in the sky type of wish list.

Strandell asked that Mr. Larson repeat his motion.

The motion was:

MOVED BY LARSON, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE 2050 STREET AND HIGHWAY PLAN, AS IS, WITH NO OMISSIONS FROM THE ILLUSTRATIVE PROJECT LIST.

Vein said that he wants to talk about the vote, if the vote is four to four it fails, right? Halford responded that that is correct. Vein stated that anything else, five to three asses, and if we do end up in a tie, what are the implications. Kouba responded that there was a tie vote in 2003, and at that time they were at an impasse to the point where a mediator was required to try to break the

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

impasse. Vein stated that eventually there was a decision made then. He added that it could come back at a later time though if someone from the prevailing side were to bring it back again. Halford asked if he was referring to amending it or what do you mean. Vein stated that if we end up with a tie vote, it could still come back again and we could still reconsider it, correct. Halford responded that we have until our January meeting to approve a plan, if we don't then at the end of January things like our T.I.P. being frozen could take place. Vein said that we have until the January meeting though. Halford responded that we do, but it isn't recommended that we wait until then because after this body approves a plan then it has to go to the DOT and our federal partners to have a last look at it and they do prefer to have a timeline to do that before the final deadline, so she would strongly recommend trying to make a decision today and not pressing that timeline if at all possible.

MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO AMEND THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE 2050 STREET AND HIGHWAY PLAN, SUBJECT TO REMOVAL OF AN INTERCITY BRIDGE FROM THE ILLUSTRATIVE PROJECT LIST.

Vein said that he has a question, and he would direct it to Mr. Grasser; if Planning and Zoning originally approved this without a restriction, and now there is a restriction before us, are you now saying those are the same. Grasser responded that he thinks so, that the actual version was to remove "all" references, so by not removing all of the references, and because that was the part that would have taken us back over six or nine months, what is on the table now was not at the Planning and Zoning for consideration, so he has to make some interpretation on that by saying that we didn't vote to remove all references, the City Council also deleted or replaced their original motion to remove "all" references with a new motion, and he doesn't see those as being incompatible.

Larson that he has a comment on the amendment to the motion, with all due respect he feels like the request to remove the intercity bridge from the illustrative project list is a counterproductive measure here for the overall goal of the MPO, as we have been working hard, and generations of our predecessors have worked hard to further this discussion and get us a little bit closer to improving our transit between the two cities involves as well as our relationship between the two cities, and we are staring at a number of grant opportunities here with the Raise Grant, and many more in the future, and to take steps that would potentially jeopardize our ability to receive grant funding because an intercity bridge, generically located, it is not listed in our Street and Highway Plan, when another communities certainly is a risk and is not necessary; and as he said is counterproductive to everything that we are trying to do here in this room, so he would strongly urge keeping everything in the plan, keeping all the opportunities in place. He said that we don't know if we are going to apply for the Raise Grant, he doesn't want to put the cart in front of the horse, but if we are able to apply for it, there is no local match because we are a community under 200,000, and communities that received this grant last year received between \$600,000 and \$16 million dollars to do further planning and design work, this is a very large and wonderful opportunity here, and a great chance for us to get together and further this discussion and continue to improve our relationships across the river, but to pull it back and make it harder for everyone in the room he just doesn't understand how that make sense.

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

Vein said that in response to Mr. Larson's comment, it also put all of our T.I.P. projects in jeopardy if we don't pass something, that is significant for, probably the City of Grand Forks more so, but you understand where he is coming from, only because, he is representing the bulk of the City Council of Grand Forks, that is why he made his motion.

Grasser stated that at the risk of being a bit inflammatory, he is going to restate, a bit, what Mr. Larson said, on a different term, we are concerned about not taking this off because we may have, call it a half million dollars of planning activity, are we not also concerned that by not approving a plan we put in jeopardy \$100 million dollars' worth of work on the Grand Forks side; he is just trying to get the numbers in proportion here that we are talking about that is at risk in the discussion. He added that another follow-up question he may have for Stephanie is, so these planning dollars, if they are approved, he believes that they are going to end up having to go through both City Councils also, correct. Halford asked if he was referring to the Raise Grant. Grasser responded he was. Halford said that it if is a joint application it would have to go through both, but either City could apply on their own if they choose to as well. Grasser said that if you are looking for joint funding it would have to go through both. Halford responded that that is outside the MPO's realm, that would be between the cities or one city or one county or all the entities to have that discussion. Grasser said that part of his point is that if the City Council is not, he doesn't know what the City Council's temperature will be relative to approving a planning document, so he thinks the message he is hearing is that even a planning level might be at risk of moving forward, you know again whether it is on the illustrative list or not, and he is reading between the lines, so he will stop there on speculating.

Lunski said she has one more question; so, if the amendment passes, then it is done, we never go back to the original motion. Halford responded that if it passes it is done unless you want to amend the plan. Grasser stated that whether or not the amendment passes we will then vote on either the original motion as is or as amended.

Vein commented that he would think that the City Council, his interpretation of the City Council is that the knew we talked about this long and hard, that we have to be united in a vote or our T.I.P. could be frozen. Strandell asked what he meant by united in a vote. Lunski responded that something has to pass. Vein added that something has to pass so that we don't put ourselves at risk. Strandell said, then, that no action is not a good idea. Vein agreed, adding that we need to have a plan, the City of Grand Forks without question needs to have a plan. Halford added that it is federally required that we have an approved plan in place. Vein reiterated that it is federally required, and he thinks the City Council understood it was required and still chose to make an amendment to the process.

Grasser said that he has one more question, and he wouldn't expect staff to necessarily have the answer, but if we went through a mediation process, is the T.I.P. then unfrozen at that point, while we are going through the mediation process, or is it frozen and then we go through the medication. Halford responded that if your plan is not approved by the end of January, the T.I.P. is frozen not matter what process you are in, unless there is some kind of special agreement with the feds is made, but they have instructed us that that is what we should plan on.

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

Vein asked, say this doesn't pass, the City of Grand Forks could bring this back for further discussion at their council meeting at that point, correct. Halford responded that we could just bring it back to this body unless you instructed us to bring it back to council. Vein said, though, that we could do that; if somebody that voted on the favorable side would want to reconsider the motion, it could be brought back to City Council for further consideration. Strandell said that he believes that is true.

Powers called the question.

Larson asked if Mr. Vein could repeat his motion.

The motion was:

MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO AMEND THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE 2050 STREET AND HIGHWAY PLAN, SUBJECT TO REMOVAL OF AN INTERCITY BRIDGE FROM THE ILLUSTRATIVE PROJECT LIST.

Voting Aye: Strandell, Grasser, Lunski, Vein, and Rustad.

Voting Nay: Powers, Larson, and Vetter.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MOTION, AS AMENDED.

Voting Aye: Rustad, Grasser, Vein, and Lunski.

Voting Nay: Larson, Vetter, Strandell, and Powers.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MOVED BY LARSON, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE 2050 STREET AND HIGHWAY PLAN, AS IS, WITH NO OMISSIONS FROM THE ILLUSTRATIVE PROJECT LIST.

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

Voting Nay: Grasser and Rustad.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF FINAL APPROVAL OF THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Strandell asked how this differs from what we just approved? Kouba responded that the biggest difference is that basically this is the document that both DOTs and the Federal Highway Administration will look at. She said that it basically summarizes our three main plans, which

are the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, the Transit Development Plan, and the Street and Highway Plan.

Kouba stated that we are asking for approval of this summary so that we have a full and complete Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY RUSTAD, TO APPROVE THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN EXECUTIVE SUMMARY, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO ITS ARCHITECTURE SCOPE OF WORK

Kouba reported that this was approved a couple of months ago, and at the time it had an end date of December 31st, 2024, but the contract with Upper Great Plains and the MPO overarches a contract the MPO has with ATAC. She stated that the ATAC contract ends in September 2024, so to make clean breaks between the current contract and the contract that will be signed sometime before September, ATAC is looking at being able to end this contract by September, so basically we are just moving up the date from December to September.

MOVED BY LARSON, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE ITS ARCHITECTURE SCOPE OF WORK, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF 2025-2028 T.I.P. GRANT APPLICATIONS

Kouba reported that as we start updating our T.I.P. process, generally we receive announcements for project solicitations, and we have been receiving them for the past couple of months now, and most of those have a deadline by the end of December, and they are all for North Dakota, so the applications are from the City of Grand Forks. She pointed out that they include applications for the following grants:

- a. 5310 Grant Application
- b. 5339 Grant Application
- c. Railroad Crossing Grant Application
- d. Transportation Alternative Grant Application
- e. Highway Safety Improvement Program Grant Application

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

- f. Urban Grant Application
- g. Urban Road Program Application
- h. Urban Regional Road Program Application

Kouba stated that these were all of the solicitations that were announced. She added that Grand Forks staff was proactive in submitting applications for the Urban Road and Urban Regional Road program applications, as we just recently receive the solicitations for those with a deadline of February, so we are looking for approval of all of the applications, in the priority the City of Grand Forks approved them.

MOVED BY RUSTAD, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO APPROVE THE 2025-2028 T.I.P. APPLICATIONS FROM THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS, IN THE PRIORITY ORDER PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF PM-1 SAFETY TARGETS

Kouba reported that the Technical Advisory Committee did approve the safety targets that were provided by staff. She said that staff did amend the final Safety Targets to reflect what they were going to approve anyway, there were a couple of changes, mostly in the fatalities as well as the crash number of serious injuries, but their question on why there isn't ten years in five sets of five year rolling averages is that there aren't ten years there are nine years in that set, so they did approve them with those changes, so staff is requesting the MPO Executive Policy Board approve them as well.

MOVED BY LARSON, SECONDED BY VEIN, TO APPROVE THE PM-1 SAFETY TARGETS, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

NON-ACTION ITEMS:

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Rustad apologized for his raspy voice, adding that he knows it is probably very off-putting to listen to, especially through a speaker, so that is his public comment. Halford said that we just

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

hope you feel better soon because it sounds awful. Rustad stated that he sounds a lot worse than he feels. Halford said that that is good.

OTHER BUSINESS

- A) 2023/2024 Annual Work Program Project Update – Halford commented that we have already seen a couple of projects cross the finish line, and there are a few that we are hoping to will get started. She said that at the end of this week should hopefully get proposals for the Grand Valley Study as well as the Safe Street For All Study, so we hope to get those started in the next year.
- B) MPO 2024 Meeting Dates – Halford pointed out that there are a list of 2024 MPO Technical Advisory Committee and Executive Policy Board meeting dates included in the packet for your reference and so you can add them to your calendar. Strandell asked if all of the MPO Executive Policy Board meetings are still on the third Wednesday of the month. Halford responded they are, that they haven't changed.
- C) January Agenda Items – Halford said that she is happy to report that as of now it looks like a relatively light agenda, we will have a presentation to the Technical Advisory Committee only about the Carbon Reduction Toolkit, unless the board would like one, but it will be presented at TAC and then we will probably have some TIP amendments.
- D) EGF Industrial Park Study – Larson asked if the study for the East Grand Forks Industrial Park is within one of these items here or is that something that we need to discuss. Halford responded that it is inside the Street and Highway Plan, that there was some coverage in there, and then that is another project that we can look at for the Safe Streets For All as well, but with the combination of the Street and Highway and the Safe Streets For All if there are some more in-depth things you would like to look at we can definitely have a conversation. Larson said that maybe we can get together and talk about it at an upcoming work session about the deliverable out of that study, he thinks it has been more high level than he understood, but we can do that at a work session if that makes sense. Halford responded that we can do that.

ADJOURNMENT

STRANDELL ADJOURNED THE DECEMBER 20TH, 2023, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:59 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager

GF/EGF Metropolitan Planning Organization

Transaction List by Vendor November 11 - December 15, 2023

DATE	TRANSACTION TYPE	NUM	POSTING	MEMO/DESCRIPTION	ACCOUNT	AMOUNT
AFLAC						
11/29/2023	Check	AFLAC	Yes		104 Checking	-564.40
Brady Martz						
11/29/2023	Bill		Yes		206 Accounts Payable	126.00
11/29/2023	Bill Payment (Check)	7503	Yes		104 Checking	-126.00
Business Essentials						
11/29/2023	Bill	Inv. #FR-FQ-18-1	Yes		206 Accounts Payable	12,140.93
11/29/2023	Bill Payment (Check)	7504	Yes		104 Checking	-12,140.93
12/11/2023	Bill	Inv. #WO-1273558-1	Yes		206 Accounts Payable	275.09
12/11/2023	Bill Payment (Check)	7513	Yes		104 Checking	-275.09
Constant Contact						
12/05/2023	Check	ConstantCont	Yes		104 Checking	-23.00
Elan Financial Services						
11/29/2023	Expenditure	Acct #9621	Yes		104 Checking	-1,557.43
11/29/2023	Expenditure	Acct. 6396	Yes		104 Checking	-251.60
HDR Engineering, INC.						
11/29/2023	Bill	Inv.#1200571196	Yes		206 Accounts Payable	35,672.15
11/29/2023	Bill Payment (Check)	7505	Yes		104 Checking	-35,672.15
IRS						
11/14/2023	Tax Payment		Yes	Tax Payment for Period: 11/08/2023-11/10/2023	104 Checking	-3,468.35
11/28/2023	Tax Payment		Yes	Tax Payment for Period: 11/22/2023-11/24/2023	104 Checking	-3,468.29
12/12/2023	Tax Payment		Yes	Tax Payment for Period: 12/06/2023-12/08/2023	104 Checking	-3,468.37
Liberty Business Systems, Inc.						
12/06/2023	Bill	Inv. #522521	Yes		206 Accounts Payable	261.62
12/06/2023	Bill Payment (Check)	7512	Yes		104 Checking	-261.62
Madison National Life						
11/30/2023	Check	7509	Yes		104 Checking	-80.16
MetLife						
11/30/2023	Check	7510	Yes		104 Checking	-294.62
Mike's						
11/15/2023	Bill		Yes		206 Accounts Payable	97.00
11/15/2023	Bill Payment (Check)	7502	Yes		104 Checking	-97.00
Minnesota Life Insurance Company						
11/30/2023	Check	7508	Yes		104 Checking	-203.45
MN Revenue						
11/15/2023	Tax Payment		Yes	Tax Payment for Period: 11/08/2023-11/10/2023	104 Checking	-485.85
11/15/2023	Deposit		Yes		104 Checking	2,750.00
11/27/2023	Tax Payment		Yes	Tax Payment for Period: 11/22/2023-11/24/2023	104 Checking	-485.85
12/13/2023	Tax Payment		Yes	Tax Payment for Period: 12/06/2023-12/08/2023	104 Checking	-485.85
Nationwide Retirement Solutions						
11/29/2023	Check	NWRS-DC	Yes		104 Checking	-538.36
11/29/2023	Check	PEHP	Yes		104 Checking	-165.00
12/08/2023	Check	NWRS-DC	Yes		104 Checking	-538.36
NDPERS						
12/05/2023	Check	NDPERS-RET	Yes		104 Checking	-4,101.43
12/06/2023	Check	NDPERS-HLTH	Yes		104 Checking	-5,832.64
Stephanie Halford						
11/30/2023	Bill		Yes		206 Accounts Payable	509.00

GF/EGF Metropolitan Planning Organization

Transaction List by Vendor

November 11 - December 15, 2023

DATE	TRANSACTION TYPE	NUM	POSTING	MEMO/DESCRIPTION	ACCOUNT	AMOUNT
11/30/2023	Bill Payment (Check)	7511	Yes		104 Checking	-509.00
Teri Kouba						
11/29/2023	Bill		Yes		206 Accounts Payable	4,023.03
11/29/2023	Bill Payment (Check)	7506	Yes		104 Checking	-4,023.03
The Exponent						
12/11/2023	Bill	Inv. #2.12524	Yes		206 Accounts Payable	195.66
12/11/2023	Bill Payment (Check)	7514	Yes		104 Checking	-195.66
University of North Dakota						
11/29/2023	Bill		Yes		206 Accounts Payable	1,314.80
11/29/2023	Bill Payment (Check)	7507	Yes		104 Checking	-1,314.80
12/11/2023	Bill	Inv. #UND-0000074169	Yes		206 Accounts Payable	1,314.50
12/11/2023	Bill Payment (Check)	7515	Yes		104 Checking	-1,314.50