

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, July 19, 2023 - 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks Training Conference Room/Zoom Meeting**

CALL TO ORDER

Warren Strandell, Chairperson, called the July 19th, 2023, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:01 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

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

Absent: Ken Vein.

Guest(s) present: Steve Emery, WSB Engineering and Jon Mason, MnDOT-District 2.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Strandell declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 21ST, 2023 MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY LUNSKI, TO APPROVE THE JUNE 21ST, 2023, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF JUNE 17TH, 2023 TO JULY 14TH, 2023 BILLS/CHECKS

MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY LUNSKI, TO APPROVE THE JUNE 17TH, 2023 TO JULY 14TH, 2023 BILLS/CHECKS, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ACTION ITEMS:

MATTER OF MPO SELF-CERTIFICATION

Kouba reported that this self-certification is something that we've normally done right before the Transportation Improvement Program is approved, but it doesn't necessarily have to be that way, this way we can kind of get a little understanding or break between the two items so that we know we are looking at the self-certification. She stated that once it is signed the signature page will be part of our Transportation Improvement Program document for the 2024-2027 T.I.P.

Kouba explained that it is basically stating that we are following all of the federal rules and guidelines for public participation as well as various other statewide planning requirements.

Kouba stated that the Technical Advisory Committee did recommend approval of this item.

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY LARSON, TO APPROVE THE MPO SELF-CERTIFICATION, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Vein.

MATTER OF FINAL APPROVAL OF THE BIKE/PED PLAN UPDATE

Halford reported that the only thing new to add to this is that there was a request to include a column on a graph for the estimates on the projects, so that has been added. She stated that the plan has gone through the final approval process in both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks and everyone has been in support, we received several comments on how happy they were with the report, and everyone is recommending approval.

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

Lunski said that she has a question. She asked if this plan, specifically for 13th Avenue, is just stating that this is a possibility, right, nobody should be worried that 13th is going to change and when it comes time to make changes, they will better fit it to the existing street or road, correct. Halford responded that a question like that got brought up at the Planning and Zoning meeting, and basically this is just a plan, this is just kind of to give you an idea and to go off of or spur conversation of maybe a further study is needed. She added that they kept all of the recommendations in there whether they were positive or negative and put the feedback we got in there so when we go back and the question gets brought up, because it always does, especially the east/west corridor and getting more of those connections, or another that always pops up every now and again, the one-way pairs on 3rd and 4th, that constantly gets brought up, so they

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 19, 2023

have these plans that we keep in there, even the negative comments and what the feedback we got was because it is always good to have all of that for reference, and then we can look at what we got and either decide as an MPO or City Staff can say that they want to further study this, or they can say, hey, this has been looked at, do we need to relook at it or not, but this is what we got so it just kind of helps with that story.

Lunski said, then, what would be the next step, she thinks in Grand Forks we have great bikepaths going north and south but nothing comes to us so what would be the next step. Halford responded that that would be something that the City would do internally, work with their staff to determine whether or not they want to further study this and look at other alternatives, which is something we could talk about and definitely help with or maybe the Engineering or Planning Departments have their own ideas of what they would like to do, but as of now this is the plan and it includes all of the recommendations and feedback we received in the course of the study, and there aren't any plans for any further study at this time.

Grasser commented that we already started some of that, they upgraded the path on 17th Avenue, and it is a matter of getting to those residential neighborhoods that is more problematic, there are more moving parts on that that it is a good idea to want something that impacts others but then you've got to get your direct input from the others, and then it is a matter of a financial component that is pretty expensive to do that work. He said that the way the State analyzes their requests for that type of money, it isn't going to rank very high so it pretty much means it will have to be locally funded, so, again, when all those pieces come into play, do you kind of leverage your local money to something that can't get federal participation and pay 100%. He said that they have some of both in their budget, but it is expensive work and it tends to create some conflict, but the idea is good, it is a matter of trying to work through the logistics and getting people on board.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Vein.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2023-2026 T.I.P. AMENDMENT #4

Kouba reported that you might recall this is the item that was tabled at your meeting last month. She stated that they have been working with East Grand Forks City staff and MnDOT to try to understand what is going on with the funding split for this project. She said that Steve Emery from the City of East Grand Forks is here and Jon Mason from MnDOT is on-line as well.

Kouba stated that the Technical Advisory Committee's recommendation to the MPO Executive Policy Board from their last meeting to approve Amendment #4 still stands, so we are still looking for approval from the Board today.

Emery said that he will let Mr. Mason kind of explain why the change and kind of why the change in percentage of funding.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 19, 2023

Mason stated that just to kind of take a step back this project has been in MnDOT's construction program for a few years now, and one of the things with that is that there have been turnovers in the project management responsibility on this project, and he won't try to bore you with all the details, but what it essentially boils down to is why the cost estimate changed on this project, and sort of how the City's percentage changed was more or less due to some estimating that happened at MnDOT.

Mason explained that last year in the 2023-2026 S.T.I.P. they had an estimate of \$1.2 million dollars on this project, and that included an estimate of \$820,000 for the traffic signals, and at that time they were looking at a 50/50 share for the traffic signals, meaning that the City of East Grand Forks had an estimated responsibility for \$410,000 and MnDOT had an estimated responsibility of \$410,000, and the remaining \$380,000 that was attributed to MnDOT was for some additional sidewalk work along DeMers and other ADA accessibility things that was estimated at one time to be a need with the project.

Mason said that with the project turnover that number just kind of hung out there but it was no longer within the project scope and they are trying to do some digging to find out where things got out of order, and they are under some assumption that it was incorrect at that time, so with that change in the total project cost going down we are now estimating that with the \$700,000 project they are just going to be replacing the traffic signals, so from the \$820,000 he mentioned earlier to \$700,000, that is more or less looking at historic bid amounts from other areas within the state and taking their best guess at what a contractor will bid that work to cost.

Emery stated that the project also, at one point, included signals at Trunk Highway 2B and 2nd Street, by Luigi's gas station, so that \$1.2 included that one as well then it was pulled out, correct. Mason agreed that it was once included and was pulled. He said that that is one of the reasons why when they were estimating the project management responsibilities the lines got blurred as to what was actually in the scope and what was actually in the budget. He stated that there was a deviation at some point and the signals at the intersection near Luigis were never included in the TIP and STIP but had been discussed.

Emery said that one thing he has been working with MnDOT on too is, they were wanting the City to pay for half of the traffic signal upgrades and then paying for some of the sidewalk ADA improvements, and what he has been working with MnDOT on, and he thinks they are in agreement but there hasn't been a cooperative agreement or anything signed yet, but basically it is looking like MnDOT will pick up all of the costs associated with the sidewalk ADA improvements so the City's only share would be the 50% of the traffic signal costs. Halford asked what that would that leave for the local share. Emery responded that he thinks that they are probably in that, he thinks they figured for the sidewalk ADA work they were estimating about \$50,000, so if the city was responsible for 50% it would be about \$25,000, so he thinks the City share will hopefully be in that \$325,000 amount, that is what he is estimating. He added that, again, of that \$325,000, DeMers and 4th Street going north is on our State Aid System so the City can use State Aid Construction funds for that, at the intersection of DeMers and 2nd the City

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 19, 2023

is going to have to use State Aid Maintenance Funds because we can't use State Aid Construction dollars on that because it isn't part of our State Aid System.

Vetter stated that his concern is why does the State get to use all the federal dollars to offset their match and the city has to pay the full amount, why don't we subtract the federal dollars off and then split the rest 50/50 with the State, that would make the most sense to him. Mason responded that the federal funds that go to MnDOT and the federal funds that go to the City of East Grand Forks through the ATP Sub-Target process, it is more or less a difference in process, so MnDOT gets federal Trunk Highway dollars through the Federal Transportation Bill, and in most cases MnDOT uses its federal funds, about 81.42% of our projects are, of a project is eligible for the federal fund reimbursement and then they use their State Trunk Highway dollars to match that. He said that the City of East Grand Forks has sub-targeted funding through the Northwest Minnesota Area Transportation Partnership on a four-year rolling basis, so that is probably the primary place that the City of East Grand Forks could or could have looked to putting federal funds on the project.

Mason said that what it kind of boils down to is that the cost sharing responsibilities at an intersection like this, where MnDOT has two legs of the intersection and the City of East Grand Forks has two legs of the intersection, and that is more or less what it kind of boils down to, each jurisdiction being responsible for those legs of the intersection being split 50/50. Vetter stated that it doesn't look 50/50 to him.

Kouba reported that we are looking for an approval of, basically the total cost of the project is going to be the total cost of the project and anything else that is worked out outside that won't affect our TIP process, so we are still looking for approval of the TIP amendment itself.

Grasser asked, when you bid, and you get a bid higher than the estimate who is on the hook for paying the overage. Emery responded that the way he understands it is the City is going to get kind of a cooperative agreement with a Schedule I that will break down the share between MnDOT and the City, but then once they bid the project the Schedule I is revised, so let's say the bids came in for the traffic signals system at \$800,000, the City would then be responsible for \$400,000. Grasser said, then that they are going to pass through all of the participants. Emery said that that is how he understands it. Mason responded that that is correct. He added that the agreement will establish what percentage is going towards it.

Vetter stated that as far as the TIP Amendment goes, he would rather see the State at \$350,000, local at \$350,000 and if the State, how they want to pay their \$350,000 if they use some of their federal dollars that is fine, but the way this looks like, this is federal dollars coming in for this project, and State and City and it isn't an even split between the city and the state so if the state wants to take the federal dollars and move them all over to the state side he would be happy with that. Halford said that the numbers and the description is something that we can't control, we get those from our partners, what they want in there, so it matches their STIP. Kouba added that also with the federal dollars we have to state how much money is being spent federally on this project, it doesn't matter how it is split, unfortunately. Halford said, again, that we don't really have control to kind of, because it isn't shown in the TIP for the STIP then the project won't

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 19, 2023

happen. Vetter said then that it goes back to his original argument that if there are federal dollars coming it that should be subtracted first and then the remainder be split 50/50 between the state and the city. Halford stated that that is between the city and the state to figure that out, the MPO can't control or dictate what it should be.

Emery said that what Mr. Vetter is saying, how he is looking at it is that if the total cost is \$700,000, you should take away the \$285,000 in federal and then you split the balance. Vetter responded that that is correct, split the balance 50/50 between the state and the city. Mason commented that these federal funds are directed to the Trunk Highway System, not the local transportation system, unfortunately.

Halford commented that another thing that was brought up at the last meeting was improvements that the city has made already in that area, was that looked at as well as the help with the cost. Mason responded that that goes a little bit into those funding that were attributed 100% to MnDOT and that was addressed through a local partnership program project that the City of East Grand Forks led, and that replaced some of the concrete sidewalk and got rid of the brick pavers that were non-compliant with ADA, however he doesn't know what the exact number was but he thinks it was around \$300,000 of State Trunk Highway dollars that were provided to the City of East Grand Forks and then the City of East Grand Forks hired a contractor to complete that ADA compliant sidewalk work, and that was in 2021 or 2022. Emery said he believes it was done in 2021. He added that, again, that was basically to replace the stamped concrete crosswalks, and some sidewalk work on the west side of 4th Street.

Vetter asked if this project would come back to the City of East Grand Forks for approval. Emery responded that it would. He explained that they haven't approved the cooperative agreement so it will come back to the city for approval. Vetter said, then, that in the interest of moving forward with the MPO and moving the project forward, he will make a motion, and argue the cost share at City Council.

MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY LARSON, TO APPROVE 2023-2026 T.I.P. AMENDMENT #4, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Vein.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF 2023-2026 T.I.P. AMENDMENT #5

Kouba reported that this is a North Dakota Department of Transportation request. She explained that on 32nd Ave, some of you may or may not know that there was supposed to be a project happening there and when they released the bids and opened them they were a bit higher than they wanted so they decided to re-released it and now they are trying to work within there area and are trying to get the best bang for their buck so basically they are splitting the project, it is still using 2022 dollars, so this will be for the 2023 year of this particular TIP and they will be

splitting into two separate projects, one is going to be between 38th Street and 17th Street, with a total cost being reduced, and the state and local shares have been reduced as well. She said that the new split project was added, and it has its own dollar splits and then there is a new project for Preliminary Engineering for the 42nd Street Overpass, so they have set up some dollars to be used for that particular project for preliminary engineering only.

Kouba said that the Technical Advisory Committee recommended approval of the amendment.

***MOVED BY LUNSKI, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO APPROVE 2023-2026 T.I.P.
AMENDMENT #5, AS PRESENTED.***

Lunski said that she would add that the mill and overlay will happen this year, the concrete work is what came back so expensive so that is what is being pushed back. Kouba stated that they are still using 2023 funding dollars for that project too, the work is just going to happen in 2024 so this project will only show up in the 2023-2026 T.I.P., it won't be seen on our new 2024-2027 T.I.P.

Grasser added that if you do a late fall bid, like in October, you can pick a funding year because the feds are on a different fiscal year than we are, so it sometimes shows up fiscally as a 2023 project but construction wise it may show up in a different year, just to kind of explain what is going on with the second piece of the 32nd Avenue project.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Vein.

NON-ACTION ITEMS:

MATTER OF UPDATE ON URBAN BOUNDARY MAP

Kouba reported that back in May we brought forward some map options and we moved forward with a draft map for our Urban Area Boundaries as well as our MPO Study Area Boundaries. She referred to Map A, which is what we approved, and as you can see some of the adjusted area boundaries were very close to the census area boundary so before the deadline the NDDOT took a brief look at it and suggested that we bring out our adjusted boundary so that it can be very definitive that it is off lines and is off the roadways and things like that so she made those changes on Map B, as requested since it is still a draft format and she sent Map B to the NDDOT for their review.

Kouba referred to Map B and stated that, as you can see, the green area is the census boundary urban area and the purple area is what she sent them so it is kind of pulled off of the green area, including some to the south end of Grand Forks, and some areas in East Grand Forks as well, but it was pretty definitive when you got down enough, not this far out look at this map but you can

definitely see that they are off the boundaries especially in the south end area in East Grand Forks.

Kouba said that this is just an update, the last she heard was that NDDOTs deadline for FTA and FHWA comments on the draft had come and gone and they had not sent them anything, had not heard back when they were going to contact them again to remind them that they need their comments. She added that we still have our September 1st deadline, and she has not heard of any change to that, so we will be bringing a final, hopefully she will get any final comments from the NDDOT before then, but we will be bringing probably Map B back for final approval of the Adjusted Urban and MPO Boundaries.

Information only.

MATTER OF UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM

Halford reported that this is more of a discussion and heads up item; and just to give you a recap, recently the NDDOT decided to move to single year contracts, but as she said we will still continue to develop two-year work programs which helps because a lot of our projects go over more than one year so when we have that two-year it shows where we are going as well, not only for staff but for our partners and city staff to know what is coming down the pike as well.

Halford stated that the only change that she recommends we do, what she would like to do is not only, usually we do two-year work programs but we go through that whole two-year so going forward we will do more like how we do our TIPs, that rolling two-years, so right now we are working off our 2023-2024 work program, and she will be bringing forward a 2024-2025 work program, so we always have that year in front of us to look at, so that will be coming forward as well as, she would like to bring the Finance Committee together in the next couple of weeks because all of our positions are changing and salary ranges and scales are changing because, as you know, we follow the salary plan that the City of Grand Forks uses, and they are proposing a new plan that, if approved, would mean changes to positions and salaries, and she wants to bring that forward and make the Finance Committee aware of all of this, so who sits on the Finance Committee is actually Warren, Clarence, and Ken, and she does have a couple of dates that she can email them and set up a meeting with herself and Peggy to share what the new ranges will be and then have a discussion on that and how it will affect the 2024 budget.

Halford said that another thing she wanted to bring up, and what she brought up to the Technical Advisory Committee was that, as we are kind of finishing things up with the Street and Highway and Bike and Ped Plans, this is a good time to start reflecting back on this is how we have always done our plans, do the timelines work with our partners, do you want to change things up, is it too slow, is it too fast, do you want to combine plans, and then also are there any studies that you want us to look at. She added that what we have seen also the last little bit is that there has been some new funding sources popping up that we haven't seen before, so kind of working with how we do our Street and Highway Plans, there is always an illustrative list, so not only looking at studies that we can do in the near future but are there studies, small or big, that is always nice to have in our back pocket if funding should present itself, we can have them ready to go and run

with them. She stated that during the Technical Advisory Committee they kind of threw out a couple of ideas and she told them to get back to her, sooner than later, with any ideas they might have that we can put into the new work program.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

A) 2022/2023 Annual Work Program Project Update:

- 1) Bike and Pedestrian Plan Update – Halford stated we are at the finish line, and we will be getting the signed documents and things together and get the final draft together and sent out.
- 2) Street and Highway Plan/MTP – Halford stated that they have been going through the base model and updating that and looking at information from leadership and the public on that.
- 3) Aerial Imagery – Halford reported that we are still looking at the beginning of August for a final product.
- 4) Safe Streets For All – Halford stated that we sent in the updated contract for this so when we get that back we will be looking for signatures on it.

B) MPO Updates:

- 1) Obligated 2023 Project Discussion – Kouba reported that she brought this forward to the Technical Advisory Committee, and she just wanted to keep the Board in the loop on it. She stated that this is part of our Transportation Improvement Program Update, for the 2024-2027 year, and in that document, we are required to include where we are at with our 2023 projects, have we obligated the funds, where are we at with the project, and just giving an outlook on what that looks like.

She said that she has received some input on the list already and she has given our partners until July 26th to give us the rest of the updates, and then we can include the final report in our T.I.P. document.

- 2) MPO Mid-Year Review – Halford reported that we did have our Mid-Year Review on June 26th at the Hive. She said that we went over where we are at on our work program, our balances, and then we were also notified that we won't be doing a Title VI Audit, so Peggy was excited that the last one was her last, so that was good news, we were a little worried that we might get it again.
- 3) August Agenda Items – Halford said that some of these we already talked about; the Protect Grant, TIP Amendments, the new TIP, work program, and the urban boundary.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 19, 2023

- 4) Planner/Senior Planner Position Update – Halford reported that we did offer it to one person, unfortunately they declined the position, so we will have to re-open it and start all over.

Lunski asked if the person you offered the position to give a reason for declining. Halford responded that they didn't feel the salary was high enough. She stated that the person is from back east, so it was nobody local, just out of school but they had some good experience. She said that she offered them the planner position, starting pay in the mid-range, and then also told them that the salary would be increasing in January as the pay-scale is changing, but it still wasn't enough, which is too bad, he had a good background and would have been a good addition to the MPO.

- 5) Monthly Approved/Signed List Of Items – Halford reported that this is something that was brought up in our audit, it is something they recommend we be doing, and it was also brought up by Mr. Grasser that we do it, so she has started signing off on the monthly checking and savings reconciliations, journal entries, transfers, etc., and hopefully this next year we won't get dinged on this anymore and they won't have any corrections or recommendations for us.

C) Agency Updates:

None.

ADJOURNMENT

***STRANDELL ADJOURNED THE JULY 19TH, 2023, MEETING OF THE MPO
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:44 P.M.***

Respectfully Submitted,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager

Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO
Transaction List by Vendor
 June 17 through July 14, 2023

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
AFLAC.							
Liability Check	06/23/2023	AFLAC	501	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-564.42
Alerus Financial							
Liability Check	06/23/2023	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-2,304.44
Liability Check	07/07/2023	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,304.36
City of East Grand Forks							
Bill	07/11/2023	Inv. #...	2023 3rd Qua...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-2,684.30
Bill Pmt -Check	07/11/2023	7443	2023 3rd Qua...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-2,684.30
Constant Contact							
Check	07/06/2023	Const...	For 7/1/2023 ...	104 · Checking		517 · Overhead	-23.00
East Grand Forks Water and Light							
Bill	07/06/2023	Inv. # ...	2nd Quarter 2...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-450.55
Bill Pmt -Check	07/06/2023	7441	2nd Quarter 2...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-450.55
Forum Communications Company							
Bill	07/11/2023	Inv. #...	Public Notice...	206 · Accounts Pay...		-SPLIT-	-579.98
Bill Pmt -Check	07/11/2023	7444	Public Notice...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-579.98
Liberty Business Systems, Inc.							
Bill	07/06/2023	Inv. # ...	Contract/Frei...	206 · Accounts Pay...		-SPLIT-	-261.62
Bill Pmt -Check	07/06/2023	7442	Contract/Frei...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-261.62
LSNB as Trustee for PEHP							
Liability Check	06/23/2023	PEHP		104 · Checking	X	216 · Post-Hea...	-123.75
Madison Nat'l Life							
Liability Check	06/23/2023	7437		104 · Checking	X	215 · Disability...	-61.88
MetLife							
Liability Check	06/23/2023	7438	5397942	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-252.41
Mike's							
Bill	06/21/2023		MPO Lunche...	206 · Accounts Pay...		711 · Miscellan...	-95.00
Bill Pmt -Check	06/21/2023	7440	MPO Lunche...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-95.00
Minnesota Department of Revenue							
Liability Check	06/23/2023	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-485.00
Liability Check	07/07/2023	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-485.00
Minnesota Life Insurance Company							
Liability Check	06/23/2023	7439	Catch Up For ...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-549.95
Nationwide Retirement Solutions							
Liability Check	06/23/2023	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-538.36
Liability Check	07/07/2023	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-538.36
NDPERS							
Liability Check	06/23/2023	NDPE...	D88	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-3,194.84
Liability Check	07/06/2023	NDPE...		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-4,979.26
QuickBooks Payroll Service							
Liability Check	06/22/2023		Created by P...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-6,258.90
Liability Check	07/06/2023		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-6,296.39