

# **2012 MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD MINUTES**

**January 18, 2012**

**February 23, 2012**

**March 21, 2012**

**April 18, 2012**

**May 16, 2012**

**June 27, 2012**

**July 18, 2012**

**August 22, 2012**

**September 19, 2012**

**October 17, 2012**

**November 21, 2012**

**December 19, 2012**

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE  
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Warren Strandell, Chairman, called the January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:05 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Warren Strandell, Mike Powers, Mike Pokrzywinski, Steve Adams, Gary Malm, Doug Christensen, and Tyrone Grandstrand.

Absent were: None.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF Planner; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF Office Manager.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Strandell declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 15<sup>TH</sup>, 2011, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY POKRZYWINSKI, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 15<sup>TH</sup>, 2011, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Malm, Christensen, Adams, Strandell, Powers, and Grandstrand.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF MINNESOTA CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR 2013-2016 T.I.P.**

Haugen reminded the board that at their December meeting they approved the North Dakota candidate projects, and this month they are being asked to approve the Minnesota candidate projects and the transit projects for the 2013-2016 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that there are two trunk highway sub-target projects for FY2016. He said that the first project is a pavement resurfacing project for US Highway 2 from Central Avenue east fifteen miles, with six of those miles being within the MPO study area.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

Haugen commented that the second project is a rehabilitation project for the Kennedy Bridge, at an estimated cost of \$10 million, with each state providing half of the cost. He stated that the North Dakota side will use federal funds, and the Minnesota side is using state funds through their bridge program.

Haugen reported that currently the focus point of Red River bridges is the Oslo Bridge. He said that they are currently in the process of finalizing that project, and once it is completed they will then move on to the Kennedy Bridge and start identifying exactly how the project will be bid several years from now. He stated that currently MnDOT, as the lead agency, has identified that they are looking at repainting the deck, and are going to be looking at improved pedestrian access on the structure.

Haugen commented that there is one FY2016 enhancement project. He explained that East Grand Forks has submitted a new sidewalk construction project for the eastside of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.E. between 14<sup>th</sup> Street N.E. and 20<sup>th</sup> Street N.E. and along the north side of 20<sup>th</sup> Street N.W. from 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.E. to the technical college. He referred to a drawing of the area and pointed out where an existing sidewalk is located on the northern edge of 20<sup>th</sup> Street N.E., and explained that the proposal is to continue that sidewalk east to 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.E., and then on the east side of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue down past the Williams Park area.

Powers asked if the sidewalk was going to be located on the park side or the other side of the street. Haugen responded that it will be located on the east side. He commented that they looked at putting it on the west side, but there just isn't enough room to physically locate a sidewalk with the tree structure there, as well as other street furniture, so it is being placed on the east side.

Leigh stated that the problem he has with this project is that we are considering placing the sidewalk on the curb, and during snow events who is going to be responsible to remove the snow, the City or the property owner. He said that he doesn't think this is a good place to put a sidewalk. Haugen responded that they priced it out on the curb, but the final placement is yet to be determined. He explained that one of the reasons for placing it on the curb is because there is existing sidewalk near the Century Apartment complex. Leigh commented that he looked at the area, and agrees that if they were to place the sidewalk where it should go they would have to remove several trees along the berm, and that isn't going to be acceptable to the property owner.

Haugen continued to explain that they placed the sidewalk on the curb for cost estimate purposes, to give them the highest price, but if they are awarded funds, when they get into the project development phase, the actual location of the sidewalk will be determined.

Haugen reported that the total cost of the project is estimated at \$225,000, with the federal request being just under \$178,000. He stated that once this is passed by the MPO it will be submitted to the ATP for funding consideration in February. He added that once they know whether or not it is being funded, in late 2014 or early 2015 the project development process will really get going, and the exact location will be finalized.

Strandell asked what the local share will be. Haugen responded that it is 20% of construction, so about \$44,000. He stated that there is an additional \$60,000 that is ineligible for reimbursement

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

through the ATP process, so the local share will be about \$100,000. Strandell asked how the City Council will fund this. Leigh responded that right now he isn't really big on this sidewalk, so he isn't too concerned how it will be funded. He stated that the problem is that they are applying for the funds, and hopefully they will receive the funds, but he is probably the only person on the City Council that doesn't like the project. He added that he feels that the project they are doing on Highway 220 serves the same purpose, gets people to the college and down to the Hugo area, etc., but where they want to put this sidewalk doesn't make sense to him. He said that most of the City Council supports this project, but he isn't one of them. Pokrzywinski agreed that the majority of the City Council does support this project, and think there is value in connecting that area to the college. Haugen added that this did come through the City Council for consideration, and was passed on to this board based on their approval.

Haugen commented that the local cost would be budgeted by a future City Council. He added that they are setting aside capital improvement monies for this.

Haugen distributed copies of the Transit project list, and went over it briefly. He explained that, essentially, for transit they are just looking at what they guess the costs will be in 2016, shown on the last page of the project list. He added that on the North Dakota side there are additional FTA programs that they apply for, shown on the second page, and Cities Area Transit is anticipating that they will be looking for \$7.2 million dollars to help them renovate and upgrade their bus barn. He stated that they have already submitted applications for grants that were not approved, however there will be future grants they will be submitting applications for.

Haugen stated that if you will recall our congressional delegation on the North Dakota side was very successful in getting earmarks for transit dollars, however with the ban on earmarks these are now annual discretionary dollars through national competition for awards of funds. He said that the State of North Dakota has been organizing this to become a statewide application so there won't be any direct competition with the state for these dollars.

Haugen commented that the other two programs are continuing of operations that are currently ongoing, the JARC (Job Access Reverse Commute) will continue the operation of Transit Routes 12/13; and the New Freedom Funds will continue to fund the Mobility Manager position they received funding for, and hired this year.

Christensen asked if this was stuff the MPO would be studying in 2012. Haugen responded that the bus barn rehab project is not something the MPO is doing a study on as the City has hired EAPC to do that project. He added that there is also the energy consultant the City hired to look at energy efficiency/deficiency in all City buildings. He stated that the cost of doing both of these is how the City reached a cost of \$7.2 million. He said, however, that the MPO is currently studying Routes 12/13, and while there may be some possible modifications made to the route, we are not recommending the route be discontinued.

Strandell asked if this was an informational item, or if action by the Board was necessary. Haugen responded that the Board does need to take action on this item.

Christensen asked if these projects had been submitted to Service Safety Committee. Grandstrand responded that they had.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

Strandell commented that he wonders if this body has the authority to apply for funds, as he would think the City Council would take that action. Haugen responded that this comes to the MPO, and we have to determine if the projects are consistent with our plans, and then prioritize them, that is our responsibility. He added that we have to give these projects a thumbs up or a thumbs down, and we have, in the past, re-prioritized City projects. Christensen asked what other projects the \$7.2 million could be used for other than energy efficiency for a 30-year old building. Haugen responded that they are capital projects so it could be used for bus shelters, bus replacement, etc. Christensen asked if it can only be used for bus related projects. Haugen responded that that would be correct.

Christensen asked if they could buy buses with those monies. Haugen responded that they could, however there currently isn't any scheduled replacements needed, to that magnitude.

Powers asked if we digest this now, make a recommendation, and it is taken to the City Council for their approval. Haugen responded that it comes from the City first, to us. Powers asked if this is something the City wants. Christensen responded that he doesn't think the City Council has really been through this, as he doesn't recall this being discussed at the City Council. Haugen stated that it went through the City's process, then was submitted to the MPO for us to either pass on to the next level, which is the ATP in Minnesota and the Bismarck Central Office on the North Dakota side.

Christensen stated that what this really gets down to is if these projects are picked, you still have to get someone to get you a grant from the feds, and that sounds virtually impossible. Haugen reported that the \$7.2 million dollar project has already been submitted twice before for consideration of the discretionary grants. He added that, again, this is part of a state-wide effort, and the way these discretionary grants are being processed by the federal agencies are by making them all go through the Central State DOT office, then they forward them on to the respective federal agency. He said that North Dakota has been making all of these transit projects one big project, where they are all prioritized as one with no intra-state competing projects. Christensen stated, then, that they will apply for a bigger grant than \$7.2 million. Haugen responded that that is true, adding that the \$7.2 million will be grouped with Fargo's request, Minot's request, Bismarck's request, and then all of the rural agencies also have a couple million they always through in on a project. Christensen asked, if they get a grant for, say \$20 million, will the DOT then parcel it out. Haugen responded that they would.

***MOVED BY CHRISTENSEN, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE MINNESOTA LIST OF CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE FY2013-2016 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING.***

***Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Malm, Christensen, Adams, Strandell, Powers, and Grandstrand.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FY2012 WORK PROGRAM**

Haugen reported that the MPO has a two-year work program that was developed and approved at the end of 2010, and now that we are entering into the year 2012, a couple of modifications are necessary. He explained that these modifications are based on some things that did or didn't occur in 2011.

Haugen commented that the first modification is to extend out our current Transit Development Plan Study. He explained that we have URS under contract to do this study, which was supposed to have been completed by the end of December 2011, but a couple of things came up that caused a delay so we are asking that for an amendment to our 2012 Work Program to show this project continuing into the first quarter of 2012. He stated that the contract monies that were not reimbursed to URS in 2011 will be carried forward as well so we will not cause any of our current 2012 monies to be reallocated.

Haugen stated that the second modification is to create, or capture a new aerial photo for the metro area. He explained that the current photo was done in 2009, and we would like to fly the area in the spring in order to have an up-to-date photo to work from. He stated that the monies being identified to pay for this new project will come from funds that were not spent on a Southwest Grand Forks study.

Haugen reported that last year the MPO was asked to begin doing indirect cost billings. He then distributed copies of the new 2012 indirect cost table and explained that when the packets were mailed out, this information was not completed; however, since then staff was able to determine what the indirect cost rate will be for FY2012. He referred to that sheet, and went over what the indirect costs consist of.

***MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE FY2012 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM AND TO AUTHORIZE THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT AMENDMENT WITH URS.***

***Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Malm, Christensen, Adams, Strandell, Powers, and Grandstrand.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF FINAL DRAFT OF THE DOWNTOWN PARKING STUDY**

Haugen reported that this is the final step for the Downtown Parking Studies we completed for Grand Forks and East Grand Forks. He said that they have submitted final drafts to both sides, and both have received and filed the report.

Haugen stated that Rich and Associates has done a very good job with this study, and he is prepared to go over the recommendations if you wish, however it has all been processed through each sides respective boards and commissions, and the final draft has been modified to reflect any changes made during the process.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

Powers asked about the anti-shuffling ordinance. Haugen responded that a person can't just park their vehicle on the street, then just move it ten feet, they have to move it further than that. He explained that there is an ordinance already in place in which he believes a person has to move their vehicle at least 300 feet in a twenty-four hour period, so we are suggesting that this be narrowed to a shorter time-frame, but a longer distance.

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY POKRZYWINSKI, TO GRANT FINAL APPROVAL TO THE GRAND FORKS DOWNTOWN PARKING STUDY AND THE EAST GRAND FORKS DOWNTOWN PARKING STUDY.***

***Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Malm, Christensen, Adams, Strandell, Powers, and Grandstrand.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF FINAL DRAFT OF THE 47<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE SOUTH STUDY**

Haugen reported that, similar to the downtown study, the 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South Study has gone through the approval process, and staff is asking for approval of the Final Draft 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South Study report.

Leigh asked who will make the final decision as to whether a signal is put in or a roundabout. Christensen responded that the City Council will make that decision. Leigh said, then, that by approving this we aren't locking the City in to doing one or the other, we are just approving the recommendations. Christensen responded that when he reviewed this document, it is just giving recommendations, not suggesting a preferred plan.

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY CHRISTENSEN, TO GRANT FINAL APPROVAL OF THE 47<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY REPORT.***

***Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Malm, Christensen, Adams, Strandell, Powers, and Grandstrand.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF DRAFT RFP FOR THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT**

Haugen reported that this is the MPO's main activity in 2012, to update our Street and Highway Plan. He referred to the packet, and pointed out that a copy of the Draft RFP was included.

Haugen stated that the RFP was presented to the Technical Advisory Committee at their meeting last week, and they, along with staff, recommend this body approve the RFP for the Long Range Transportation Plan Street/Highway Element.

Haugen pointed out that we have a budget of \$175,000 to hire a consultant to help us through this process, which is programmed to continue into the first part of 2013. He stated that our current plan will expire at the end of 2013, so we need to have an updated plan in place before then.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

Haugen commented that the Transit Development Plan is one component, and staff has been working on the Bike/Ped component, and now we need to address the Street and Highway side as well. He stated that basically they will be following the same generic process we would normally go through.

Haugen said that there are a couple of unique things, if you will recall, we discussed in the past doing an intercept survey of the three bridges like we did about ten years ago. He added that we are still engaging with A.T.A.C., out of NDSU, to do our travel demand forecast modeling, which we use to help us calibrate the model. He said that they will identify issues through public input, and from past plans, and will use that information to develop alternatives. He added that they will also look at our current Long Range Transportation Plan recommended projects to determine if they are still valid or if alterations need to be made to them.

Haugen commented that a big thing we will need to address is our financial plan. He said, as you will recall, we have to have a fiscally constrained transportation plan, which means we have to identify our revenue sources to pay for all the projects we are recommending. He stated that our current plan has a 2% rate of growth in our revenues, and a 4% rate of growth in our cost estimates, so we will have to determine if those rates are still valid.

Haugen reported that there are two other studies that we are doing as part of this. He stated that the signal coordination plans in Grand Forks were done a few years ago, and with the data we will be gathering as part of the Long Range Transportation Plan, the consultant will be able to look at those timing plans and make any necessary modifications in order for them to reflect the current traffic flow out there. He said that the other study, as you will recall we discussed previously, is the request that we look at possibly closing University Avenue, either a full closure or a partial closure of traffic. He explained that in order to consider this we need to have it in our Long Range Transportation Plan efforts to see what impact it will have on our roadway system.

Haugen stated that the RFP, assuming approval today, will be submitted to consultants and advertised by March 2<sup>nd</sup>. He said that they then hope to have a consultant on board by the end of March.

Grandstrand commented that he feels closure of University Avenue is a really good idea. He stated that vehicles don't get through there very well anyway, so it would be much better and much safer if they used 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, or Campus Road instead. Powers asked if it would be closed from Columbia Road to 42<sup>nd</sup>. Grandstrand responded that he doesn't think it would include that much area. Haugen stated that it will look at closure between Columbia Road and Stanford Road. He added, however, that the study will look at the possibility that it could be narrowed even more, such as between the coulee or Princeton and Hamline; and whether or not it should be closed 24/7, or only five days a week, or even if it will work at all.

Christensen asked if this was included in the Long Range Transportation Plan or is it a separate project. Haugen responded that ultimately the decision would be part of the Long Range Transportation Plan if we decide to close traffic off even for a specific timeframe, as we would need to identify what kind of improvements would be necessary on the carrying corridors so that we can fulfill the closure requirements. He stated, however, that if we decide that we will not

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

close University Avenue at all, that, too would need to be part of our Long Range Transportation Plan and UND would have to go back and modify their plans knowing that we aren't approving the closure of University traffic.

Leigh asked, if University Avenue is closed, would North 6<sup>th</sup> need to be widened. Haugen responded that that would be part of the study.

Powers asked how personnel from Lake Agassiz School feel about this. Haugen responded that that would be part of the effort, to engage the neighborhood in the discussion of this proposal.

Christensen asked how much money is being put into the Long Range Transportation Plan Study. Haugen responded that the budget is \$175,000 for the 15-month process. Christensen asked, of that amount, how much will be needed to complete the proposed University Avenue closure request. Haugen responded that through discussions it may cost about \$50,000. Christensen said, then, that that is a pretty serious project, so is \$50,000 going to get it done; and how long will it take to get it done. Haugen responded that it will be part of the total Long Range Transportation Plan, and the recommendations should be available by this time next year as to whether or not we think University Avenue should be closed at all, and if so what time periods make the most sense for closure of the roadway, what impacts it will have, what improvements will be necessary to implement it.

Christensen asked what other big areas are going to be studied with the \$175,000, what other big components will be looked at. Haugen responded that the big components will be river crossings, interchanges. Christensen interjected that river crossings are bridges, that's code for bridges, guys. Christensen asked if we have to go through this drill. Haugen responded that we go through this every five years. Christensen asked if there is a reason we have to continue to go through that drill every five years. Haugen responded that if we don't then there are no federal transportation funds. Christensen stated that there may not be any anyway, but what he is getting at is, the outcome of some of these studies is probably foregone anyway, so why do we continue to study the same thing over and over every five years; is it because maybe it will have changed because we have relocated a street called 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South, because we know how far south East Grand Forks has grown in the last fifteen years, so he is curious as to why we continue to do this. He stated that he recognizes it involves federal funds, but can't you study other things with that Long Range Transportation Plan.

Christensen suggested that Mr. Grandstrand has a pretty good idea of moving our city to the west, so what can we study to move our city to the west. Haugen responded that the appropriate time to study that would have been during the Land Use Plan update that you just approved, and adopted, but which doesn't show a lot of growth occurring to the west side of the city. Christensen asked if they could re-open that study as part of our Long Range Transportation because we will need to reconsider some things if we begin thinking about that idea. Haugen responded that the short answer is, yes you can; but the long answer is that we obviously have to plan for the metropolitan area, and the issues that are going to be continuously raised when we do this are: 1) additional bridges and where we should locate them, and 2) additional interchanges and where we should locate them.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

Haugen reported that the purpose of the Long Range Transportation Plan is to get the communities to identify, with these limited funding sources, the projects we are going to pursue. He stated that if our financial plan shows that we have several millions of dollars less than our current plan, then obviously we can't continue to carry the same project forward, and we need to prioritize what projects we want to see done.

Christensen stated that, because this is the MPO, and we are supposed to take and give you direction as to what we'd like planned, and approve it; he doesn't want to continue to study a 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue bridge because we don't have any money to build it anyway, so it is superfluous to continue to study it. He stated that you can continue to do that, but we can't even find enough money to build out 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue as we promised Mr. Grassel we would do; so if we adopt this he doesn't want it written in stone so you can come back to us and we can modify what we want to study rather than just continue to study the same things. Haugen responded that as we go through the whole process and identify what issues we have, if we start identifying that we have studied these things to death, then we won't study them in earnest, but we still have to address the overall transportation needs of the metro area, and what the public is telling us, and what our traffic volumes at key intersections is telling us, so we need to somehow either modify the network to address those issues, or, what we thought we were doing with the last Land Use Plan Update was to identify if there is a desire to shift growth from what the current pattern is.

Christensen said that, obviously this will probably get passed here today, so you can get your study going to count cars going over the bridge, but he would like staff to come back to this board and identify the areas that you recommend we study, or no longer study, and study something else because that is what this board is supposed to be doing. He stated that he doesn't just want to approve this so you can hire a consultant and then you just go back and study the same things, he wants to know what is going to be studied before you embark on the study.

***MOVED BY CHRISTENSEN, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO APPROVE THAT THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD GET RECOMMENDATIONS FROM MPO STAFF AS TO WHAT SHOULD BE STUDIED, AND WHEN WE SHOULD START STUDYING IT AS PART OF THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN.***

***Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Malm, Christensen, Adams, Strandell, Powers, and Grandstrand.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

Christensen asked when everyone would like to get the recommendations back from staff. He stated that we need to hire a consultant, so would it be sufficient to allow for six weeks to do so. Leigh agreed that six weeks should be sufficient.

***MOVED BY CHRISTENSEN, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO APPROVE HIRING A CONSULTANT TO ASSIST WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE, AND TO REQUEST THAT MPO STAFF COME BACK TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD WITH RECOMMENDATIONS ON WHAT SHOULD BE STUDIED.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

Malm said that your approving hiring a consultant, but you aren't giving them any direction. Christensen responded that he is, that the consultant will be coming before the board to receive direction. Malm commented that what he is worried about is that the guy that gets hired will look at things we aren't looking at as he will be making his decisions based on what is in the RFP, and Mr. Grandstrand is saying he would like to see us studying growth to the west, and he knows the NDDOT won't consider another interchange south of Grand Forks, between here and Thompson, and that is what you would need to have growth west of the interstate, so you will have to argue how you will get people to live out there. Christensen responded that we can work on that, that is what Mr. Grandstrand and himself will work on. He said that it is their job to promote development out there, and they will come up with ideas and ways to fund it, such as their growth fund, sales tax initiatives, property tax initiatives, etc.. Malm stated that he has property tax there. Christensen said, then, that they won't need it then and people will have more money to build their buildings.

Malm stated that he understands what Mr. Christensen is trying to say, but he is concerned that when you ask someone to do something, they do what you tell them to do, but if you leave them wide open you might get something you don't want, so we have to give them some kind of direction on what we actually want studied. Christensen stated that if that isn't what he said, it is what he wanted to say; that once you get the person hired you bring him back here and then we, as members of the community, will tell him what we want studied. Malm said, then, that we need to start talking here about what we want to see studied, now, not when he comes in. Christensen responded that we won't do it today, but we can meet and do that later.

Malm commented that he understands we can't do anything today, but we have to make a decision. He pointed out that Mr. Grandstrand would like to close University Avenue, but he used to live close to 6<sup>th</sup> and Stanford, and he knows that those people will come out of the woodwork faster than you can believe if you suggest putting more traffic through their neighborhoods. Christensen stated that we are supposed to take the lead because we're on the MPO, and we're the City Council of Planning, or the County Commissioners of Planning, so he is just going to try to get this to be more than just a lunch meeting, and try to get into the planning process and earn our lunch. He said that it isn't going to hurt anyone to spend a couple of hours and have some ideas, and say, think about this, that there are other places that we've built out in the southend of Grand Forks that would be more suitable for a bridge, if we really want one on the southend to service East Grand Forks, so it doesn't have to be 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue South and 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South.

Christensen called the question.

Christensen rephrased his motion as follows:

***MOVED BY CHRISTENSEN, TO APPROVE AMENDING HIS MOTION TO HIRE A CONSULTANT TO ASSIST WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE, AND PRIOR TO THAT CONSULTANT BEGINNING THE UPDATE THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD MEET TO DETERMINE WHAT AREAS THEY WANT THE CONSULTANT TO STUDY.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

Leigh asked if there is a timeline we need to follow. He asked if there is a reason why we need to hire a consultant before we come up with ideas. Haugen responded that there is a timeline. He explained that in order for the MPO to meet the 2013 timeframe we need to do the bridge intercept survey while UND is still in session this spring. Malm asked if we couldn't just do the bridge intercept survey then start discussing where we want to go from there and then hire the consultant. Christensen stated that they need to allocate the \$175,000 for the study. Haugen responded that that is correct. He added that one of the first meetings they will have with the consultant will be to say that this is our current Long Range Transportation Plan Street and Highway recommended improvements, decide which ones you want to pursue further, which ones you want to drop, and what new ones you want to add.

***LEIGH SECONDED THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION.***

***Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Malm, Christensen, Adams, Strandell, Powers, and Grandstrand.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF N.W. EAST GRAND FORKS TRAFFIC STUDY DRAFT REPORT**

Haugen reported that this is a preliminary draft report, so this is more of an informational item. He reminded the board that the City of East Grand Forks asked the MPO to reconsider, or re-examine the issue of putting in a full intersection at 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.W. and U.S. Highway 2. He added that in addition to that request they also took a second look at the intersection of 17<sup>th</sup>/River Road/ and 12<sup>th</sup>.

Haugen commented that they hired the consulting firm of Alliant Engineering, who has been working with East Grand Forks and the Steering Committee to go through alternatives, and they have come up with some preliminary recommendations.

Haugen referred to illustrations of the recommendations (included in the file and available upon request) and went over each briefly.

Haugen commented that, ultimately, the full intersection at 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.W. and U.S. Highway 2 is still the long-term recommended improvement for this area, however the City is not going to pursue constructing it in 2014. He reminded the board that as discussed during our T.I.P. discussion, every four years the City of East Grand Forks gets roughly three-quarters of a million dollars to do improvements, and in 2014 they currently identify this intersection. He stated that, with the ultimate approval of this plan they would not construct this in 2014, but would push it further down on the timeline.

Haugen stated that at the intersection of 17<sup>th</sup>/River Road/12<sup>th</sup>, the recommendation is to do a minor modification of the curve on River Road in order to bring the intersection into focus as more of a four-legged 90-degree angled intersection, and to modify the stock condition. He explained that currently River Road is free flowing, and this improvement would suggest a stop sign for southbound traffic.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

Haugen reported that five years ago East Grand Forks was awarded T.E. monies to connect the underpass at U.S. Highway 2 to the Trailhead at River Heights Park, with the expectation that the off-ramp would be removed as part of the full intersection at 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.W., however, since the intersection project not being done, and the off-ramp not being removed, they looked at additional alternatives to still make that connection using those T.E. dollars in 2012. He referred to the illustration of this area and pointed out where the recommended solution was located, explaining that it would basically involve pavement striping, and construction of a multi-use path on the east side of the dike up to the Trail Head. He stated that the East Grand Forks City Council decided not to pursue this project, and sent a letter stating that they intend to release the 2012 Transportation Enhancement dollars, so if we were to pursue this project we would need to seek alternative funding alternatives to do so.

Powers asked if this was discussed by the City Council. Pokrzywinski responded that the major component of that study was the intersection at 5<sup>th</sup> and U.S. Highway 2, and there just wasn't the political will from the council, and with opposition from the neighborhood, it was felt that the project shouldn't be done. He said that the only comment he would make about it being pushed down the road in the long range plan, that was more of a way to leave the option open for future councils rather than endorsing it at this time.

Leigh commented that when you look at the three-quarter intersection, it's dangerous enough at Highway 2 and 220 with a lighted intersection, and we found that it isn't really warranted at this time for a lighted intersection, and it is cost prohibitive. He added that there isn't ample support for it either, and, as Mr. Pokrzywinski said, once we got rid of that option, what was the point of spending \$300,000 to take the off-ramp out, which he personally thought it was an unnecessary expense. He added that striping the street for bikes is ridiculous as well, as he rides that street all the time and there is hardly anyone on it, so why spend \$110,000 to put a line down a street, it doesn't make any sense.

Leigh said that they did have a divided council on this, as some preferred it and some didn't, but there just wasn't enough votes to get it done. Pokrzywinski agreed, adding that there weren't more than two or three votes for it at the most. He said that the other option they considered was putting in a left turn access for westbound traffic to get downtown, which he thought had merit to giving people an additional way to get to the downtown entertainment district and campground, but because the different elevations of the two, the westbound and eastbound lanes, became very expensive, the cost benefit wasn't there.

Powers asked about the intersection of 17<sup>th</sup>/River Road/ 12<sup>th</sup>. Leigh responded that he raised the issue that he has lived here all his life and has never seen a major accident there yet, so he wonders why we are doing anything, although this alternative is probably the least expensive alternative. Pokrzywinski commented that he feels this intersection creates a lot of confusion for people using it, and he feels this takes care of that.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY POKRZYWINSKI, TO ADJOURN THE JANUARY  
18<sup>TH</sup>, 2012, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:15 P.M.***

***Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Malm, Christensen, Adams, Strandell, Powers, and  
Grandstrand.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE  
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Thursday, February 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2012 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Warren Strandell, Chairman, called the February 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2012, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:02 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Warren Strandell, Greg Leigh, Mike Pokrzywinski, Steve Adams, Gary Malm, Doug Christensen, and Tyrone Grandstrand.

Absent were: Mike Powers.

Guest(s) present were: Bill Troe, URS.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF Planner; Bryan McCoy, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF Office Manager.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Strandell declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 18<sup>TH</sup>, 2012, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY POKRZYWINSKI, TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 18<sup>TH</sup>, 2012, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Malm, Christensen, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Adams, Strandell, and Grandstrand.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO THE 2012-2015 T.I.P.**

Haugen reported that this is a request from the City of Grand Forks' Cities Area Transit (CAT).

Haugen commented that some time ago the Cities Area Transit was awarded some earmarked monies. He explained that the CAT had already planned on purchasing this Automatic Vehicle Locator (AVL) system, and had received some good bids, so because they had some funds left over, and we have been working with UND on transit coordination and they had expressed

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, February 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2012**

interest in having this system in their shuttle fleet, we are amending our 2012-2015 T.I.P. to allow UND to purchase the AVL equipment using \$18,000 of our federal funds subject to UND providing the \$4,500 local match funds.

Haugen stated that this will allow that both the UND system and the City's system will be exactly the same, and as we implement further coordination we will have the ability to use smart phones, computers, etc., to identify fleet locations.

Haugen said that the request that came from the City of Grand Forks, to us, was to approve amending this into the S.T.I.P. so that the \$18,000 in federal funds can be used by the City and UND to purchase this AVL equipment. He stated that it has gone through the approval process, and staff is recommending the MPO Executive Policy Board approve it.

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE 2012-2015 T.I.P. AS SUBMITTED.***

Pokrzywinski asked if, when a person punches this up on their smart phone will they see where every bus is, including the ones in East Grand Forks. Haugen responded that they will see the total system. He added that if a person doesn't have a smart phone they can still google it on the internet as well.

***Voting Aye: Malm, Christensen, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Adams, Strandell, and Grandstrand.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AERIAL PHOTO DRAFT RFP**

Kouba reported that they basically do this every three years or so, and they are just trying to update their inventory so that we have more up-to-date information. She referred to a map of the study area, and pointed out what will be included in the update.

Kouba commented that at the Technical Advisory Committee there was some interest expressed in regard to us doing pictometry. She explained that this involves getting an oblique angle as well as the overhead we get every three years. She stated that it is an interesting thing, particularly to fire and police because it allows them the ability to measure the side of a building, which in turn would allow them to determine how high a window is on a building.

Kouba stated that currently doing pictometry is not in our budget to do. She said that it would have to be something that other departments are interested in, and some are, but county-wide she has not gotten very many responses, and at this point in time she doesn't believe she would recommend doing it because she doesn't believe that we have given them enough time to budget for something like that to do anything in-depth into this type of oblique imagery. She added that, although it would come in handy as we grow, she thinks that what we are truly looking for, especially the MPO, is the basic aerial photography, which is something that was done in the past. She added that they will continue to look at new things, but she doesn't think that it is time for us to look into doing something like this at this time.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, February 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2012**

Kouba commented that the current RFP is written towards getting the basic aerial imagery, but if we did decide to look at getting pictometry done we would need to rewrite the RFP to include it.

***MOVED BY POKRZYWINSKI, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THEAERIAL IMAGERY PROJECT RFP.***

Strandell asked what the cost of this project is. Kouba responded that the budget is \$37,000. She added that for pictometry, if we say we will do two flights, with the option of not doing the second one, for the whole county it would be \$77,000; for just our MPO area it would be more along the lines of \$41,000, but to do that we would have to ask if any other department would give any funds towards that cost.

Strandell asked how this is different from the LIDAR. Kouba responded that it actually uses some of the LIDAR to get the height differences between the buildings. She explained that basically LIDAR is more of the topography of the land itself, but not necessarily what the height of the buildings are.

Leigh asked, if we approve this and we don't get anyone to join it on it, where would the extra money come from. Kouba responded that we wouldn't be able to do it. Haugen commented that currently the motion is not to pursue the oblique, or the pictometry option, just what the base RFP asks for, however, for roughly \$5,000 more we would get our base plus the pictometry.

Christensen asked what you get beside that, do you get a whole bunch of pictures that are zooming up and down the streets. Kouba responded that basically what people will be able to do with the pictometry is measure from the ground to a window, and they will be able to determine how high from the ground that window is. Christensen asked how the MPO would use it. Kouba responded that the MPO probably wouldn't use it much at all, but it would be something of great help to the fire and police departments, as well as the assessment department, etc..

Christensen asked if staff was recommending not doing the pictometry. Haugen responded that this issue came up at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting two weeks ago, at which time it was thought that the initial cost was tens of thousands of dollars more than what was budgeted, but we now know it will cost about \$5,000 more to do the two cities, and, quite frankly he thinks there is one department in Grand Forks that would be willing to pick up that additional cost to have the urban area covered, so he would actually lean more towards asking that you reconsider your motion to include doing the pictometry if the \$5,000 is covered.

***Christensen asked whether the mover and second would add the option of pictometry if the extra cost is covered as a friendly amendment to the motion. They agreed.***

***THE MOTION NOW READS AS FOLLOWS: MOVED BY POKRZYWINSKI, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THEAERIAL IMAGERY PROJECT RFP, AND TO INCLUDE PICTOMETRY OF THE CITIES OF GRAND FORKS AND EAST GRAND FORKS SUBJECT TO SECURING THE NECESSARY FUNDING TO DO SO.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, February 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2012**

*Voting Aye: Malm, Christensen, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Adams, Strandell, and Grandstrand.*

*Voting Nay: None.*

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FINAL N.W. EAST GRAND FORKS TRAFFIC NETWORK STUDY**

Ellis reported that staff is seeking final approval of the N.W. East Grand Forks Traffic Network Study. She said that this body has seen the alternatives so she won't go into them in detail today.

Ellis stated that this has gone through the approval process, and has been presented to the East Grand Forks City Council twice, once in detail and once for the recommendations, which she would like to go over briefly.

Ellis explained that this is an implementation plan, and the recommendations are as follows:

0-5 Years:

- 1) Remove 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.W. as a full intersection and just go with updating the signal coordination on Highways 2 and 220, 5<sup>th</sup> and 2, 14<sup>th</sup> and 220 so that we get better traffic circulation, however leave the full intersection project in the Long Range Transportation Plan as a possible project sometime within years 5 and 20, dependent upon signal warrant, funding, etc..
- 2) Improve the intersection of River Road/17<sup>th</sup>/12<sup>th</sup>, which is currently made up of four legs coming together in a rather confusing manner. Move the road so it lines up at a more 90-degree angle. The City has asked that Jersey Barriers are put up to see how this change would work before actually doing the reconstruction project. If it is determined that this improvement should be done, the cost to do so will be about \$163,000 to \$175,000, and some funding sources have been identified.

5-20 Years:

- 1) Leave full intersection project at 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.W. in the Long Range Transportation Plan so should we reach a level of service that warrants it, if a signal is warranted, or if any other issues should arise, we can revisit it at that time.
- 2) Move on the Central Avenue Corridor recommendations for transportation, such as looking at a light at 23<sup>rd</sup>, etc..
- 3) Multi-modal Plan – At present the funding we receive from T.E. to do the project was able to cover the project before we started the study, however, by keeping the off-ramp open the cost versus the benefit is not there, however we are leaving it in the plan because we still do like the connection, and if we ever decide to close the off-ramp, or we foresee a

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, February 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2012**

need or want, and the funding is available to make the connection from the underpass up to the trailhead, we would like to pursue this as well.

Ellis reported that the City of East Grand Forks has approved the final document and are ready to move forward and file for future consideration.

***MOVED BY POKRZYWINSKI, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO GRANT FINAL APPROVAL TO THE NORTHWEST EAST GRAND FORKS STREET NETWORK STUDY REPORT.***

***Voting Aye: Malm, Christensen, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Adams, Strandell, and Grandstrand.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF FINAL WASHINGTON STREET/UNDERPASS CORRIDOR STUDY**

Haugen reported that, similar to the N.W. East Grand Forks Street Network Study, the Washington Street/Underpass Corridor Study has also gone through the typical study process. He added that it was presented to the NDDOT Upper Management for their consideration, was presented to the City of Grand Forks, to the Technical Advisory Committee, and the Steering Committee and they recommend approval.

Haugen commented that he would like to briefly highlight the four main things staff was asked to look at on this corridor, from 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue North to 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue South:

- 1) Street Condition – pavement is fifty to sixty years old, and needs to be replaced.
- 2) Underpass Structure has some condition issues.
- 3) Capacity issues at intersection of DeMers/Washington.
- 4) Multi-modal along corridor.

Haugen reported that the study is recommending a total rebuild of the corridor, at a total cost of \$35,000,000. He said that we all know we don't have that kind of funding available to do it all at one time so the MPO was asked to prioritize those projects. He stated that the first project on the list would be to replace the underpass structure, and NDDOT has already started pursuing funding to do it.

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO GRANT FINAL APPROVAL TO THE WASHINGTON STREET/UNDERPASS CORRIDOR STUDY REPORT.***

Leigh asked when the Columbia Road project is scheduled to occur. Haugen responded that the area south of the overpass is scheduled to take place in 2013/2014. He reminded everyone that

back in December it was determined that there was a \$2,000,000 shortfall in federal funding participation, and in the month of March we hope to hear whether or not there is some way to bridge that gap. He added that once we know this we will then need to determine whether or not we plan on pursuing doing both projects, or how we are going to come up with the \$2,000,000 shortfall.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, February 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2012**

*Voting Aye: Malm, Christensen, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Adams, Strandell, and Grandstrand.*

*Voting Nay: None.*

**MATTER OF DRAFT TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS**

Kouba reported that Bill Troe, URS, is here today to give a brief presentation on the Transit Development Plan. She added that they basically got the draft out, and it is on the MPO website, and a summary was included in the packet as well.

Kouba commented that an open house is scheduled for this evening, from 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. for public comments. She stated that it will be held in the Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers.

Bill Troe, URS, explained that his presentation will cover the recommendations included in the Transit Development Plan.

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

Christensen asked if we just put this on a shelf. Haugen responded that we will need to approve this plan in April, which will then allow the Cities Area Transit the ability to do the on-time performance recommendations to get the routes on-time; and also to make changes to the routes so that when the Wellness Center, and Doctor's Hospital open up we have the routes set up to service them. He added that the plan will also be used to allow us to go after grants to do the coach replacements, rehab the bus barn, etc..

Christensen said, then, that in as much as a five-year plan, there is no money on the horizon. Haugen responded that there is no extra money. Christensen stated that the bus barn could continue as it is until they can no longer breathe the air. He asked what the recommendation would be to get us to 30-minutes, and forget about the 60-minute routes; and what about thinking about another centrally located area. Haugen responded that we basically would need to add another bus to operate out there, so that would require another \$200,000, and the budget does not identify an additional \$200,000 being available. Christensen stated, though, that if we did that it would eliminate a lot of the problems, and he is all about the 30-minute routes instead of the 60-minute routes. He added that if this is ever going to get a chance for ridership and usage, we have to make it user friendly. Adams commented, however, that realistically you aren't sitting in a bus for an hour, you're going to your transfer point to get to and from the area you want to be at.

Haugen stated that, as you see, we really want to go to the 30-minute headway as much as we can, but we don't have the \$200,000 to implement it. Christensen said, however, that we can figure that out, and if that is the recommendation, then you'll stretch us to figure it out.

Christensen commented that he can see the road full of people because the friendly bus driver is picking them up wherever they are on the route, and if we now try to make them walk two blocks

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, February 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2012**

to a set pick-up location, then we need to put some bus shelters in. He added that we are going to have to figure this out because the town is growing, and more people are going to be using the system, but he doesn't know how we do that unless you stretch your policy makers to find the funds needed.

Pokrzywinski said, earlier it was mentioned that if we went with designated stops they would be set up so that people wouldn't have to walk more than 500-feet. Troe responded that there is 1000-feet between stops. Pokrzywinski asked how many stops that would be for a 30-minute route. Troe responded that he thinks a lot of the routes are about 21,000 to 22,000 feet long, so you would be looking at 20 or so stops, however it wouldn't mean that the bus would actually stop at all of those locations, only those where clients are waiting. He commented that today you could say there are an infinite amount of stops on each route. Pokrzywinski asked how much would need to be added, what amenities would need to be added throughout the community to implement the designated stops. Troe responded that they have not included a hierarchy, essentially, that would say that this stop would assume that there would be a shelter, a sign, etc.. Haugen responded that they have assigned the cost to put up the signage, but not the other amenities. Pokrzywinski asked if there has ever been an effort to move to this type of system. Christensen responded that he doesn't think so, but if you want it used you have to get it to 30-minute routes, so you have to identify what you want to do to get that done. Kouba commented that part of making it more friendly can be those designated stops because she has also heard that people are confused as to where the bus stops.

Haugen reported that, as you saw in the recommendations, they are still trying to pursue that 30-minute frequency if possible, but, as you are also aware, congress needs to do something with our reauthorization bill, so for this year we are kind of assuming the status quo, but if congress acts favorably one way then 30-minute headway will be much easier to accomplish, but if they act unfavorably it will make it much more difficult to do so.

Christensen stated that he would like to see us strive for the 30-minute headway because that pushes everyone to work for it. Troe commented that this is what they have identified as one of the recommendations. He added that they also need to show a fiscally constrained plan, which pushes them to say that it can't be done today because we can't identify the dollars. Christensen said that he is sure we can find the \$200,000, but he would also like the signage identified as well so that people know where we are going to stop. He added that he would also really like to see the changes made to the Columbia Mall and Altru campuses as well.

Troe reported that their recommendations also include vehicle replacements, and over the course of the plans' five-years we have about \$1.9 million dollars programmed for vehicle replacements; three 30-foot buses currently being operated, one smaller bus currently being operated, and the para-transit fleet. Christensen commented that he strongly suggests not recommending going with the big buses, get back to the smaller buses, because the big buses just don't get filled up, and he knows that there isn't going to be the support you want to buy the big buses. Haugen stated that there are some routes where a majority of the runs require us to have a higher capacity bus. Christensen asked why that is. Haugen responded that otherwise they are leaving people behind. He added that they currently have busses where they are at capacity and they have to tell people that they can't board the bus. Christensen asked how often that happens.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, February 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2012**

Haugen responded that on a given day there is one route that has to do that once. Christensen said, then, that is kind of a casualty.

Grandstrand stated that he would like to offer an idea; maybe we can figure out which routes have that and which ones don't, and for the ones that don't have that problem maybe we can do an analysis to determine how much we would save going with a smaller bus, and then we can decide if it is worth the savings. Christensen said that he agrees with that, that is our job, our job is to figure out what we are going to buy and put it on our route. He stated that you can recommend the replacement, we already know about that, so he isn't really sure if that is part of the scope to determine what kind of replacement vehicle we should purchase. He said that that is something this committee can do, we can determine what kind of replacement bus we want to purchase so don't make that kind of recommendation.

Haugen commented that they currently have seven buses running out there; four of them are more productive routes where they have ridership and they are operating the 30-footers, and the other three they are operating the smaller buses. He said that they can revisit that, but they have gone through that exercise once already and came to the conclusion that for the four routes using the 30-footer they should continue to use them, and that they should continue to use the smaller buses on the other three routes.

Malm asked how many people have to be on a bus before you have to turn people away. Haugen responded that on the smaller buses there isn't any standing room, so once twenty people board, additional people have to be turned away. Malm asked about the larger buses. Haugen responded that they can carry about forty to sixty people. Pokrzywinski asked if they actually get to capacity, where they can't fit any more people on it. Haugen responded that they have. Christensen stated that he would like to see one of those go by, he has never seen one. He added that he can buy a bus that holds thirty people, and he knows he can because he does work for someone who builds them, so there, he solved the problem. Malm commented that he agrees about the issue of the large buses because people do complain about them because you can see them running nearly empty all the time, but of course now they have their windows painted over so you can't see inside them anymore.

Christensen stated that you can make your recommendations, but he doesn't think they will be followed, but if you recommend implementation of buses that are safe, and you have the appropriate review of what you can afford, he thinks Mr. Grandstrand's committee will embrace it and work on it. He said that his guess would be that the Public Safety Committee would embrace it and work on it and try to help Todd reach the stretch.

Presentation continued.

Haugen reported that one of the grant opportunities that will be presented in the near future has to do with "one call-one click", which tries to integrate the Veteran's Services with all of the demand response type of services we have available regionally. He explained that NDDOT is looking at Grand Forks to be a kind of regional hub for that service, and are looking at trying to build the computer/telephone type of equipment so that we can handle a "one call-one click"

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, February 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2012**

center in Grand Forks. He stated that the operation of that would not increase our operating costs but would instead be an operating grant.

Troe stated that there is an open house scheduled for 6:00 p.m. in the Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers tonight.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY POKRZYWINSKI, TO ADJOURN THE FEBRUARY 23<sup>RD</sup>, 2012, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:15 P.M.***

***Voting Aye: Malm, Christensen, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Adams, Strandell, and Grandstrand.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE  
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Thursday, March 21<sup>st</sup>, 2012 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Gary Malm, Past Chairman, called the March 21<sup>st</sup>, 2012, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:10 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Greg Leigh, Mike Pokrzywinski, Gary Malm, Mike Powers, and Tyrone Grandstrand.

Absent were: Warren Strandell, Doug Christensen, and Steve Adams.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Nancy Ellis, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF Planner; Bryan McCoy, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF Office Manager.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Malm declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 23<sup>RD</sup>, 2012, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MALM ASKED IF THERE WERE ANY ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS TO THE FEBRUARY 23<sup>RD</sup>, 2012, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD. HEARING NONE, MALM DECLARED THE MINUTES APPROVE AS PRESENTED.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE FY2012-2015 T.I.P.**

Malm opened the public hearing.

There was no one present for discussion.

Malm closed the public hearing.

Haugen reported that we have some projects that need to be changed in our current T.I.P. document. He referred to the staff report, and pointed out that they are highlighted in the report as follows:

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, March 21<sup>st</sup>, 2012**

- 1) A request from the NDDOT to amend the T.I.P. to change the scope and cost estimate for a 2012 project. Originally the project involved complete reconstruction of the Gateway Drive/Columbia Road intersection, however during the project development process it was determined that an agreement could not be reached as to the full amount of geometry changes needed for this intersection, so a “do-nothing” alternative was chosen instead. Therefore the project scope has been changed from a full intersection reconstruction down to a preventative maintenance project, and the project cost dropped to \$500,000, with \$400,000 being federally funded.
- 2) A request from the City of East Grand Forks to amend the T.I.P. to replace their 2014 project of constructing a new, full intersection at 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.W. and Gateway Drive with a project to reconstruct 17<sup>th</sup> Street N.E. between Central Avenue and 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.E. The cost of the 17<sup>th</sup> Street N.E. reconstruction works with the City’s Sub-Target Funds, and the change was approved by their City Council.
- 3) A request from MnDOT to make a minor modification to the sidewalk construction project on the westerly side of Bygland Road. East Grand Forks received a Safe Routes To School Infrastructure Grant to construct a sidewalk along Bygland Road, and as part of Minnesota’s program, when anyone receives infrastructure monies, they have to set aside \$5,000 of those funds to go towards non-infrastructure activities. In the current T.I.P. both the infrastructure and non-infrastructure projects were listed as one project, however MnDOT has asked that we separate out the non-infrastructure portion, so as an administrative modification we are including a new project in the T.I.P. listings as a \$5,000 non-infrastructure project.

Haugen commented that the Technical Advisory Committee met last week, and they, along with staff, are recommending approval of these amendments and modification as being consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan.

Pokrzywinski stated that he just wants to make sure that the request from East Grand Forks to replace the 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.W. Intersection project to the 17<sup>th</sup> Street N.E. reconstruction project, is in compliance with federal regulations and that funding is available. Haugen responded that it is. He explained that 17<sup>th</sup> Street N.E. is a functionally classified roadway, and thus is federally eligible for funding. He added that the plans he has seen for the reconstruction include multi-modal provisions as well.

Powers asked how far the sidewalk will run on the west side of Bygland. Ellis responded that it will run from 6<sup>th</sup> to 13<sup>th</sup>. She added that once it is constructed we will have sidewalks on both sides of Bygland to 13<sup>th</sup>, and then there is the extension on the east side out to the Middle School.

Leigh asked if there were any plans to add a crosswalk. Ellis responded that they are planning on putting in a crosswalk with the new sidewalk with pedestrian actuated crosswalk signs, so you

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, March 21<sup>st</sup>, 2012**

will push a button and the lights will flash around it. She stated that they unfortunately don't have enough funds to do the radar signs at this time, but they are still looking at a way to get them. Pokrzywinski asked when the crosswalk signs will be installed. Ellis responded that they should be installed before August. Pokrzywinski asked if it will just be on 13<sup>th</sup>, or will there be any crosswalk signs elsewhere as well. Ellis responded that they will just be at 13<sup>th</sup> for that project, but they will be putting in a crosswalk at 6<sup>th</sup> as well. Pokrzywinski asked if there will be signs included with that as well. Ellis responded there would. Pokrzywinski asked if they would be pedestrian actuated signs. Ellis responded they would not.

Powers asked if the road itself, across the coulee, would be fixed as it is pretty rough right now and is that something MnDOT would take care of. Ellis responded that it is actually still in the city limits, so the city will need to take care of the repairs.

Ellis reported that the non-infrastructure funds to go Safe Kids to continue the work they do within the school system. Pokrzywinski asked if she meant the Safe Kids Coalition. Ellis responded she did, adding that it doesn't make sense to write a new program when they have a program that is nationally renowned, and are recognized for their work.

Malm asked why the Columbia/Gateway Intersection project was changed. Haugen responded that closing off the frontage road and putting in a signal at REA Drive and Gateway are sticking points. He said that he thinks everyone would be supportive of closing off the frontage road if the traffic signal were installed, but ultimately, a signal at that location is not currently warranted, therefore, NDDOT is not willing to put one in right now.

Malm asked why the signal at Columbia and Gateway doesn't change when there isn't any traffic going east/west, but he is trying to turn west from Columbia. Williams responded that she isn't sure, but they just put in video detection at that location. She said that she would look into it. She added that they have also submitted a request to the NDDOT for authorization to put in protected left turns for north and south bound traffic at that location.

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE AMENDING THE 2012-2015 T.I.P., AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Malm, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Powers, and Grandstrand.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF APPLICATIONS FOR FTA/JARC/NEW FREEDOM PROGRAMS**

Kouba reported that basically NDDOT had sent out solicitations for their JARC and New Freedom programs. She stated that the only applications they received were from the Cities Area Transit.

Kouba stated that the JARC application was for funding to continue the operation of the City of Grand Forks' Route 12/13. She added that the New Freedom application was for funds to be able to retain their Mobility Manager position; to add a notification module to the RouteMatch software; and for the replacement of a paratransit vehicle.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, March 21<sup>st</sup>, 2012**

Kouba commented that both the Technical Advisory Committee, and Staff recommend approval of these applications as being consistent with the MPO's Long Range Transportation Plan.

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY GRANDSTRAND, TO APPROVE THE APPLICATIONS FOR NDDOT JARC/NEW FREEDOM FUNDS AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE MPO LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN.***

*Voting Aye: Malm, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Powers, and Grandstrand.*

*Voting Nay: None.*

**MATTER OF PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF DRAFT TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

Kouba reminded the board that at their last meeting Bill Troe, a consultant from URS, who was hired to do the Transit Development Plan Study, was here to give a presentation. She stated that she is here today seeking preliminary approval of the Draft Transit Development Plan that was provided to us from URS.

Kouba referred to a power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request), and briefly went over the recommendations and funding options.

Presentation ensued.

Powers asked if the \$30,000 covers the cost of one bus. Kouba responded that, in addition to any New Freedom funds, would allow us to purchase one replacement vehicle per year.

Presentation continued.

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY POKRZYWINSKI, TO APPROVE THE PRELIMINARY DRAFT TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN.***

Pokrzywinski asked if there are any more public meetings, or public hearings scheduled or is that part of the process completed. Kouba responded that it will be going through more of the Planning and Zoning public hearing processes now. Pokrzywinski asked if it will eventually come back to this body for final approval, and when. Haugen responded that they will be presenting the final document to the Planning Commissions in April, and then it will go to the City Councils, and finally to this body in May.

Pokrzywinski asked if there has been much objection raised concerning the proposed fixed stops. Kouba responded that there has been little objection to them.

Malm commented that the Grand Forks Planning Commission's April meeting will not be a good one for this to be presented at. He explained that they will be hearing comments/concerns from the neighborhood regarding a proposed zoning change from commercial to multi-family on the

south end of Grand Forks, and at their last meeting discussion on this issue took two hours. He suggested that it be a very short presentation.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, March 21<sup>st</sup>, 2012

*Voting Aye: Malm, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Powers, and Grandstrand.*  
*Voting Nay: None.*

**MATTER OF CONSULTANT SELECTION FOR LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION  
PLAN – STREET/HIGHWAY UPDATE**

Haugen referred to the staff report and pointed out that it indicates that the RFP was distributed out, and that five proposals were received. He stated that the nine-member selection committee identified three firms they wanted to interview; URS, SRF, and KLJ; and SRF was the top choice.

Haugen stated that one of the questions asked of the consultants during their interview dealt with our signal coordination system. He explained that we just established a coordinated plan for Grand Forks' arterial roadways; which is working well, and has been very well received. He added, however, that we do have a couple of older plans from the earlier process; 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South and Columbia Road, so before we got too far into the TDP and Long Range Plan alternatives, we wanted to make sure we had our signal coordination up to snuff again, and that is one of the very first pieces of work we are asking the consultant to do.

Haugen reported that when they asked SRF about this, they got a somewhat evasive answer. He stated, however, that as the selection process continued the committee still ranked them as the top ranked firm.

Haugen explained that with our selection process, we do not open the cost estimate and detailed work sheets until we have selected the winning firm. He said that when they opened SRF's cost estimate packet we discovered that they were not going to do what the RFP identified be done to the full extent, so during the negotiation process we had to do a little give and take with SRF.

Haugen commented SRF originally wanted to take our turning movement data and identify whether or not timing plans needed to be updated, however the RFP stated that we not only wanted them to tell us that, but also to update the plans and help us install them in the field. He stated that they finally reached somewhat of an agreement with SRF to actually do all the signal timing we asked for, but in order to free up the money for them to do that they asked that we do some tasks that normally they would, such as a fairly large amount of GIS work.

Haugen stated that, because there are still some minor things to work out with the contract, he does not have a recommendation today; therefore he is requesting that the MPO Executive Policy Board either authorize the Finance Committee to approve execution of a contract agreement with SRF, or hold a special meeting to do so.

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO AUTHORIZE THE MPO FINANCE  
COMMITTEE APPROVE EXECUTION OF CONTRACT AGREEMENT TO THE  
RECOMMENDED FIRM TO PERFORM AN UPDATE TO THE LONG RANGE  
TRANSPORTATION PLAN - STREET/HIGHWAY SECTION.***

*Voting Aye: Malm, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Powers, and Grandstrand.*  
*Voting Nay: None.*

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, March 21<sup>st</sup>, 2012**

Haugen commented that they should be able to execute the agreement prior to the next MPO Executive Policy Board meeting, so it would be his expectation that the consultant hired will be at the April meeting. He reminded the board that the discussion they had when the RFP was approved asked that the board have the ability to meet with, and discuss what issues they want the consultant to look into with this study.

Haugen stated that the next thing you will see happen with the study will be a vehicle intercept survey at our three bridges in early May. He added that beginning next week we will also begin turning movement counts throughout the metro area. He said that the counts will continue for the next five weeks.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Matter Of Progress On Statewide Transportation Planning

Haugen referred to the information included in the packet, and pointed out that MnDOT has a couple of things going on with their statewide multi-modal planning effort. He stated that they released what comments they received back on their draft objectives and policies. He added that they are also doing an update to their bike plan as well.

Haugen reported that MPO staff went to their open houses in both Crookston and St. Cloud. He added that there is another way to participate in this process, via the internet at:  
[www.dot.state.mn.us/bike/study.html](http://www.dot.state.mn.us/bike/study.html).

Haugen commented that NDDOT is also kicking off the update to their Statewide Transportation Plan as well. He stated that the effort is called: TRANSACTION III, and will be their third update to their plan. He pointed out that they are holding an invitation only meeting in Grand Forks on March 28, and he hopes that everyone here was invited. He stated that if you weren't invited you can go to the website.

Information only.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY GRANDSTRAND, TO ADJOURN THE MARCH 21<sup>ST</sup>, 2012, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:55 P.M.***

***Voting Aye: Malm, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Powers, and Grandstrand.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE  
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Thursday, April 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Warren Strandell, Chairman, called the April 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:12 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Greg Leigh, Mike Pokrzywinski, Gary Malm, Mike Powers, Warren Strandell, and Dout Christensen.

Absent were: Tyrone Grandstrand.

Guest(s) present were: Janelle Mullroy, Brady Martz.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Nancy Ellis, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF Planner; Bryan McCoy, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF Office Manager.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Strandell declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 21<sup>ST</sup>, 2012, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE MARCH 21<sup>ST</sup>, 2012, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Malm, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Powers, Strandell, Adams, and Christensen.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF 2011 MPO AUDIT REPORT**

Janelle Mullroy, Brady Martz, was present for a brief overview and discussion on the 2011 Audit Report. She referred to copies of the report, included in the packets, and went over the information briefly.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, April 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

**QUESTIONS/COMMENTS:**

Christensen referred to page 9, and asked how you would find how the general administration is set up. Haugen responded that the salaries are spread throughout all of the line items. He pointed out that we have both direct costs and indirect costs, and general administration is one such line item that staff charges hours to.

Christensen asked how this is set up so that we know exactly what our salaries are for our people. Haugen responded that this is identified in the work program. Mullroy added that the general ledger would also show this information. Christensen asked why it wouldn't just be reported. He stated that the reason he asks this question is because he sees that we have one employee for which we are funding a 401K, who is it. Haugen responded that it is him. Christensen commented that he doesn't have a problem with it, but he is just wondering about it.

Christensen asked who the MPO employees are. Haugen responded that in addition to himself the MPO consists of three full-time employees; Peggy McNelis, Nancy Ellis, and Teri Kouba; and two part-time employees: Bryan McCoy and Mitchell Kasdan.

Christensen requested that a list of employees, and their salaries be made available. Leigh asked if there was a formula used to determine the cost breakdown for a project, including salaries. Haugen referred to a table, included in the packet illustrating the breakdown of staff and consultant hours, and went over the information briefly.

Christensen asked about the financial management item, what are we managing, are we spending \$12,000 to manage whatever cash we have. Haugen responded that financial management would include such things as monthly billings to the DOTs for reimbursement, paying consultants, accounting and payroll functions, etc.. He added that the bulk of the hours would be for work done by Peggy McNelis, Office Manager.

Christensen asked why this isn't done by the City of Grand Forks. Haugen responded that the City wanted the MPO separated from the City, so we do all our own accounting and human resource functions, although we still follow the City's benefit and salary schedules.

Christensen asked where everyone was located. Haugen responded that his, Teri's, Peggy's and the intern's offices are located in the Grand Forks City Hall Planning Office, and Nancy's is located in the East Grand Forks City Hall Planning Office. Christensen asked if the MPO pays the City rent. Haugen responded they do, at a cost of about \$12.00 a square foot.

***MOVED BY CHRISTENSEN, SECONDED BY MALM, TO RECEIVE AND FILE THE  
2011 MPO AUDIT REPORT, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Malm, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Powers, Strandell, Adams, and Christensen.  
Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT MINNESOTA FY2013-2016 T.I.P. PROJECTS**

Haugen reported that normally in April we would be adopting a draft T.I.P. document that covers both sides of the river, however this year we are only processing the Minnesota side Draft 2013-2016 T.I.P. at this time as North Dakota is just not quite ready to identify the projects they want to program for the next four years on the North Dakota side, so right now we are just processing the Minnesota projects for East Grand Forks, with the exception of the Kennedy Bridge project in 2016.

Haugen stated that they held a public hearing last week, and no one appeared. He added that they also placed a notice ten days prior asking for comments, but none were received.

Haugen commented that there are no surprises in the Draft T.I.P. from what this body approved as being consistent with the Long Range Transportation Plan, and as were prioritized back in January.

Haugen stated that MNDOT did provide one corrected action. He referred to page 17, Project #6, and explained that this project consists of replacing curb ramps on DeMers Avenue or US Business 2, and was originally identified to be funded 100% with state funds, but that has now been changed to include some federal monies, so it now shows that \$240,000 will be federally funded, and the remaining \$60,000 will be state funded.

Haugen said that the Technical Advisory Committee, along with staff, are recommending this body approve the Draft FY2013-2016 Minnesota Side T.I.P.

***MOVED BY POKRZYWINSKI, SECONDED BY CHRISTENSEN, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT FY2013-2016 MINNESOTA SIDE T.I.P., AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Malm, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Powers, Strandell, Adams, and Christensen.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FINAL PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN FAMILY DOCUMENTS**

Haugen reported that back in January staff gave you these draft documents, then we had to go through a 45-day comment period for this family of plans, per a requirement in the Federal Register. He stated that that comment period ended March 1<sup>st</sup>, and the only comments we received were from the two state DOTs, although we did not actually receive those comments by March 1<sup>st</sup>.

McCoy stated that most of the updating involved some changes to data, facts and figures, as well as some other minor narrative changes.

Haugen commented that when we talk about the family of public participation plans, the four documents we are referring to are:

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, April 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

1. Public Participation Plan
2. Environmental Justice Manual
3. Title VI
4. Limited English Proficiency Plan

Haugen stated that the Environmental Justice Manual, Title VI, and Limited English Proficiency Plan are all included as part of the Public Participation Plan, but are also stand-alone documents as well, which is why we call this the “Public Participation Plan Family Documents”.

Haugen reported that the Technical Advisory Committee, and staff recommend final approval of the Public Participation Plan Family Documents.

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO APPROVE THE FINAL PUBLIC PARTICIPATION FAMILY DOCUMENTS, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Malm, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Powers, Strandell, Adams, and Christensen.  
Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FINAL TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

Kouba reported that there have been no changes since this was before you for preliminary approval. She added, however, that the Public Library is going back to Service Safety for further consideration of providing service, but as long as this doesn't add miles or time there should be no real change to the budget.

Kouba commented that they will be doing an operational study, which will look at the multi-ride fares, as well as a more in-depth look at the 30-minute service

***MOVED BY POKRZYWINSKI, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN.***

***Voting Aye: Malm, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Powers, Strandell, Adams, and Christensen.  
Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AERIAL PHOTO CONTRACT**

Kouba reported that they have gone through the selection process, after receiving more proposals this year than in the past, and AeroMetric was chosen by the selection committee to perform the imagery again this year. She said that they did come in slightly under budget at \$36,901.

Kouba stated that they are going with a 6-inch resolution across the entire MPO area. Strandell asked if this would include elevations as well. Kouba responded that they will update the elevations they currently have on file.

Leigh asked what the extra \$5,000 was for. Kouba responded that they had originally considered having oblique angles done, and AeroMetric gave them a cost estimate of \$29,000, but when she

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, April 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

went out to ask other departments if they were interested in having this done, and if they would contribute towards the cost, she didn't get any responses so it appears none were interested at this time.

Pokrzywinski asked for an explanation on what 6-inch resolution means. Kouba responded that it is the size of the pixel. She stated that when they use a 6-inch resolution the pictures are clearer than if they use a lesser resolution. Pokrzywinski asked if the stuff on Google would be comparable. Kouba responded it would, but these photos may actually be a little bit better.

Powers said that he heard from someone that it covers approximately 144 square miles, how far out are they going. Kouba responded that they are going out past the airport, and a bit south of Merrifield. Haugen clarified that they will be going, east-west from the Mallory Bridge to the Airport and north-south from the North Washington Interchange to the Merrifield road area.

Haugen pointed out that they did price out doing a higher resolution shoot, but the cost almost doubled so they decided to go with the 6-inch resolution instead.

Strandell asked if this information would be made available to assessors. Kouba responded that they give this information to both cities, including the GIS Coordinator in Grand Forks, and FS Engineering in East Grand Forks.

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE ENTERING INTO A CONTRACT WITH AEROMETRIC TO PERFORM THE AERIAL IMAGERY PROJECT, AT A COST NOT TO EXCEED \$37,000.00.***

***Voting Aye: Malm, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Powers, Strandell, Adams, and Christensen.  
Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON MPO LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION –  
STREET/HIGHWAY PLAN UPDATE**

Haugen reported that we do have SRF Consulting under contract to assist in the update to the Street/Highway element of our Long Range Transportation Plan.

Haugen referred to a summary of SRF's Scope-Of-Work, included in the packets, and explained that it summarizes their approach to the study. He pointed out that there are several items we wanted to have done in sequence:

1. Existing conditions
2. Identification of issues
3. Range of alternatives
4. Financial plan
5. Finalizing recommendations/alternatives

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, April 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

Haugen referred to a power point slide and pointed out that there is an “x” shown. He explained that they originally thought that both cities would have pavement management software in place, but they discovered that isn’t the case so they had to scale back a little on how they are doing the financial planning for this. He stated that they included a re-write of that section of the proposal in the packets. He said that they were originally going to look at all street, even local, to make sure we have as much financial information as possible, but that has been scaled back to include the federal aid eligible streets, as these are the ones that could be federally funded in which case they would be included in our T.I.P.

Haugen commented that they are currently doing traffic counts at all signalized intersections, and the consultant will be looking at the signal timing plans that are in place in Grand Forks to determine whether or not they need to be updated. He said that the next thing will be the vehicle intercept survey that will be done at all three bridges.

Haugen reported that the consultant will be attending the MPO Executive Policy Board’s May meeting to work with you, and others, to determine what issues you want them to identify.

Christensen commented that he doesn’t want to engage in another session of arguing about where a bridge should be placed when it isn’t going to be anywhere. He said that he just isn’t going to engage in a conversation about bridges when nothing has really changed, that he can see, as to what was decided regarding Merrifield, and although he can see angst on the East Grand Forks members, that is the decision that has been made so if you are going to bring it forward as to why you think it should be changed, he would like the reasons before we get into that conversation. He added that another thing he, quite frankly, that he finds interesting is that they are going to identify future revenues and expenditures by consultants, and you and I can do that, but how are they doing to do it when we don’t even know.

Christensen stated that we had a great big study for an underpass, and he doesn’t even know how many millions that was, and we spent a lot of time and that is on the shelf, a great big study for an underpass/overpass at 42<sup>nd</sup>, and he would imagine those items are now, the study has been done so the question becomes, when do you get the money, if you get the money, what do you do first. He said that what he is curious about is studying and recognizing there may be a minimal level of funding so there are only so many things we can do with the money that comes forward rather than light rail transport between here and the airport.

Haugen commented that the current recommended plan will give you an idea of what projects we currently believe we have funding to implement by 2035, so that would be the starting process. Christensen said that he understands that the MPO has to project out to 2035, but realistically we don’t know what will happen by then. Haugen responded that this is the requirement we have, and the timeframes we identify are the short term, which will get you to 2017; then the medium term that will get us out to 2025; so the projects we identify in those are really the ones we are trying to commit our resources, and are identify as priority projects that we want to pursue funding for.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, April 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

Pokrzywinski asked if he could address Mr. Christensen's comment about perceived "angst" that East Grand Forks member might have. He said that they understand reality, and he doesn't think there is any appetite to keep fighting a fight that is over, at least for the immediate future, so any "angst" that you might perceive from them, as to where a future bridge might be located, he doesn't think is really there. He added that there isn't any money, nor is there any desire or will in Grand Forks to do one at all, so why keep fighting that battle. He said that he would argue, though, that, if, in order for us to qualify for federal funds we have to do the studies for the time periods required, we have to do it. He stated, however, that he doesn't necessarily think, if it were him, that this is how he would do it, but if this is the game we have to play then we have to do it. Christensen agreed, adding that he is glad that Mr. Pokrzywinski said what he said because that will preclude a whole bunch of issues. He stated that if there were money available to do it he would be glad to do so, but there isn't.

Haugen commented that if we can maintain what our current plan is, that would be great, but the question will be funding because Congress can't even give us an appropriation for a year.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Matter Of Update On Statewide Planning Efforts

Haugen reported that this is just a reminder that you have opportunities to participate in the Statewide Planning Efforts for both North Dakota and Minnesota.

2. Matter Of Update On Minnesota/4<sup>th</sup> Avenue Corridor

Leigh asked for an update on the Minnesota/4<sup>th</sup> Avenue Corridor efforts, as that is a terrible corridor to drive on. Christensen agreed, asking how this project can be pushed this forward. Haugen responded that currently there is one block of granitoid that is still on the National Preservation Register, towards the Senior Center, but the City has approached the Historic Preservation Commission to update the Memorandum agreement they have concerning that section of pavement in order to get this project done. He added that he believes the plan the City is pursuing is to attempt to amend the agreement to be able to do a mill and overlay on the portions of roadway not on the register this year.

Christensen asked when the Sorlie Bridge work was supposed to occur. Haugen responded that it is scheduled to occur in 2018. Christensen stated that we need to get the Minnesota/4<sup>th</sup> Avenue Corridor project into the queue as soon as possible. Haugen asked what the hope is, to reconstruct it or to do a mill and overlay project. He said that one is a temporary fix, giving you ten to fifteen years, and the other is a more permanent fix. Christensen asked what the cost would be to do the more permanent fix. Haugen responded that it would be closer to six or eight million dollars. Christensen said that we need to take this back to the Service Safety Committee, and then back to the City Council to get this into the City's CIP.

Haugen gave a brief overview on what occurred when the MPO did a study on the Minnesota/4<sup>th</sup> Avenue Corridor.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, April 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO ADJOURN THE APRIL 18<sup>TH</sup>, 2012,  
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:50 P.M.***

***Voting Aye: Malm, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Powers, Strandell, Adams, and Christensen.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE  
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2012 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Warren Strandell, Chairman, called the May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2012, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:08 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Greg Leigh, Mike Pokrzywinski, Gary Malm, Mike Powers, Warren Strandell, Tyrone Grandstrand, Steve Adams, and Doug Christensen.

Guests present were: Brian Shorten and Lance Bernard, SRF Consulting Group; Jane Williams and Richard Romness, GF City Engineering.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Nancy Ellis, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF Planner; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF Office Manager.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Strandell declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 18<sup>TH</sup>, 2012, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO APPROVE THE APRIL 18<sup>TH</sup>, 2012, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Malm, Grandstrand, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Powers, Strandell, Adams, and Christensen.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**INTRODUCTIONS**

Haugen said that, for the sake of Mr. Shorten and Mr. Bernard, he would ask that everyone state their names and who they represent.

**MATTER OF INITIAL MEETING WITH SRF CONSULTING ON LONG RANGE  
TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE**

Haugen reminded the board that we hired SRF Consulting to assist us with our Long Range Transportation Plan Street and Highway Update, adding that representatives from SRF are here today to give a brief summary on what is planned for the update. He referred to the packet and pointed out that it includes the study approach and schedule.

Haugen stated that, as you are aware, we have already done some vehicle intercept surveys, the results of which will be discussed today; and tonight we will be holding the first public open house in the Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers at 6:00.

Haugen then introduced Brian Shorten, who is the project manager for SRF.

Shorten stated that they certainly appreciate the opportunity to work with the MPO on this transportation plan update.

Shorten referred to the information in the packet, the agenda, and pointed out that they will be talking a bit about the study process, the origin/destination study that was recently completed, the open house format, and then we would like to visit with this body to get a better understanding of what you want to see with this update.

Shorten reported that they did include a copy of the study approach summary, which is what they presented to the selection committee, to show them how they plan on approaching this project. He stated that they you will see that they are addressing the requirements the MPO listed in the RFP.

Shorten referred to the study approach summary table, pointing out that the key elements of their effort are listed across the top, and went each briefly. He commented that the objective of this whole transportation effort, for the streets and highway section, is to help develop a program of projects that are fiscally constrained, that you can use to bring in federal and state funds to match your local funds in order to be able to implement the transportation projects that are identified in the plan.

Shorten then referred to the project schedule, project timeline table, also included in the packet, and went over that briefly as well.

Grandstrand asked how they are making sure people get to the public meetings. Lance Bernard, SRF Consulting, responded that they have been working with staff, putting public notices in the papers, word of mouth, etc., to get this information out to the public. Grandstrand asked how many people they would ultimately like to see attend these public meetings. Bernard responded that ultimately they would like to see 50 or more people attend the meeting tonight, adding that they have heard that there seems to be a good level of interest in the update, so are optimistic that this can be accomplished.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

Haugen reported that there have been some groups that have expressed interest in their portions of the metro area, who have indicated they will invite people to come to the meeting.

Christensen asked who these groups are. Haugen responded they include Global Friends, the New Americans, the Healthy Grand Forks Coalition, UND, the Merrifield or South Bypass Coalition, etc.

Bernard commented that they want to involve the public in a new interactive way, an electronic survey, which they have been using at a lot of public open houses. He stated that this survey is basically a power point, with survey questions asking the public to rank projects, etc. He added that they, along with staff, have developed a series of about 50 or so questions that they will present to the public, who will then be able to use survey clickers to answer. He said that their answers will automatically be shown on the screen, which will allow them to see whether or not their peers feel the same way they do about an issue or project.

Bernard reported that the format they intend to use for tonight's meeting is:

- 1) For the first half-hour they would like to have public look at boards that staff has put together showing existing land use patterns, future land use patterns, existing and future transportation issues, etc..
- 2) Move on to survey portion, which they will open with a short presentation explaining their process and the timing of the project.
- 3). Last half-hour they would like to allow people to mingle and discuss what has transpired.

Shorten referred to a memorandum, included in the packets, that discusses the origin-destination survey that was performed on the three red river bridges, and gave a brief summary on the preliminary results of that survey.

Shorten stated that the data from this survey will help ATAC and MPO staff calibrate their traffic model, and will also provide information about travel patterns within the metropolitan area for transportation planning within the project development stage. He commented that they will have a much more detailed report on the survey results by the end of the week.

Shorten said that based on some other work they have done, the survey went very well, and the public was quite cooperative. He added that he hopes nobody's phones were ringing off the hook with complaints. Pokrzywinski stated that there were some nasty things said on Facebook, as well as a call to the radio station about traffic backup. He asked if, when you were first starting up the survey, was there an issue with some major backup of traffic. Shorten responded that although he wasn't there, whenever a backup started they would just let the whole stream of traffic go through to release the pressure, but maybe for the first little bit there may have been some buildup, just until everyone got a sense of how the flow of traffic was going, but after that he doesn't think there were any further issues. Haugen explained that the A.M. Peak at the Kennedy Bridge, where traffic merged from the on-ramp down to one lane of traffic, that is where the problem occurred.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

Pokrzywinski asked about the 10% external trips, and whether or not there will be a breakdown for each bridge. Shorten responded they would provide that.

Shorten stated that lastly, they would like to open up the floor for discussion. Bernard added that part of the materials included in the packets was just to get everyone some background information in order to get the conversation rolling today; specifically what are some of the issues, opportunities, or needs that you see with this update. He pointed out that the two questions being posed up front are: 1) what are your top three transportation needs for the metro area; and 2) what are some constraints in meeting future transportation needs.

Grandstrand commented that we need to understand why our traffic model hasn't predicted what's going to happen over the last ten years. He said that traffic has decreased in a lot of areas where it should have increased. He added that another thing is that we need more biking or multi-modal structure.

Shorten asked if there was a preference regarding bike paths versus bike lanes. He pointed out that there are two ways of making connections: 1) a bike lane, the cheaper option; 2) a bike path, engineers preferred choice. Christensen responded that you can address that issue like this: 1) we don't have places for paths in the north end of Grand Forks unless you create them; 2) if you happen to go down University Avenue, you will see paths that have very little use by bikers; 3) since the flood all of the streets have had bikepaths added, either an 8-foot or 10-foot path. He said you can spend a lot of time on this, but it's how you implement it, so, he isn't here to throw cold water on Mr. Grandstrand's suggestion, but the areas in the community simply aren't conducive to that because you have old and new, so when you are done with this discussion he would like to discuss other areas that don't have to do with biking.

Christensen commented that we need to focus on the development of Columbia Road South and 47<sup>th</sup> because that will square our city off, and he doesn't know where it fits in this list of priorities, but it has to move forward, it has to move up sooner than later because when we get those built out we will be able to locate a school in the southwest quadrant of the City of Grand Forks, so we will need to focus on a four-lane or five-lane someplace in that area. He added that he would suggest we have bike paths, not lanes when we do this.

Shorten stated that he noticed in the last transportation plan that it called for Columbia Road, between the two arterials, to be a four lane roadway in the long term section. Christensen asked if long term means within the next ten to twenty-five years. Shorten responded that that would be correct. Christensen said, then, that we need to move it to the short-term. Haugen commented that we amended the plan in November to do the Columbia Road project in the 2016 to 2017 timeframe, so it was moved from the long-term to the current mid-term timeframe. He added that 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue is also in the current mid-term timeframe. He stated that they just completed the study of 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue from Columbia to Washington, so both those corridors are in the current mid-term programming of projects in our plan.

Christensen said that he understands what Mr. Haugen is saying, but the purpose of this meeting, as he believes it, is to simply move something from mid-term to short-term, or something from

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

long-term to mid-term, and he is speaking as a representative of the City of Grand Forks, and he would like the Columbia Road and 47<sup>th</sup> projects moved up. Haugen responded that he understands, but that the short-term of our plan is already five years past, so when he describes mid-term that is actually our current project term. Christensen stated, then, that they are on the same page.

Christensen commented that, as discussed at last month's meeting, there is no appetite, he believes, to continue a conversation on bridges because neither community has the funds to do any additional bridges, so he would rather you not spend a lot of time dealing with these issues until sources of funding can be determined, and also because it takes valuable time away from other more valuable conversations you can have where there is some degree of funding, and he laud your efforts to try to predict the funding for the next ten to twenty-five years in light of what is going on in our country, he simply doesn't know how we will get these things moving as there are no more earmarks.

Pokrzywinski said that, for the record, in terms of the bridges he agrees with Mr. Christensen that the money isn't there, the political appetite isn't there at this time to start really talking seriously about building a bridge, but he doesn't favor taking the siting of bridges out of the long range plan, and he hopes that that isn't what his comments have been interpreted as meaning as he feels a lot of work was done siting those hypothetical bridges should we ever find that there is an absolute need to build one, and/or the funding becomes available to proceed, so he thinks they should be left in the long term plan, and that is what will be his position. He added, however, that he also doesn't think we need to spend a lot of time talking about the impossible, but he also thinks that since the long range plan is in place, if and when we decide we need to build a bridge, we have identified where they should be located. Christensen stated that he concurs with Mr. Pokrzywinski, as planners and councils before us have come up with the locations, so he agrees they should be left in the plan.

Christensen stated that, if we are going to decide on an overpass/underpass in this community, we need one on 42<sup>nd</sup>. He said that we need to figure out how we are going to fund it, and how and when we are going to build it, so wherever it is in the current plan, if we can we need to move it up because Grand Forks could probably get the funds to do it.

Leigh commented that he would like to see you revisit the issue of opening 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue N.E. onto Highway 2, the intersection there, because it is a straight shot from one end of town to the other.

Pokrzywinski reported that two of our three bridges are woefully inadequate as far as pedestrian access, they are unsafe for pedestrian crossings. He stated that, while we have two pedestrian bridges that connect the north and south end of the greenway trails, but they really don't provide convenient access from one neighborhood to the next, so when we do go to upgrade or replace those bridges, it is very important that we look at addressing this issue.

Malm asked how soon they can get the closure of University Avenue out of the study. Christensen asked if this body were to direct the consultant to discontinue studying it, would it happen. Malm asked how they force the issue on this because all it is doing is creating very bad

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

feelings within the neighborhood. Grandstrand asked how this would affect Mr. Malm's neighborhood as there is a coulee between University Avenue and his neighborhood. Malm responded that his neighborhood is the whole northwest corner of the city, and how are you going to get around University Avenue without causing traffic through the neighborhood streets.

Christensen stated that, quite frankly, you can do whatever you want, but the question is how did the closure of University Avenue get this far when anyone that drives there can figure out there isn't anywhere to go to the south, and the only place to go to the north is 6<sup>th</sup>, so how do you direct the traffic. He added that we don't need to spend \$150,000 for someone to study that, so why are we doing it, is it in the scope of work. Haugen responded that it is in the scope of work because it is an official part of UND's plan. Christensen stated that they can pay for it themselves, then. He added that Mr. Zitzow didn't seem too enthused with the programs when he was on T.V. the other day. Haugen commented that this might be viewed as an opportunity to convince UND to alter their Climate Action Plan to eliminate the possible closure of University Avenue and look at other alternatives instead. Malm asked how we do that. Haugen responded that we do it through this study process. He then briefly explained what the study process would provide in terms of alternatives, etc. Pokrzywinski commented that he feels this would be a worthwhile thing to do, to figure out some options to make the university safer. He added that if you go to UND's website, where the Climate Action Plan exists, it does talk about how they understand that the option of closing University Avenue will be controversial, and they do rank it as a low priority item. He said that he doesn't know if they realistically think it will ever happen, and how much should we have to pay for a study to rule something out, or whether it is the University's responsibility, he can't answer that.

Discussion ensued.

Leigh stated that, ultimately, we are doing a study to give UND information on what they should do, why aren't they doing their own study. He added that he does think that they should do a study to determine the impacts the closure of University Avenue will have on neighboring roadways. Christensen agreed, citing a study that was done for the 34th Avenue neighborhood to help them determine how they would get through Kiwanis Park, and guess what, they came up with their own solution and the street is being placed.

Haugen reminded the board that it is a transportation issue in our metro area, and the MPO Executive Policy Board is the transportation body that deals with transportation issues. Malm stated, then, that we should make a recommendation and send it back to the University. Grandstrand commented that, before we make any recommendations, we need to remember that there are 14,000 residents that use that campus, not including, of course, the thousands of professors and staff, and none of them are here. Pokrzywinski said that he would agree with that point. He stated that they are a very large entity, as far as the size of this community, and they don't have a representative on this body, and the 14,000 students and staff do have a huge impact on the transportation system within this community, so to suggest that we aren't responsible for paying for some information they want he doesn't totally buy that, but he doesn't agree that closing University Avenue is a good idea, and would never support that, but he doesn't agree with the notion that they should pay for a study about the transportation system because they are a big enough part of this community to warrant a study be done for them.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

Haugen stated that they could request SRF try to separate this task cost from the rest of the study and approach UND to pay the local match. He added that the chairman is going to suggest a June 27<sup>th</sup> meeting, so between now and then we will have had an opportunity to have SRF do that. He said that there is an existing committee that meets quarterly with UND City Staff, People About Transportation, that will meet in June so we will have a chance to work through the channels, and we will certainly have UND representatives here as well. Christensen commented that he doesn't think it is a question of cost, he thinks it is more of a message. He added that he agrees with Mr. Pokrzywinski, that studying it is fine, for the reasons he articulated, the problem is there is no solution, no one is going to support closing it, so don't do a study that is going to come back saying close it, because you might have one vote here to do that, but he doesn't think there will be any other votes, so he feels we should study things where you can affect some change rather than those you can't.

**MATTER OF DISCUSSION ON MNDOT CIMS**

Haugen reported that this is a new approach MNDOT is doing with their major highways. He explained that CIMS is an acronym for Corridor Investment Management Strategy.

Haugen commented that MNDOT held a meeting in Thief River Falls last Thursday, and Chairman Strandell and himself attended. He explained that they are trying to do more with less, trying to identify low cost high reward type highway projects along the corridors.

Haugen stated that more impetus of this is to try to get dreams of other corridors throughout the state wherein it is a current two-lane roadway that the local people want to expand to four-lanes with multiple access so that they can grow commercial strips along them, so it is kind of taking an approach where instead of MNDOT trying to work alone to invest and to manage it's corridor they are trying to engage with groups along the corridor to come to an agreement as to how they are going to invest and manage that corridor realistically rather than via a wish list.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY POKRZYWINSKI, TO ADJOURN THE MAY 16<sup>TH</sup>, 2012, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:06 P.M.***

***Voting Aye: Malm, Grandstrand, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Powers, Strandell, Adams, and Christensen.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE  
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, June 27<sup>th</sup>, 2012 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Warren Strandell, Chairman, called the June 27<sup>th</sup>, 2012, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:03 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Warrant Strandell, Mike Powers, Gary Malm, Greg Leigh, Steve Adams, Mike Pokrzywinski, and Tyrone Grandstrand.

Absent was: Doug Christensen.

Guests present were: Lance Bernard, SRF Consulting Group; Peggy Lucke, UND; Jane Williams and Richard Romness, GF City Engineering.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Nancy Ellis, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF Planner; Bryan McCoy, GF/EGF Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF Office Manager.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Strandell declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MAY 16<sup>TH</sup>, 2012, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO APPROVE THE MAY 16<sup>TH</sup>, 2012, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Grandstrand, Malm, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Powers, Strandell, and Adams.  
Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF MNDOT SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL AWARD**

Ellis stated that this is a public hearing.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, June 27<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY MALM, TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING.***

***Voting Aye: Grandstrand, Malm, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Powers, Strandell, and Adams.  
Voting Nay: None.***

There was no one present for discussion.

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY MALM, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.***

***Voting Aye: Grandstrand, Malm, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Powers, Strandell, and Adams.  
Voting Nay: None.***

Ellis reported that Minnesota had some additional Safe Routes To School funding available for non-infrastructure, which is your bike/ped programs, not sideswalks, etc. She said that Safe Kids out of Grand Forks, along with the East Grand Forks School District teamed up and submitted an application, and did receive a \$20,000 grant to support a comprehensive bike/pedestrian program for the East Grand Forks School District's K-8.

Ellis stated that, because these are federal monies, we are requesting that the board approve amending the 2012-2015 T.I.P. to include them. She said that she visited with Mr. Haugen earlier, and the funding will go into FY2013, but will be advanced in FY2012, so we need to put it in both the FY2012 and FY2013 project lists.

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO APPROVE AMENDING THE 2012-2015 T.I.P. TO INCLUDE THE MNDOT SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL NON-INFRASTRUCTURE GRANT OF \$20,000.***

***Voting Aye: Grandstrand, Malm, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Powers, Strandell, and Adams.  
Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF AUTHORIZING THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD CHAIRMAN AND THE MPO EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO SIGN THE 2012 MINNESOTA STATE CONTRACTS**

Haugen reported that this is an annual contract that we sign with MNDOT for around \$11,000 in state monies that we can use as 100% local match to our federal funds. He added that, as part of this, East Grand Forks has to match 20% of these funds to allow us to access the \$11,000, which has been part of routine annual budget for twelve-plus years.

Haugen commented that the State fiscal year begins July 1<sup>st</sup>, and typically would we be signing these contracts in January, but this year, because of past State Legislative issues, appropriations were not available for us to sign until now, we are seeing these contracts now.

Haugen stated that this is a very typical contract, one that we have signed in the past, so staff is recommending approval to sign.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, June 27<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

***MOVED BY POKRZYWINSKI, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD CHAIRMAN AND THE MPO EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO SIGN THE 2012 MINNESOTA STATE CONTRACTS.***

Powers asked if the City of East Grand Forks has the funding necessary to match the 20% of the \$11,000. Haugen responded that the 20% is already part of the City's budget.

***Voting Aye: Grandstrand, Malm, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Powers, Strandell, and Adams.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON KENNEDY BRIDGE STUDY**

Haugen reported that back in April we approved a draft T.I.P. on the Minnesota side that indicated we were going to program \$10,000,000 to rehab the Kennedy Bridge structure, with each State contributing 50%, or \$5,000,000 each. He said that they also heard that MnDOT was going to do a study to determine whether or not rehabbing is the appropriate action to take or not.

Haugen stated that a couple of weeks ago MnDOT released an RFP indicating what they want the consultant to look at, a copy of which was included in the packet. He commented that the due date for submittals is mid-July, with the hope that a contract can be signed by the end of July, with a 12-month study process from start to finish.

Haugen referred to the scope-of-work, and pointed out that one of the first things the consultant will need to look at is a pier on the North Dakota side that is rotating and moving. He stated that this is something that we were made aware of some time ago, and, in-fact, we actually programmed \$1,000,000 to replace that pier, but then the two states held further discussion and decided to delay the project in order to include it when a more extensive rehab of the deck itself at a later time. He said, however, that 2016 is that time, and the pier has still been moving, therefore consideration of replacement of the bridge may be necessary

Haugen commented that another thing he wanted to get some feedback on, and perhaps some action from the MPO Executive Policy Board is, you notice they also identified they want to have a Study Advisory Committee, formed; and as the staff report identified, that is the purpose of the MPO, to be that forum for transportation decision making in the metro area. He stated that he has been communicating with MnDOT and NDDOT that the Study Advisory Committee should be the MPO Executive Policy Board, but he wanted to get feedback from the board as to whether or not you agree with you acting in that capacity knowing that some of these other stakeholders would be involved in a board meeting, such as our environmental, fish and wildlife, Corps of Engineers, and other federal and state environmental agencies. He added that their staff members would also participate in the Technical Advisory Committee settings as well, so offering that the MnDOT and NDDOT use the MPO structure as the way to coordinate the Grand Forks and East Grand Forks counties, states, and DOTs working together on determining what to do with the Kennedy Bridge.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, June 27<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

Pokrzywinski asked for clarification on the Study Advisory Committee issue. Haugen explained that in the RFP they identify that a Study Advisory Committee will be formed to provide project management direction, and that the study team will be made up of people from the cities of Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, Grand Forks County, Polk County, etc., and some of those stakeholders, although not all of them, but the majority are members of the MPO already. He added that further, there will be another meeting of all of these stakeholders, which he would envision being the TAC acting as that capacity as most of them would be staff representing the stakeholders at these other meetings once they get to the technical side of things, and the MPO Board would be the upper level, just as you are now, making the policy type decisions.

Haugen stated that at the board level you would have to have some of these other agencies be Ad Hoc members to the board for this study, just for that study purpose agenda items, and not for all the rest of the MPO Board actions that you will take once that study goes through.

Haugen reported that the other bit of information, which he just found out about this morning, as you may have seen North Dakota finally released their federal program for the next four years, which is normally done in April, but one thing they did not show to the MPO, as far as what projects were going to be programmed in the metro area for FY2016 was anything regarding the Kennedy Bridge. He stated that he tried to find out from them if that was just an omission, or what was going on, and this morning he was informed that North Dakota is actually going to program, instead of the \$10,000,000, with \$5,000,000 being North Dakota's share, their document is showing a \$32,000,000 project, with a 50/50 split.

Haugen stated that it is somewhat confusing as to why they are programming that much money, but what the District Engineer, Les Noehre, informed him this morning was that they are probably looking at having funds available in the event the decision is to replace the bridge, then they won't have to scramble to find the necessary funds in 2016. He said that this may require an amendment to the Minnesota Draft T.I.P. to add the additional funding amount.

Pokrzywinski asked how MnDOT reacted to North Dakota doing this. Haugen responded that our hope is that someone with the North Dakota Bridge Division has been communicating and coordinating with someone with the Minnesota Bridge Division. He said that the people he communicates with aren't sure, and haven't been able to have conversations with the Bridge Divisions to make sure they are understanding that one is doing \$32,000,000, and the other has already done \$10,000,000, and hopefully something happened in-between where they met and agreed to program \$32,000,000 and Minnesota is going to come back and amend their \$10,000,000 to \$32,000,000, but he can't tell you if that has happened.

Pokrzywinski asked if there were any issues with the Kennedy Bridge with the State Historic Preservation people. Haugen responded that we do not, not like with the Sorlie.

Malm asked, if they decide to do a replacement of the Kennedy, will there still be enough money to do the Sorlie. Haugen responded that they are programming as best they can to have something done on the Sorlie in 2018. He stated that part of the delay in North Dakota doing a

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, June 27<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

draft T.I.P. release has been the inability of Congress to pass a long-term transportation bill. He added that there has to be something done by the end of this week, congress has to take some action whether they pass another extension, or if they actually have a new bill they will authorize; and there is a slight chance they will authorize a new two-year bill with funding amounts similar to those we have now, but with quite a different structure on how the monies will be released. He added that this will only get us out, technically, to past FY2014, and these projects are scheduled for FY2016 and FY2018, so they are trying their best to have money reserved for something on the Sorlie in FY2018.

Haugen commented that there will be another RFP released for the Sorlie to do a similar type study. He stated that the major difference between the two studies, the Kennedy is more of just a planning type study, where they won't go directly into project development or design, while on the Sorlie they will be going straight to project development and preliminary engineering, so it will take a couple of years to determine what will be done with Sorlie, as they are more concerned about the Kennedy right now.

The Board gave consensus that they desired to be the Study Advisory Committee. Haugen stated that, as they start the process, we will continue our communication with the DOTs to have the MPO Board act as that study advisory committee, knowing that we will have some Ad Hoc members for that agenda item during our board meetings, and then we will further try to determine how to reconcile our two sides as far as what to program in our next T.I.P. document. He added that more on this will be available at your July meeting.

Information only.

**MATTER OF RESULTS FOR LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN OPEN  
HOUSE AND BRIDGE INTERCEPT SURVEY**

Haugen reported that at the last meeting representatives from SRF were in attendance, and there was some great discussion. He stated that that evening they held an Open House, and Lance Bernard, SRF, is here today to provide support, however he will do a presentation highlighting the results they got from both the open house feedback and what they received when they performed the Bridge Intercept Survey on all three bridges.

1. Open House Summation

Haugen referred to a power point presentation, and went over the questions and responses given at the open house (a copy of the questions and answers are included in the file and available upon request).

Haugen commented that one question asked was what method they would like to see implemented to raise revenue; with the options being bonding, utility fees, property tax, special assessments, developer impact fees, no need to increase the funding, or they had no opinion. He stated that in both cities have been or are working on utility fees, and he doesn't know if there has been a whole lot information about that work out there, but that was the most popular of these items that people responded to as a way to raise revenue.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, June 27<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

Malm asked what kind of utility fees were they talking about. Haugen responded that you are paying a utility fee for garbage pick-up, for water distribution, so the transportation utility fee would be similar to that. Malm asked if they would just add it on to the rest of the fees. Haugen responded it is a fee, as opposed to a sales tax, or a mill rate, it is a fee that is related to how you use the transportation system. He explained that both cities are looking at how they would apply this type of fee. He said that some of it has been based on traffic generation, trip generation, the type of square footage, etc. He stated that East Grand Forks did pursue this quite strongly for a while, and he thinks Mr. Leigh is involved in this.

Leigh commented that prior to his committee looking into this, a consulting firm came up with some guidelines, and they recommend a monthly fee for households; while for businesses, their fees would be based on the type of business they are and the amount of traffic it generates. He stated that it is looking more and more like this is the path they are going to take as it is probably the fairest. He said it will then be a matter of what to set the monthly fee at, and that is something that the City Council will do. He pointed out that, while no one likes fees, it appears that a lot of people would rather see fees than their property taxes increase, while others would rather see the property taxes increase so they can use them as a deduction. Pokrzywinski stated, however, that there certainly isn't unanimous agreement as to which direction they should go, and there is some question as to the legality of trip generation fees, at least in Minnesota, so they are evolving their opinions, but he doesn't know when or if they will come to a conclusion. He added that they also have an election coming up that is going to change the make-up of their council, possibly significantly, so then you have to go through the process of getting the new people up to speed, so it is a complicated issue.

Pokrzywinski reported that East Grand Forks' City Charter states, and State Law says that an assessment can't exceed the benefit to the property. He explained that this means that you have to prove that your assessing an amount that will increase the value of that property to the property owner, at least as much as the amount of assessments, so there is no way you can make that standard, especially with major reconstruction of a street in front of someone's house.

Haugen commented that the only other thing about the open house was that they had a fairly diverse demography, as far as male/female, age, although they did have a substantial higher amount of Grand Forks, or North Dakota residents than Minnesota residents, so we need to try to see if we can attract more people from Minnesota for our future events.

Haugen reported that the interactive survey used at the open house gave instantaneous results to those in attendance. He explained that a question was asked and the people answered it using a hand held remote. He said that after a minute or two their answers were calculated and the results were shown, which allowed for immediate interaction. Pokrzywinski stated that the interactive survey was well received, however this was just a small sample of absolutely unscientific data as some people there had an agenda, so we can't base our decisions based on the results of this survey.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, June 27<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

2. Bridge Intercept Survey

Haugen commented that the only striking thing that came out of the survey this time, compared to when it was done ten years ago, is that there were more Minnesota license plates utilizing the bridges than North Dakota, about 6% more. He explained that traffic going across the bridges has grown by 6%. He said that for 2000-2010, or roughly the same time frame, the City of East Grand Forks grew at a faster rate than Grand Forks, so that might be accounting for the increase in plates.

Strandell asked what, if at all, the problems with American Crystal affected the survey. Haugen responded that they are working with American Crystal to find out about their employment base, however we have not yet received that data, but we are looking to see if the lock-out impacted the shift.

Haugen said that for the most part the results of this survey are very similar to what they were ten years ago, however if you look at the new data closely the one exception might be that the Kennedy Bridge seemed to have less people identifying that they were coming to, or going to South I-29, than they did ten years ago. He added that there were also slightly less work related trips this time.

Haugen pointed out that they didn't stop trucks this time, after learning their lesson last time.

Haugen reported that in terms of the bridges themselves, the Kennedy is still our predominantly regional bridge, the Sorlie serves both, and the Point is mostly our local bridge, but he also wanted to emphasize that the Point Bridge, even though we all think its local, there is still a good share of people using it to get east of our metro area, so it is local, but it still has a small regional component as well.

Haugen commented that we did arrange a meeting for the freight interests in the metro area to meet with us and the consultant, so we are still pursuing trying to get information to update our freight component of the traffic we have here. He added that next month they should have a report that gives you what our existing traffic conditions are out there, sort of our hot spots for accidents, our congested areas where the level of service is low. He stated that they will also present to you the objectives they are trying to achieve through the planning process.

Information only.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

1. New Highway Bill

Haugen reported that, as he already mentioned, there may be action later this week, either with a new highway bill or an extension, but in any event they have to do something by the end of the week to extend the flow of funds for transportation in the United States.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, June 27<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

Haugen commented that they are supposedly very close now to having reached an agreement. He said that this morning's news indicated that the Keystone Pipeline will be dropped and in exchange environmental streamlining will be streamlined in the approval process. He said that they will most likely also roll in to the transportation bill the issue of student loan interest rates. He stated that the term that they used for how they are going to fund this is "pay for", and the majority of the pay for is going to come from adjusting how federal pensions are paid out, and a new tax on rolling your own cigarettes.

Haugen said that, basically, they are going to infuse, into the Highway Trust Fund, funds from outside the gas tax that is collected in order to make it possible to have fun for two years. He stated that the federal amount will be roughly the same as we are getting now, but they will have a whole different structure of the type of programs it is coming from, and how it is spent.

Information only.

2. Traffic Signals

Malm stated that he kept complaining about traffic signals, and the movement of traffic, and he just wanted everyone to know that the intersection of Gateway Drive and Columbia Road is now moving really smoothly, and you can drive up to it and the light changes, and he truly appreciates it, as do a lot of other people, so he wants to thank whomever is responsible.

Information only.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY MALM, TO ADJOURN THE JUNE 27<sup>TH</sup>, 2012,  
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:45 P.M.***

***Voting Aye: Grandstrand, Malm, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Powers, Strandell, and Adams.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE  
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, July 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Warren Strandell, Chairman, called the July 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:10 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Warren Strandell, Mike Powers, Gary Malm, Greg Leigh, Steve Adams, Mike Pokrzywinski, and Doug Christensen.

Absent was: Tyrone Grandstrand.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Nancy Ellis, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF Planner; and Bryan McCoy, GF/EGF Intern.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Strandell declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 27<sup>TH</sup>, 2012, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO APPROVE THE JUNE 27<sup>TH</sup>, 2012, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Malm, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Christensen, Strandell, Adams, and Powers.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF AMENDMENT TO THE FY2012 ANNUAL ELEMENT OF THE 2012-2015 T.I.P.**

Haugen reported that this is a request from the City of Grand Forks. He explained that previously, in 2012, both the City of Grand Forks and the NDDOT were going to do some major reconstruction improvements to Gateway Drive and Columbia Road, however through the project development process they concluded that there wasn't an appetite to do so so both are taking their respective projects and re-scoping them.

Haugen referred to a slide and pointed out where the two projects had been planned to occur, and stated that back in March we amended the NDDOT project scope to reduce the dollar amount so

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

that basically what NDDOT is now doing is the same rehab type of project they did on the rest of Gateway Drive, so the total project amount dropped by half. He said that Grand Forks has now decided what they want to do with their \$1.4 million dollars assigned to that same project, and are asking us to program it to Phase 1 of the Columbia Road reconstruction project from DeMers to 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue South.

Haugen commented that since these are 2012 dollars, there is no room to make changes, additions, or add money to it, so we are simply taking the \$1.4 million dollars from the Gateway Drive/Columbia project and moving it to the Columbia Road Phase 1 project.

Haugen reported that we had to advertise that a public hearing would be held at today's meeting. He stated that in the notice we asked that written comments be submitted by 11:00 a.m. today, and did not receive any. He added that the Technical Advisory Committee has requested that this body approve this amendment as submitted.

***MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY MALM, TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING, HEARING NO COMMENTS, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AND TO APPROVE AMENDING THE 2012-2015 T.I.P. TO REPROGRAM FUNDS TO THE COLUMBIA ROAD RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT BETWEEN DEMERS AVENUE AND 11<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE SOUTH, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Malm, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Christensen, Strandell, Adams, and Powers.  
Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT NORTH DAKOTA SIDE OF THE 2013-2016 T.I.P.**

Haugen reported that back in April we would have typically approved a Draft T.I.P. for both Minnesota and North Dakota, and we did do that for Minnesota, however we were unable to do so for North Dakota until now.

Haugen explained that the reason for the delay was because of the uncertainty of what Congress was going to do, but they finally did approve MAP-21, which we will talk about in the next agenda item.

Haugen commented that back in December, when we determined which projects we wanted considered for the next T.I.P., we were told to use a 0% revenue growth, but the draft before you has a 3.6% per year average revenue growth rate in it, however this draft, even though North Dakota said they were going to wait until Congress took action, their draft of 3.6% is more generous than what MAP-21 is going to provide, so a lot of the projects in this draft may be changed considerably, or maybe even dropped before final approval in August or September.

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY MALM, TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING, HEARING NO COMMENTS, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AND TO APPROVE THE DRAFT FY2013-2016 NORTH DAKOTA SIDE T.I.P., AS SUBMITTED.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

*Voting Aye: Malm, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Christensen, Strandell, Adams, and Powers.  
Voting Nay: None.*

Haugen said that he does want to point out that we do have a major difference between the MNDOT and the NDDOT cost estimates for the Kennedy Bridge project. He explained that Minnesota shows it as a \$10,000,000 rehabilitation project, while North Dakota shows it as a \$32,000,000 replacement project. He stated that in our T.I.P. we have to have an agreement reached as to which number we will show in our Final T.I.P., so we are trying to work with both states to determine that. Strandell asked who makes the decision as to whether or not this will be a rehab or reconstruction project. Haugen responded that that decision won't be made until the study MNDOT is hiring done is completed. He stated that until that process is done in the next 12 months, we won't know what the actual project will be, and the program year is 2016, so in some respect they just need to throw out a number at this time so we can get it programmed into the document, and amended at a later date as we will have at least three more years to be able to update that 2016 number.

Haugen commented that another thing to note is that in 2013 North Dakota reduced the amount of federal funds coming to Grand Forks, so the City is asking us to continue working with them, and the NDDOT to try to fully fund that last remaining portion of Phase 1 of the Columbia Road project.

Haugen reported that there are also some more North Dakota programs that they still need to inform us as to what they are funding, so, again in August or September there will be some substantial changes to the Draft T.I.P. before you.

**MATTER OF HIGHLIGHTS OF MAP-21**

Haugen reported that MAP-21 is being advertised as a two-year bill. He explained that the first three months are actually a continuation of current law, so MAP-21 doesn't actually come into effect until October 1<sup>st</sup>.

Haugen stated that we talked a little bit in the past about how it is financed, so that by the end of 2014 the major funding source for transportation will be the Highway Trust Fund, or the Gas Tax, which will be down to a balance of roughly \$5,000,000. He said that annually it is meant to fund \$40,000,000 worth of projects, so they have a fiscally constrained bill that lasts two years, but coming into 2014 they still need to find a major resolution to the financial picture of federal transportation.

Haugen commented that, specifically for MPOs, the only change to the MPO process is requiring us to identify performance measures, and then annually recording our performance against those measures. He said that this is something that isn't entirely new, as the last couple of years Federal Highway and Transit have been working with us to understand performance measures issues, and in our Draft Long Range Transportation Plan, the current one we are updating with SRF, we are drafting performance measures in the document for consideration.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

Haugen stated that there are a couple of other highlights to note; right now there are many funding silos in federal transportation, but they have consolidated a lot of those programs so we won't see as many specific projects by funding source, although we will probably see the same number of projects, but our prioritization of those projects will be tightened a little more than in the past. He said that the other thing to note is that they are creating a national highway system, and a lot of the interstate monies, the old national highway monies, etc. are now being combined. He explained that at some point in the future we will be asked to assist both State DOTs in identifying what is this new national network means for our metropolitan area. He stated that it will surely include the Interstate, U.S. 2, and other state highways, but it will be our opportunity to try to get at least our principle arterials designated as part of that network.

Haugen reiterated that Congress passed this new transportation bill, however it doesn't actually come into effect until October 1<sup>st</sup>. He explained that the reason for this is because there are still three months of 2012 dollars appropriated based on SAFETEA-LU that needed to be used, and it also allows them three months to try to figure out how they are going to implement MAP-21 federal agencies.

Haugen commented that when we do program a project, and a City of the DOT takes over a new project development, one major revision they have done is to the environmental law in that, if you are working in existing right-of-way you are exempt from having to do environmental studies, and if your project has less than \$5,000,000 in federal highway involvement you are also exempt, which should speed things up somewhat, which is good for us as most of our projects are in existing right-of-way and are under \$5,000,000. He added that this will also mean a lot less local dollars having to be invested in these environmental documents, which are currently necessary, but will soon be unnecessary for us to do.

Information only.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

1. NDDOT Long Range Statewide Transportation Plan Open House – July 18th

Haugen reported that North Dakota has an open house at the Howard Johnson Hotel on its Long Range Transportation Plan. He stated that it will take place from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. He stated that you are welcome to attend, but he would also point out that they do have a Survey Monkey survey that you can take to participate instead.

Information only.

2. MPO Long Range Transportation Plan Open House – July 26th

Haugen reported that a week from tomorrow, on our Long Range Transportation Plan, an open house will be held here in this room (East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room), starting at 5:30 p.m.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 18<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY MALM, TO ADJOURN THE JUNE 27<sup>TH</sup>, 2012,  
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:45 P.M.***

***Voting Aye: Grandstrand, Malm, Pokrzywinski, Leigh, Powers, Strandell, and Adams.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE  
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2012 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Warren Strandell, Chairman, called the August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2012, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:00 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Warren Strandell, Mike Powers, Gary Malm, Greg Leigh, Steve Adams, and Doug Christensen.

Absent were: Tyrone Grandstrand and Mike Pokrzywinski.

Guests present were: Douglas Munski, Citizen and Troy Schroeder, NWRDC.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Nancy Ellis, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Bryan McCoy, GF/EGF Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Strandell declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JULY 18<sup>TH</sup>, 2012, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO APPROVE THE JULY 18<sup>TH</sup>, 2012, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Malm, Leigh, Christensen, Strandell, Adams, and Powers.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE ADJUSTED FEDERAL URBAN AID BOUNDARY**

Haugen reported that every ten years, after the census has been completed, the Census Bureau is required to define what is an urbanized area to establish the 50,000 population number. He stated that when they do this they use their logic as to what the geography boundaries should be, but it has been a long standing practice that Federal Highways allows us to modify those boundaries to make them smoother, and to include, perhaps, more of a transportation facility

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2012**

than what the Census Bureau's geography normally would allow, and this is our effort to make those adjustments.

Haugen commented that the basic rules we are operating under is that we cannot be less than what the Census defines as the boundary, but we can be more. He stated that those areas where the Census does not include all of the property in the city limits, we want to make sure it is included, and we also want to make sure that we take in what is needed for a proper transportation intersection.

Haugen referred to the Urban Aid Boundary Map, and pointed out that the areas highlighted in green are those areas we are suggesting changes be made. He stated that some of these changes are necessary, and some are recommendations.

Powers asked, the criteria for non-residential urban land, would that be like the golf course. Haugen responded that the golf course would be the most classic example, but it would also include industrial areas, retail areas, etc. He said that it, again, is to define the urbanized area and that is a definition of population density, so when we have an area where there is no population, it wasn't included in the geography, so this criteria was developed to include major employment areas even though there aren't any residents so transportation interests can be served in those areas as well.

Haugen referred to the map, and went over the changes.

Strandell asked about the industrial area on the west side of Washington. Haugen responded that they are excluding that area, leaving it as a rural industrial area because it is outside the city limits, however they are including the right-of-way along North Washington up to Mill Road.

***MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE CHANGES TO THE URBAN FEDERAL AID BOUNDARY.***

***Voting Aye: Malm, Leigh, Christensen, Strandell, Adams, and Powers.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL TO AMEND THE FY2012 ANNUAL ELEMENT OF THE 2012-2015 T.I.P.**

Haugen reported that there are two basic things going on with this agenda item; back in early spring there were some FTA programs that we solicited projects for, we processed them through our Technical Advisory Committee, and the Executive Policy Board, as being consistent with our plans, and agreed to program them in our T.I.P. if they were funded, and three of them have been funded and need to be amended into the T.I.P.

Haugen added that the other item is North Dakota is going to let a project that we currently have identified as being done in 2013. He explained that because North Dakota wants the project let this year, we need to move it from 2013 to 2012. Leigh asked how it works moving funds from one year to the next. Haugen responded that basically they have identified that there are some

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2012**

2012 monies available to be used so they don't have to wait until 2013, which will then free up the 2013 monies for another project.

Christensen asked what the 12/13 means. Haugen responded that it stands for our Route 12/13 Transit Route that services the Alerus Center, Columbia Mall, South Middle School, the Wellness Center area, etc. Christensen asked what the \$128,000 JARC funds are. Haugen responded that it is basically the 50% cost to operate that route on an annual basis. Christensen asked if this was federal monies. Haugen responded it was. He added that they have been operating with this JARC money for the last four years or so, so that is how that route has been financed. Christensen asked what happens when those funds go away. Haugen responded that if they go away we would have to decide if we want to continue the route, modify it, or drop it.

Christensen asked what the Mobility Manager position was, and who is it. Haugen responded that Ali Rood is the Mobility Manager. Christensen asked if she was working for the City of Grand Forks. Haugen responded she is, under Todd Feland. Christensen asked when the money would go away. Haugen responded that this money pays for an annual salary, and it is the second year it has funded the Mobility Manager position for Grand Forks. Christensen asked again when this money would go away. Haugen responded that at the end of the agenda we will discuss the new Transportation Bill, and he will show everyone where the money is shifting, but added that the funds aren't anticipated to disappear anytime soon.

Haugen explained that Ms. Rood's job description is, basically she has been the principle person behind getting a cost constraint on the Demand Response side of the transit system. He stated that if you look at the statistics there has been a healthy drop in the number of rides being taken, and that is due, in-part, to her management. He added that this reduces the cost considerably to the City of Grand Forks.

Leigh asked if her position saves \$50,000 to the City. Haugen responded that he doesn't know, but it would come pretty close. Leigh said that what he is asking is if her position pays for itself. Haugen responded it does. Christensen asked why this is even on our agenda. Haugen responded that, again, because this is federal funds being awarded the City, we have to program it into our document called a T.I.P. in order for the funds to be accessed.

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY CHRISTENSEN, TO CLOSE THE REGULAR MEETING AND OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING.***

***Voting Aye: Malm, Leigh, Christensen, Strandell, Adams, and Powers.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

Douglas Munski, stated that he is here today as a private citizen, although you may recognize him as a faculty member of the University of North Dakota, as well as the Commissioner of the Grand Forks Historic Preservation Commission. He said that, as a private citizen, he would like to encourage the adoption of this amendment to the T.I.P. in order to enhance the quality of life in Grand Forks.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2012**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AND RESUME THE REGULAR MEETING.***

***Voting Aye: Malm, Leigh, Christensen, Strandell, Adams, and Powers.  
Voting Nay: None.***

***MOVED BY CHRISTENSEN, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE FY2012 ANNUAL ELEMENT OF THE 2012-2015 T.I.P., AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Malm, Leigh, Christensen, Strandell, Adams, and Powers.  
Voting Nay: None.***

**OTHER BUSINESS**

a. MAP-21 Briefing

Haugen reported that he would like to give a brief summarization on where we are at with MAP-21. He said that he did include a lot of information in the packet, much more detailed than what he plans on discussing today.

Haugen referred to a slide presentation, and commented that he has summarized this into a couple of short slides that hopefully are informative of our MPO purposes and how this impacts us. He added that there are still a lot of questions that are unanswered, and probably will be for a while yet, but this is where they are at and what they know for now.

Haugen reported that, as he said earlier, MAP-21 is advertised as a 27-month bill, but what that actually means is that three months of the old transportation bill, SAFETEA-LU, will carry on and then MAP-21 and all its provisions will kick in on October 1<sup>st</sup>. He stated that the financing for it is hoped to extend for the 24-month period, but the latest estimates from Washington are that we will be struggling by the early part of Fiscal Year 2014 to have enough revenue in the trust funds to finance transportation.

Haugen commented that in any event we are still required to do our typical requirements; MAP-21 is continuing those requirements, as well as adding a few new ones. He then referred to a slide, and went over the new requirements briefly.

Haugen stated that one of the new requirements is that we incorporate performance measures and targets into our plan documents, and then when we actually develop our T.I.P. we can say that these projects, for the next four years, should get federal funds. He said that we then have to go back and assess how those projects are helping us achieve our performance targets.

Leigh asked, if they are making you do all these extra things, are they giving you the funds necessary to do them. Haugen responded that we are getting a little more money, so, in the big scheme they are.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2012**

Haugen referred to a slide and explained that it lists the national performance goals, which, at a minimum we will need to address in our Long Range Transportation Plan. He added that we are currently in the middle of updating our Long Range Transportation Plan, so in the next month or so you will see how we are trying to incorporate these into our goal statements. He pointed out that we will have to submit reports annually as to whether or not our performance measure targets are being met.

Discussion ensued with Mr. Christensen asking what the most important steps are with this, because he'd like to know so we don't waste a lot of staff time going over everything. Haugen responded that that is what he is trying to do today, to go over the most important performance measures we will need to address. He added that in a couple of months you will see how we are attempting to address these performance measures. Christensen asked what is new. Haugen responded that there aren't many new measures, but they have not specifically identified a performance measurement. He said that they have been trying to achieve these things, but they need to come up with something that identifies percent reduction, whether it is 5%, 10%, and then a timeline of when we expect to reach it.

Haugen commented that both States are adopting, "towards zero deaths", so that is the performance measure they are going to try to achieve, zero fatalities on the transportation system, so that is the overall measurement they will have, and then within that there will be sub-measurements; for North Dakota that will be to achieve no more than 100 deaths in ten years. Christensen said that he is more concerned about Grand Forks. Haugen responded that that is what they will be working on the next couple of months with the assistance of the Technical Advisory Committee and our federal partners, so he is introducing you to the fact that we are going to have to now establish performance measures, and actually measure things. He added that they have been trying to achieve these things, but now we have to show a measurement that we can report how we are achieving them, and give progress reports on an annual basis.

Malm stated that he doesn't want to muddy the water, but how do you measure those kinds of things. He asked if there was an empirical number we are going to use, or is there some kind of philosophical statement. Haugen responded that it will be a number, most of which is data driven. He added that for condition of the infrastructure, we have pavement management system in place so we are already providing both cities a ranking of what their pavement condition is.

Malm said that he is looking at "congestion reduction or system reliability". Haugen responded that congestion reduction is done via the traffic signal timing plans we have implemented, particularly on the Grand Forks side. He said that when they implemented them they were able to reduce congestion considerably. He added that they have those measurements as part of their update, and stated that SRF will be out re-timing those plans in the next couple of weeks to make them even better, and will have the before and after times available to show the improvement.

Haugen referred to slides discussing the anticipated funding for each state. He pointed out that in 2013 and 2014 you will see that they have eliminated some programs, and have created a couple as well. He stated that one program they created is the National Highway Performance Program. He explained that when this program was created, by consolidating two programs, it

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2012**

left us with about \$100 million dollars less in funding, so this is where the feds are going to focus their federal monies, on this highway performance program, which essentially involves our principle arterial system. Christensen asked when we start identifying new arterials. Haugen responded that we cannot identify new principle arterials. He commented that they just updated their functional classification map last fall, and identified all our principle arterials. He added that there is a set maximum percent of our street mileage that we can identify as principle arterials, which we have achieved, and he wouldn't anticipate an opportunity to increase that until we grow out and annex in large areas of property. '

Christensen asked if Columbia Road was on the principle arterial system. Haugen responded it was. Christensen asked if 47<sup>th</sup> was on it. Haugen responded it is not. Christensen asked what we have to do to get that done. Haugen responded that we can attempt to update our functional classification map to include it, but because 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue already is, and 47<sup>th</sup> is only a mile south, it is unlikely it will be approved. Christensen said that we need to get that done so he would like to add that to our next agenda.

Discussion on possible ways to get 47<sup>th</sup> on the arterial system ensued.

Haugen pointed out that the Highway Safety Improvement Program got a healthy bump in funding, so again, it is driving towards zero deaths and severe accidents.

Haugen commented that, we are all fairly familiar with the enhancement projects we have been funding, the bikepaths, some safe routes to school sidewalks, etc., but all those programs have been consolidated into this thing called Transportation Alternatives. He said that the funding for that has been stripped by a third from what used to just be enhancement dollars, but which they have now thrown in all these other programs into the pot, so there is maybe less money to do our enhancement type of activities than in the past, so those are the three major impacts they have done with the appropriations.

Haugen stated that the one big thing is they are focusing on the principle arterials, safety items, and have shortened our enhancement type projects that we have been fairly successful in getting funded, and another is environmental streamlining. He explained that there is a huge push to shorten the timeline from when we say, okay your project is going to be funded, to when you can actually get the project approved to go out for bids.

Haugen stated that there are two big things; one, if we keep within the operation right of way, it is an automatic category "x" exclusion, so very little environmental should be done; and the other is if there is \$5 million dollars or less in federal funds involved in the project, then it is also automatically in the category "x". He said that most of our projects are less than \$5 million, so our project delivery should be quicker as we won't have environmental delays any longer.

Haugen reported that another key thing is that we can now acquire right-of-way prior to going through the NEPA process. He explained that we currently have to wait until the NEPA process has been completed before we can acquire right-of-way, but this law will now allow us to purchase right-of-way prior to the NEPA process being completed.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2012**

Haugen commented that in terms of planning, we can now enter into agreements with our State friends so that our planning products can be incorporated into the NEPA process. He said that we currently, for the most part when doing a study we give our conclusion and recommendations, and then when the NEPA process starts they go back to point one again and go through that same process, and now they are saying that, by law they can take our work product and use it instead of having to start at point one, and start where we left off.

Christensen asked if this means that the 42<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Underpass/Overpass project would not need an environmental study done before we acquire right-of-way. Haugen responded that that project, because it was started under the old law would have to carry through its completion under that law instead of the new law. Christensen asked how long an environmental study lasts before you have to start over. Haugen responded that if you don't do anything with them they are good for three to five years. Christensen said, then, if there is no real reason to do the study at 42<sup>nd</sup> since there isn't any funds available for three to five years, we could just as well wait and not do an environmental study now. Haugen responded that what your staff is telling you is that they anticipate doing a little bit of work in that three to five years so it keeps it fresh, so it is still germane for a longer life. He explained that any time you do a little bit of work on it you add that three to five cushion onto it. Christensen asked if he is talking about the environmental study or on the project. Haugen responded that it would be on the project, whether it is purchasing a little right-of-way, or whatever, if you do some little project that gets it into the T.I.P., once it is in the T.I.P. it extends that three to five years out.

Haugen reported that on the transit side, they have consolidated the JARC and the New Freedom programs into one program. He stated that this program maintained the characteristics that it had here, where a portion of it had to spent in an urbanized area, so even though, typically the 5310 is considered a rural program, it has a requirement that a portion of it has to be spent in an urbanized area, so the federal funds, although their repealed, they got put into programs and are still set aside, although we aren't quite sure how much the 5307 funds increased compared to previous years, whether the \$130,000 that we just amended into the T.I.P. is covered or not, or if it is actually more than that.

Haugen commented that both the Highway and Transit sides have to establish asset management programs. He stated that our pavement management is one example of an asset management program, our TDP is another example, so we already have some of these components in place, so we are sitting better than a lot of areas across the nation, but there are probably more things we will need to add.

Information only.

b. Kennedy Bridge Update

Haugen reported that, if you recall, we have been trying to reconcile between the two states what the cost will be that we need to put into our T.I.P. document in 2016, and there is probably a 99% surety that the project will be pegged at \$32 million dollars, and the description for the 2016 year will be determined by the study that they just hired a consultant to do over the next twelve months, so we are 99% sure that in September when you see the T.I.P. document for the 2013 to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2012**

2016 timeframe, it will be a \$32 million dollar project that both states agree is the cost they will peg in for now, and will revisit a year from now when the study is concluded.

Christensen asked how much of the \$32 million dollars is state versus federal. Haugen responded that it is typically an 80/20 split, so on the North Dakota side 80% will be federally funded and 20% will be state funded, and on the Minnesota side it is currently 100% state funded from their bridge bonding bill they did after the collapse of the I-35 bridge in Minneapolis.

Discussion ensued.

Information only.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY CHRISTENSEN, TO ADJOURN THE AUGUST 22<sup>ND</sup>, 2012, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:53 P.M.***

***Voting Aye: Malm, Leigh, Christensen, Strandell, Adams, and Powers.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE  
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, September 19<sup>th</sup>, 2012 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Warren Strandell, Chairman, called the September 19<sup>th</sup>, 2012, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:08 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Warren Strandell, Mike Powers, Steve Adams, Tyrone Grandstrand, and Doug Christensen (via conference call).

Absent were: Gary Malm, Greg Leigh, and Mike Pokrzywinski.

Guests present were: Jane Williams, Grand Forks City Engineer.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

**SUSPEND AGENDA**

Strandell stated that because a quorum is not yet present we are unable to act on those agenda items requiring action, therefore he would like to suspend the agenda to discuss agenda items not requiring action.

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON KENNEDY BRIDGE STUDY**

Haugen explained that he would be placing this study, as well as the Sorlie Bridge Study on the monthly agendas for both the Executive Policy Board and the Technical Advisory Committee in order to keep everyone informed as to what is going on with each of the studies.

Haugen reported that the firm CH2M Hill was hired to perform the Kennedy Bridge study. He stated that they are currently working on organizing their guiding team, adding that staff has been communicating with MNDOT, which is the lead agency on this study, about the possibility of this board serving as a coordinating board for this study, however they are still trying to figure out how it fits in with what they want to do. He explained that their view of the study advisory committee is one that would be more of a technical group that will guide them through the process, and he is trying to convince them that that is what our Technical Advisory committee is set up to do, and that the Executive Policy Board could act as their policy advisory committee, so we are still waiting to hear what our role will be in this study. The MPO Board, and the TAC for that matter, would need to have additional agencies sitting at the table when this Bridge Study is

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 19<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

involved; but the MPO structure can be used as the base with adding the key agencies not currently represented.

Haugen commented that it is their intent to have the work completed within a year, and at our next T.I.P. cycle we should have an agreed to project, and an agreed to cost estimate for the project.

Strandell reported that Roger Hjelle is MNDOT's bridge specialist, and he was at their last Transportation Advisory Committee meeting for the Northwest Regional Development Commission, and concerning the Kennedy Bridge he said there was one pier, Pier 6, that is really in bad shape and needs to be addressed. Haugen agreed, adding that it is a pier on the North Dakota side, and in 2010 they had originally programmed \$1,000,000 to fix that pier, but they have since decided to combine that project with this project for 2016. He stated that the first item for the consultant to accomplish is to examine that pier and determine what can and should be done with it. He added that they are also still looking at the potential replacement of the structure, but it seems more and more that the outcome will be to do a rehab project instead.

Powers asked if the pier movement was caused by flooding over the years. He stated that it says that the pier is seven inches off its original position. Haugen responded that it is combination of Red River soils and flooding.

Haugen commented that when we get into the Minnesota side of the T.I.P. you will see that we are now programming for a \$25,000,000 project in 2016 for the Kennedy Bridge rehab or replacement.

**MATTER OF SORLIE BRIDGE REPLACEMENT OR REHABILITATION PROJECT**

Haugen reported that North Dakota is the lead agency on this project, and they just issued their RFP, with a response date of October 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Haugen stated that one thing to note is the process difference between the two studies. He explained that North Dakota is taking this straight to the project development phase, the NEPA Phase, so that entails or requires a whole different set of federal participation processes. He said that the way they set up, and how they are going to approach advisory committees and such is already determined by the NEPA process, whereas the Kennedy Bridge Study is a planning study and will not engage the NEPA process at this time. Strandell asked what NEPA stands for. Haugen responded that it is the environmental protection act.

Haugen reported that the end result is that the Kennedy Bridge Study will not actually determine what the preferred or recommended alternative treatment is because the NEPA process will not be followed and/or engaged in it, so they will go through their study process, reach a consensus, but then they will need to go into the actual project development, which engages the NEPA process, so there is still a little uncertainty as to what the actual outcome of that process will be because once you fully engage the NEPA process you have a whole different set of requirements you have to process through.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 19<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

Haugen commented, then, that because North Dakota is engaging the NEPA process right from the start on the Sorlie Bridge project, whatever the outcome is for the project scope should be what goes forward for actual implementation.

Strandell stated that it appears that they will be rehabbing the Sorlie Bridge rather than replacing it. Haugen agreed, adding that a clue to that effect is that North Dakota is doing a Project Concept Report. He explained that originally in our current T.I.P. we show that a full EIS study estimated to cost \$6M+ would be done on the Sorlie Bridge, with one NDDOT division doing the EIS, but it now shows that a different division will be doing the study and it was dropped down to a PCR, so that is a good indication that this will be a rehab project, however they will still look at a replacement alternative as well.

Strandell asked about the historical requirements should the bridge be replaced. He said that it was his understanding that if it is replaced the old bridge needs to be reconstructed at a different location. Haugen responded that that may not be the case, but they would have to have a mitigation agreement, which can be something as simple as preparing a document on the bridge that is placed in the historic register, or you can go to the extent of placing the old bridge elsewhere as a functional structure of some sort. Strandell asked who would be involved in this process. Haugen responded that it would include both DOTs, Federal Highway, and the Department of Interior; and they would go through what is called a Section 404 Historic Mitigation Process. He added that the Sorlie is listed on the National Register, and MNDOT and its historic body have reached an agreement that this is identified as one of the bridges they hope to try to preserve in place. He stated that North Dakota was not a party to that determination, however even though they are the lead agency they still have to comply with Minnesota laws, and, ultimately, because it is on the National Register, regardless of who is the lead agency they will need to mitigate through that Section 404 Mitigation Process.

Discussion on project timelines ensued.

Grandstrand asked if Mr. Haugen would be willing to attend the City Council meetings to give updates on these two projects. Haugen responded that he would be glad to give updates on the two projects.

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON THE FY2013-2016 T.I.P. – NORTH DAKOTA SIDE**

Haugen reported that the FY2013-2016 T.I.P. for the North Dakota side is on hold until a determination can be made as to how MAP-21 will affect funding. He said, however, that NDDOT has indicated that what we approved in our Draft 2013-2016 T.I.P. in July is probably not too reliable as to what the out-years of 2015 and 2016 show for funding, therefore some changes will most likely need to be made once more is known.

Haugen stated that the reason we only approved the Minnesota side T.I.P. today is because MNDOT's philosophy is that these projects are worthy projects since they have been programmed, so for now we will put them into a new T.I.P. document, and then as we work out MAP-21 our first priority will be to determine how to get these projects done; whereas North Dakota is saying they want to figure things out first before we finalize a document.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 19<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

**MATTER OF PROJECT SOLICITATION FOR FY2014-2017 T.I.P.**

Haugen reported that even though we are just finishing up our current T.I.P. process, we now have to begin the next T.I.P. process by soliciting projects. He stated, however, that while Minnesota is going forward with this, the only projects we will be soliciting will be County and State projects in our MPO area, otherwise all other programs on both the North Dakota and Minnesota sides are on hold until further information is known regarding how MAP-21 will impact funding.

Christensen was connected via conference call. A quorum was present.

**MATTER OF FINAL DRAFT OF THE FY2013-2016 T.I.P. – MINNESOTA SIDE**

Haugen reported that a public hearing was held and no verbal or written comments were received. He stated that both the Technical Advisory Committee and staff are recommending the MPO Executive Policy Board adopt the 2013-2016 T.I.P. for the Minnesota side.

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE FINAL FY2013-2016 MINNESOTA SIDE T.I.P., AS SUBMITTED.***

Christensen asked if they were approving only the Minnesota side, not the North Dakota side. Grandstrand responded that only the Minnesota side was being approved today.

***Voting Aye: Christensen, Strandell, Adams, Powers, and Grandstrand.  
Voting Nay: None.***

**OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO ADJOURN THE SEPTEMBER 19<sup>TH</sup>, 2012, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:38 P.M.***

***Voting Aye: Christensen, Strandell, Adams, Powers, and Grandstrand.  
Voting Nay: None.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE  
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2012 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Warren Strandell, Chairman, called the October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2012, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:03 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Warren Strandell, Mike Powers, Steve Adams, Greg Leigh, Gary Malm, Mike Pokrzywinski, Tyrone Grandstrand, and Doug Christensen.

Guests present were: Jane Williams, Grand Forks City Traffic Engineer.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Nancy Ellis, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Strandell declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 19<sup>TH</sup>, 2012, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 19<sup>TH</sup>, 2012, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Malm, Leigh, Grandstrand, Powers, Adams, and Strandell.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING ON TRANSIT SERVICE REDUCTION AND FARE POLICY**

Kouba stated that, basically, back in June FTA came out and did an evaluation/audit of the City's Transit Service. She said that they always try to find something, so one of the things they noticed; transit uses the MPO Public Participation Policy and Process, and one of the things that wasn't explicitly stated in that policy involved fares and major service changes in the bus routes and to the bus service, so this addendum, basically, is stating that when fare changes or major

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

service changes happen for the transit it will end up coming through the MPO Public Participation Process.

Kouba reported that both city councils have approved this and staff is just looking for concurrence from this body.

***MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE ADDENDUM TO  
ADD FARE AND MAJOR SERVICE CHANGE LANGUAGE TO THE MOU AGREEMENT  
BETWEEN THE CITIES AND THE MPO.***

***Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Malm, Leigh, Grandstrand, Powers, Adams, and Strandell.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON KENNEDY/SORLIE BRIDGE PROJECTS**

***Kennedy Bridge***

Haugen reported that as far as the Kennedy Bridge project is concerned, MNDOT is still working on finalizing their contract with CH2M Hill. He said that once this is accomplished, and they are under contract; they, along with MNDOT, will begin formulating their plan on how to structure the Study Steering Committee, for which the MPO has requested they consider utilizing this board as the base for that entity, along with other necessary agencies such as the US Corps of Engineers, the DNRs, etc..

***Sorlie Bridge***

Haugen reported that on the Sorlie Bridge, as discussed at our last meeting, NDDOT did put out an RFP for a consultant to do a project concept report.

Haugen stated that NDDOT did request that we stress that there has been no pre-determination as to the outcome of either of these bridge studies, that they are studying both of them for either replacement or rehab, so for both there are still options on the table and nothing will be finalized until the studies are completed.

Haugen commented that they are hoping for a bid date on the Sorlie Bridge project of November 17, 2017 so the project can be done in 2018. He stated that he is not aware of a specific bid date for the Kennedy Bridge at this time.

Haugen reported that on the Minnesota Side there is a signed agreement to try to preserve and maintain the Sorlie Bridge in place rather than replacing it. He stated, however, that if it does need to be replaced, there is a process that federal Highway can use in order to allow the necessary work be done on the structure. Pokrzywinski asked what process would be followed if it needs to be replaced. Haugen responded that the process can be found in 36 CFR Part 800.

Christensen reported present.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

Haugen commented that they received seven responses to the RFP for the Sorlie Bridge Study. He said that they are going to interview three or four of them, possibly this week yet.

Haugen explained that the PCR timeline is September 1, 2014, so between now and then work will be done on the environmental document for the Sorlie Bridge, after which we will then have a little more understanding of what project will be brought forward.

Leigh asked what kinds of things they will look for during the environmental process. Haugen responded that they will look at the structural soundness of the bridge, specifically whether or not it can be maintained or preserved in place; if they are doing any alterations, whether they are maintaining it or not, they will have to do the necessary floodway analysis to determine how it impedes the flow of the flood waters; etc.

Pokrzywinski commented, then, that we will know what the plan is for the Sorlie by September 1<sup>st</sup>, 2014. Haugen responded that under the current schedule, yes. Pokrzywinski asked what the timeframe is for knowing what the plan will be for the Kennedy Bridge. Haugen responded that that is a 12-month study, so once they have a consultant on board, you should have an idea of what the plan will be for the Kennedy Bridge one year from then.

Pokrzywinski reported that one thing they have discussed at the East Grand Forks City Council work sessions, in relation to the MPO, is that with just two council members attending the MPO meetings, with these big issues/projects coming up they are going to make sure that they bring forward not just their opinions on this, but the entire council and Mayor's thoughts as well as this is something bigger than the two people on this board. He said that this is something they consciously discussed, that the City Council has to get more informed about what is going on here because of the magnitude of these projects, and they will do that. He added that the City Administrator will be key to making sure that the information is forwarded on to the City Council members, and they are kept up to speed. Christensen stated that they will be doing the same thing for the Grand Forks council, adding that their City Council wants to be more involved in the planning and outcome.

Information only.

**MATTER OF AMENDMENT TO SRF CONTRACT**

Haugen reported that this is a request to add some work to our contract with SRF Consulting Group. He referred to some graphics and explained the need for the amendment to the contract.

Haugen pointed out that the area shown in yellow represents a lot of residential growth. He stated that our Transportation Plan, by federal law, has to be consistent with the local land use plan, so we would load up our 2040 Travel Demand Model with primarily residential type uses in this area, and will generate a certain type of traffic pattern. He said that there are some proposals that have not been formally submitted to the City for consideration, but the City and the developer have been working on a new development in this area and it brings in more

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

commercial type of activity rather than residential. He stated that the process for, if they were to submit this requested change to their land use plan, it would take the City until the end of December to formally change their plan, so the request before you today is to amend the contract to allow for a parallel track analysis following the existing land use plan, and what traffic impacts that presents, and then this alternative land use plan and what traffic impacts that has.

Haugen reported that the amendment request, then, is to allow staff to anticipate that there is a likelihood there will be a change in the land use, so that our transportation plan can be updated should that change occur. He explained that this is roughly a \$12,000 add on to the SRF contract. He added that they also have A.T.A.C. doing the travel demand modeling, and they have requested \$5,000 for that, so the total amendment cost will not exceed \$20,000. He stated that we do have the funds in our account to add this to the contract.

***MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY CHRISTENSEN, TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE SRF CONSULTING GROUP CONTRACT TO ADDRESS LAND USE SCENARIOS AT A COST NOT TO EXCEED \$12,500.00; AND THE AMENDMENT TO THE A.T.A.C. CONTRACT TO DO TRAVEL DEMAND FORECASTING NOT TO EXCEED \$5,000.00.***

***Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Malm, Leigh, Grandstrand, Powers, Adams, Christensen, and Strandell.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF STREET AND HIGHWAY PLAN UPDATE**

Haugen reported that this is an update on the progress of the Long Range Transportation Plan. He stated that beginning yesterday, and going through Saturday, the traffic signal timing plans along the major arterials in Grand Forks are being updated. He explained that some of the corridors have up to seven, eight or more timing plans that will need to be updated depending on the time of day, the season, etc., but we are only focusing on the a.m., p.m., and Saturday peak times.

Haugen commented that, as indicated in some e-mail exchanges prior to this, what is really occurring is that we are giving more green time to the side streets because the traffic volumes on the major streets are less, via our recent traffic counts, than they were when we first established these timing plans, so for the traveling public traffic on the main streets should continue to progress fairly well through the corridor, but for the side streets they will now experience less waiting time.

Haugen stated that part of the work was to try to figure out some of the major changes that occurred in the traffic volumes so they put together graphics that illustrate those changes. He referred to those graphics and went over the data comparisons for both a.m. and p.m. peak hour changes in turn counts over several years.

Discussion on reasons for these changes ensued.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

Haugen reported that the second part of the update they have been working on is the goals section and performance measures. He stated that, again, MAP-21 is requiring us to now identify what our performance measures are in relationship to what we are trying to achieve. He said that in the future we will have to show how we are progressing towards these measures, as well as report in our T.I.P. document what projects we are providing federal funds with, and how they will progress towards these performance measures.

Haugen stated that we have a total of eight goals that the federal government is requiring we meet to show what we are doing with our transportation funds.

Haugen reported that some of the targets we have identified are things we are currently doing, we just have not labeled them as performance measures in the past. He said that we are now keeping track of the changes in land use in comparison to what is going on in our T.I.P. He explained that we are having semi-frequent meetings with our freight operators, which was a request from both Minnesota and North Dakota do.

Haugen commented that the initial draft that was presented to the Technical Advisory Committee had many more potential targets identified, but as was discussed at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting, that might be too many, too fast; so we are now trying to focus more on what we are already doing.

Haugen reported that another issue is that after MAP-21 the US DOT has to establish some performance targets they want to see from a federal perspective. He added that those, then, will be passed down to the state level so both states will need to review and establish their performance targets, which they will then pass down to us, however they have two years to do this, which is why we are not going to try to anticipate what those might be but rather focus on what we are already doing.

Haugen referred to a slide presentation discussing the eight goals, and went over each of them briefly.

Haugen stated, again, that we feel that we are focusing on what we are already trying to accomplish with our planning efforts. He said that we do, however, recognize that as MAP-21 is implemented we will more than likely have to revisit this planning document two years down the road, after the US DOT, MnDOT, and NDDOT have determined what their targets are.

Haugen referred to a slide illustrating the Issues Map, and went over it briefly. He explained that we began this process by saying that our current transportation plan identifies the issues we are trying to address. He said that we then went through a public process and held a couple of public meetings to identify what additional issues are out there, as well as what issues have already been addressed, and this is the end result of that. He added that this map shows the issues that form the base of what we will try to address in our range of alternatives in order to ultimately allow us to compile our new 2040 recommended plan.

Discussion ensued.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

Haugen commented that our biggest challenge is the financial side of this. He explained that, unfortunately, the State of North Dakota is not yet in a position to share with us what they project their future financial condition will be. He stated that they are trying to wait to see what comes out of their legislative session, but we are informing them that our deadline doesn't allow us to wait that long, so they will have to come up with something soon. He added that, as you know, we haven't yet approved a new T.I.P. for the North Dakota side, so we have projects out there that need to get included in the T.I.P. in order for them to move forward and get done, so timing is of the essence for North Dakota, but our biggest challenge in this planning process is going to be the revenue side.

Information only.

**MATTER OF MAP-21 IMPLEMENTATION**

Haugen reported that one of the first implementation actions out of MAP-21 was designating the "enhanced" National Highway System (NHS). He explained that this is the system that congress put about 2/3 of the federal funding into, so it is a very important designation for certain roadways to be eligible for funding.

Haugen commented that the law basically states that all current principal arterials should roll into this enhanced national system, however each state is at a different point in being able to tell the feds what their current principal arterials are, so the memorandum from the feds, included in the packet, states that they had to release something by October 1<sup>st</sup>, that there will most likely be errors, and here is how we will correct those errors.

Haugen stated that for Grand Forks and East Grand Forks we expect that there are just technical errors, so additional discussion won't be required as to whether the principle arterial should or shouldn't be included. He referred to the actual map put out by Federal Highway, and pointed out the errors made for both sides. He explained that the process we will need to follow to get roadways onto the National Highway System should be to just make simple technical corrections to the Maps.

Haugen went on to explain how all of this will affect both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks.

Information only.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

1. October 22<sup>nd</sup> MnDOT State Highway Investment Plan (SHIP) Meeting

Haugen reported that MnDOT has a meeting next Monday, from 3:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. in Bemidji on their State Highway Investment Plan.

Haugen referred to the website and went over how their interactive scenario tool works.

Information only.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2012

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO ADJOURN THE OCTOBER 17<sup>TH</sup>,  
2012, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:00 P.M.***

***Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Malm, Leigh, Grandstrand, Powers, Adams, Christensen, and  
Strandell.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE  
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, November 21<sup>st</sup>, 2012 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

In Chairman, Warren Strandell's absence, Steve Adams, Vice Chairman, called the November 21<sup>st</sup>, 2012, 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, Steve Adams, Gary Malm, Mike Pokrzywinski, Don Dietrich (Proxy For Warren Strandell); and Doug Christensen.

Guests present were: Jane Williams, Grand Forks City Traffic Engineer.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Nancy Ellis, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Adams declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 17<sup>TH</sup>, 2012, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 17<sup>TH</sup>, 2012, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Malm, Powers, Adams, and Dietrich.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON KENNEDY/SORLIE BRIDGE PROJECTS**

***Kennedy Bridge Project***

Haugen referred to the staff report included in the packets, and explained that he tried to inform this body that as far as the Kennedy Bridge project is concerned, as discussed last month, they did select a consultant, however as negotiations ensued a hiccup occurred between the two State's agreement that prohibited signing of the contract. He said that they then went through and resolved those issues prior to completing the agreement with CH2M Hill, which is the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 21<sup>st</sup>, 2012**

consultant they selected, but it appears that everything is on track now and MNDOT expects to sign the contract prior to Thanksgiving.

Haugen reported that one other thing to note is that J.T. Anderson, who was the project manager on this project, through a series of promotions within the district will no longer be able to continue in that capacity, and a new project manager will be taking over soon.

*Sorlie Bridge Project*

Haugen reported that NDDOT did hold interviews, and a top firm was chosen, KLJ, along with Widseth Smith and Nolting as a sub.

Haugen stated that negotiations are in progress for them to do the initial work needed to identify what type of environmental document they will have to do on the project.

Christensen reported present.

Haugen reminded the board that the Kennedy project is scheduled for 2016 and the Sorlie project is scheduled for 2018.

Malm asked when they would hear the consultant's reports. Haugen responded that, as he noted, both of these studies are going to have a local work committee to help steer them, and he continues to request that they consider this board as being the local group to help steer the project. He added that there are also some agencies that we would invite for specific topics including U.S. Fish and Wildlife, Coastguard, etc., that are involved with bridges over rivers.

Pokrzywinski asked if it isn't this board doing this who else would it be. Haugen responded that that is a good question. He said that that is why the MPO exists, to coordinate transportation improvements in the metro area. Christensen asked who on this board would do that, aside from Mr. Haugen. Haugen responded that the consultants would keep this board updated, and would utilize its guidance through the process. He added that they would also be utilizing the Technical Advisory Committee for a lot of the technical issues, and most of the Technical Advisory Committees are going to be providing the technical expertise either way.

Haugen stated that there will be a lot of public involvement that will help this body remain informed as to what the public's comments and input are during the process.

Christensen asked if this body has ever done anything like this before. Haugen responded that it has been quite some time since they have, but that is only because we haven't had projects like these in a long while.

Christensen commented that he would argue that if he were engineers with the City of Grand Forks and/or the City of East Grand Forks he would want to be involved. Haugen responded that they will be involved. Christensen said that he would much rather have his engineer on the North Dakota side and the engineer on the East Grand Forks side along with Mr. Haugen

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 21<sup>st</sup>, 2012**

involved, and that would be the key, that they, then, would be responsible for keeping both City Councils updated. He added, however, that if they needed some MPO guidance the board would be there for Mr. Haugen, but he doesn't really see the MPO as having to be involved very much because we would be shutting traffic down in certain parts of the city. Haugen responded that there is that technical group that you described, that would be guiding them a lot on the day to day activities, but they also want to have a broader group of elected officials and from these larger federal agencies, to help steer the direction and give guidance at key points, so that is DOT's preference, and that is how they are trying to set up these studies, so they want to form this committee, and we are suggesting that that committee is already formed in the function of this board, subject to adding those key representatives from those other agencies.

Pokrzywinski said that he would just like to comment that he feels that their City Council, and Grand Forks' City Council need to be involved as these are too big a decision to be made without getting the entire councils and staff involved more than they have been. He commented that in his opinion; and although he will be leaving this board at the end of the year he certainly plans to remain engaged, especially with the Kennedy Bridge project, as well as the Sorlie Bridge project down the road, he thinks it would be useful to have East Grand Forks' City Administrator be involved with these studies, and he would ask that he attend these meetings. He added that he also doesn't think it would be a bad idea to have representatives from the engineering staff from both communities at these board meetings to answer questions specific to the bridge issues as well. He stated that he doesn't totally agree with Mr. Christensen, that he absolutely feels that it is the MPO's role, that this is what this board does, what this body does, but with these issues he also feels there should be a little more engagement with their engineers and administrative staff.

Christensen stated that it seems to him that Mr. Haugen shouldn't probably get too far downstream on this until such time that the respective councils, and engineering departments for both cities, present more guidance. He added that when he goes back to the council, that is what he is going to say; put this together guys because it is coming down the lane, and get your input in.

Haugen reported that on the Kennedy Bridge project you will get a request from MNDOT; when they and their consultant decide, along with the NDDOT, what structure they conceptualize in the study RFP, the two committee structures, and what representation they desire. He said that, then, conversely on the Sorlie, you will get a similar request from the NDDOT, along with MNDOT.

Christensen asked when the consultants will get to the respective city councils so they don't lose track of this. Haugen responded that the consultants for the Kennedy and Sorlie projects are hired by both DOTs, so when they are signed, sealed and delivered and on board, and they aren't currently at this moment, then we will hear more. Christensen asked who was doing the signing of the contracts. Haugen responded that MNDOT is on the Kennedy, and NDDOT is on the Sorlie. Christensen said, then, that what they will do on the Grand Forks side is, and this is for the staff person from their engineering department, to get back to Al on this right away, and Rick. Williams responded that they are aware of this, but she will take these comments back to them, and she agrees with what has been discussed.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 21<sup>st</sup>, 2012

**MATTER OF AUTHORIZING MPO CHAIRMAN AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO SIGN MNDOT GRANT AGREEMENT FOR 2013**

Haugen reported that this is our annual contract we have with MNDOT to receive Minnesota State funds to assist us with our MPO planning activities. He commented that 100% of these state funds are used to lessen the local match to the federal funds, and the contract is the same one we have been signing for the past several years, so we do need to have a resolution officially approved by the MPO Board authorizing the Chairman and the Executive Director to execute this contract.

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY POKRZYWINSKI, TO AUTHORIZE THE MPO CHAIRMAN AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR EXECUTE THE AGREEMENT FOR DISTRIBUTION OF STATE PLANNING FUNDS WITH MNDOT.***

***Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Malm, Powers, Adams, Dietrich, and Christensen.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE HUMAN SERVICES PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION COORDINATION PLAN**

Kouba reported that, basically they have been following the process, they have pulled together a committee of their human services, and gathered their input on what they need, what they are looking at, as well as allowing them to look over this final document. She said that they have had to go through the transition of SAFETEA-LU to MAP-21, as well, there have been few changes, mostly between MAP-21 and SAFETEA-LU, MAP-21 requires this document as well, but mostly for the enhanced mobility of seniors and individuals with disabilities section of the FTA funding.

Kouba commented that they have gone through and made sure that they focused in on what our human services have wanted, and feel is necessary to be prioritizing any kind of projects that come forward to the MPO. She said that they have had their public meeting as well, no comments from the general public have been put forward to us so they are requesting the approval of the final document.

***MOVED BY POKRZYWINSKI, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO GRANT FINAL APPROVAL TO THE HUMAN SERVICES TRANSPORTATION COORDINATION PLAN, AS SUBMITTED***

***Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Malm, Powers, Adams, and Dietrich.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2013-2014 MPO UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM**

Haugen reported that we prepare, every two years, a document that identifies all of the work activities we will charging the federal funds towards. He said that this document lists those projects, by year with the estimated budgeted dollar amount for each.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 21<sup>st</sup>, 2012**

Haugen referred to the staff report, and pointed out that the fourth paragraph discusses possible staffing changes. He explained that we currently contract out staff to both cities, however East Grand Forks has utilized staff hours significantly more in the past for their land use planning activities, and for transit financial activities. He stated that the City of East Grand Forks is strongly considering hiring their own full-time City Planner, which would mean we would no longer be contracting out MPO staff for those duties. He commented, then, that the work program is anticipating that we will have 100% MPO staff instead of having some of our staff contracted out.

Haugen reported that the East Grand Forks City Council was expected to have this staff change approved by last night, however it was delayed as Mr. Huizenga was unable to attend the working session meeting, and there were some questions raised so it was tabled until the next cycle of working session council meetings. He stated that as far as he is aware the anticipated result is that they will hire their own full-time planner, so the work program that is proposed today should be able to be fulfilled.

Haugen stated that they asked their partnering agencies what activities they would like us to undertake, and the result is as follows:

Fiscal Year 2013

1. Finalize Long Range Transportation Plan
2. Update Traffic Counting Program
3. 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South IJR
4. Pavement Management Update

Fiscal Year 2014

1. West Gateway Drive Access Management
2. Traffic Incident Management
3. ITS & Regional Architecture

Haugen reported that this document has been submitted to our State and Federal partners, and received comments from MNDOT, but are still waiting for comments from NDDOT and Federal partners. He said that they did inform him that they would have their comments to us last week, however that did not occur, so if this body does approve any actions today it will be subject to their input.

Discussion ensued.

***MOVED BY CHRISTENSEN, SECONDED BY POKRZYWINSKI TO APPROVE THE 2013-2014 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM CONTINGENT ON ANY COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM OUR FEDERAL PARTNERS.***

***Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Malm, Powers, Adams, Dietrich, and Christensen.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 21<sup>st</sup>, 2012**

**MATTER OF RECOMMENDED UNIVERSITY AVENUE IMPROVEMENTS**

Haugen commented that you are aware we are holding an open house on November 29<sup>th</sup>. He said that he does have a power point presentation that he feels simplifies all the information and puts it into a better flow of what is being recommended. He explained that what we were asked to do was to look at ways to reduce traffic, and we think we have come up with recommendations that put a lot of emphasis on UND addressing its traffic rather than the City of Grand Forks trying to address it to solve their problems.

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

Haugen reiterated that there will be an open house on Thursday, November 29<sup>th</sup>, at the Memorial Union from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. to get feedback from the campus community, as well as from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. to get feedback from the rest of the community.

**MATTER OF A.T.A.C. SCHOOL STUDY DRAFT REPORT**

Ellis reported that our A.T.A.C. School Safety Studies are something that we've done for the last five plus years. She explained that they typically look at three schools a year; elementary, middle, and parochial schools within the Grand Forks and East Grand Forks areas at a time.

Ellis stated that representatives from public works, engineering, enforcement staff, school districts, superintendents, principles, parent teacher organizations, and safe kids gather and try to address safety issues in and around the schools.

Ellis commented that one thing these studies address, that typically aren't mentioned in a safe routes to school study is that we look at all modes, so they aren't just looking at bike and pedestrian, but also at bus drop-off and pick-up, as well as parent drop-off and pick-up issues.

Ellis stated that the three schools done this year were Valley Middle School, Schroeder Middle School and South Point Elementary, and they are now in the process of receiving a draft report. She said that, although they have not yet seen the full report, it does discuss existing conditions, suggested improvements, whether they be short-term or long-term, and cost estimates for each of those improvements.

Ellis referred to the information included in the packet, and briefly went over the recommendations for each of the three schools.

Ellis said that they will get the draft report within the next week, will go back to the schools, city engineer, public works, and then this will come back for final approval. She stated that they do not see any major changes being needed, but may see some added cost estimates, and then these reports are kept at the schools and can be used when considering any capital improvements for the school.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 21<sup>st</sup>, 2012

**OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY POKRZYWINSKI, SECONDED BY CHRISTENSEN, TO ADJOURN THE  
NOVEMBER 21<sup>ST</sup>, 2012, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:05  
P.M.***

***Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Malm, Powers, Adams, Dietrich, and Christensen.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE  
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2012 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Warren Strandell, Chairman, called the December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2012 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, Steve Adams, Gary Malm, Mike Pokrzywinski, Greg Leigh; Warren Strandell; Doug Christensen; and Tyrone Grandstrand.

Guests present were: Jane Williams, Grand Forks City Engineer and Rich Romness, Grand Forks City Engineer.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Nancy Ellis, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO 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 21<sup>ST</sup>, 2012, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY POKRZYWINSKI, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 21<sup>ST</sup>, 2012, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Malm, Powers, Adams, Leigh, Strandell, and Christensen.  
Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF PRESENTATION OF LETTER OF APPRECIATION TO MIKE POKRZYWINSKI FOR YEARS OF SERVICE**

Strandell presented a letter of appreciation to Mike Pokrzywinski for his years of service to the MPO Executive Policy Board. He also explained that a plaque has been ordered, however it was not done in time to be able to present it today.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

**MATTER OF 2012 HOLIDAY HOURS**

Haugen explained that, as in past years, the City of Grand Forks has approved a four hour holiday time-off bonus for their employees, and since the MPO tries to mirror what the City does for its employees, we are requesting approval of the same four hour time-off bonus for the MPO Employees as well. He added that these hours are to be used by the end of June, so employees don't have all year to use them.

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE A FOUR HOUR HOLIDAY TIME-OFF BONUS FOR MPO EMPLOYEES.***

***Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Malm, Powers, Adams, Leigh, Strandell, and Christensen.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF AUTHORIZING MPO CHAIRMAN AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE THE 2013-2014 UPWP AGREEMENT WITH THE NDDOT**

Haugen reported that the MPO bi-annually enters into an agreement with the NDDOT in order to obtain our Federal Consolidated Planning Grant Funds. He explained that this is the standard contract we have executed for the past several years, and there are no significant changes, therefore staff is recommending approval to authorize the Chairman and Executive Director to execute the contract.

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY CHRISTENSEN, TO AUTHORIZE THE MPO CHAIRMAN AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR EXECUTE THE CONTRACT WITH THE NDDOT.***

***Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Malm, Powers, Adams, Leigh, Strandell, and Christensen.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON KENNEDY/SORLIE BRIDGE PROJECTS**

***Kennedy Bridge Project***

Haugen referred to the staff report, included in the packets, and explained that there hasn't been any change since last month's meeting. He stated that the contract has still not been signed, due mainly to some internal financial issues on MNDOT's side, specifically some contract clauses, so they still do not have their consultant on board.

Haugen reported that the other thing concerning the Kennedy Bridge project, which we will address in more detail with the T.I.P. amendment agenda item later, is that we received a request from MNDOT to amend the funding source for their half of the cost of the project to reflect 80% federal participation instead of the 100% state funding previously shown.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

*Sorlie Bridge Project*

Haugen reported that KLJ has a negotiated contract in their possession for signatures, however last he heard the contract has not been returned to NDDOT, so they are not officially on board yet.

Haugen commented that their work will be part of a field review, and they will be doing an initial survey of what is there, and then work with the DOTs to come up with a more refined scope of work to determine what the next phase of the project will be, and that will be the actual start of the NEPA process as well

Grandstrand reported present.

**MATTER OF PROPOSED T.I.P. AMENDMENT**

Haugen reported that there are four T.I.P. amendments that we need to take action on today, two for North Dakota and two for Minnesota.

Haugen stated that the North Dakota amendments are to identify new projects into the T.I.P. in order for them to be able to receive federal funds. He reminded the board that they did not adopt a 2013 T.I.P. for North Dakota, so these are actually amendments to the 2012 T.I.P.

**NORTH DAKOTA:**

- 1) Reconstruct multi-use trail along the easterly side of South 20<sup>th</sup> Street between 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue South and 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South.

Leigh asked if this trail was located south of Cartiva, out to the middle school. Haugen responded it was. Christensen asked where they are going to put the path. Haugen responded that this is a reconstruction of the trail that is already there, tearing out what is there and replacing it. Christensen asked if it is a sidewalk or a bituminous path. Haugen responded it is currently a bituminous path. Christensen stated, then, that it should be on the east side of the soccer fields. Haugen responded that it is on the east side of South 20<sup>th</sup>, but it is on the west side of the soccer fields. Adams asked if it is currently a sidewalk and will it be widened. Haugen responded that it is a trail right now, a wide trail.

Christensen stated, then they are going to spend \$400,000 to do this. Haugen responded that they are, they are going to tear out what is there and put in new. Christensen asked why they would do this. Haugen responded that this was an application the City Council approved back about a year ago. He explained that they went through the North Dakota process for project ranking, and it was prioritized statewide as a project to get funding, and was chosen to receive those funds. Romness added that it was originally put in as a temporary bituminous

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

trail. Christensen asked if it is a six-foot or eight-foot wide trail. Romness responded it is currently an eight-foot wide trail, but will be replaced as a ten-foot wide trail.

Grandstrand stated that he would just like to say how much he appreciates that that path is there. He explained that when he was in middle school he used to walk across that field, and one time when it was really wet he got stuck in the mud, so having that path there is really great.

Christensen commented that he agrees it is a great path, but he wonders why we are doing this rather than the bituminous trail that is on the east side as he would think it would be a nice link for the bikepath. Haugen responded that there is a path along the drainway. Christensen said that that is the one he is talking about. Haugen explained that it is a concrete trail now on the east side of the drainway, but this one connects 47<sup>th</sup> to 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Christensen asked if we approve this are we stuck doing this, can we move the money around. Haugen responded that it is to be used on this project only.

- 2) Fund NEPA document for the proposed improvement on the Kennedy Bridge scheduled for FY2016.

Haugen reported that MNDOT is about to hire someone to do a study of the Kennedy Bridge, so in 2014 North Dakota wants to set aside their portion of the funds needed to do the project development process, or the NEPA process, so they need to program \$425,000 in order to ensure the money will be available when it is needed.

**MINNESOTA:**

- 1) Minor concrete repair and planing on US 2 and MN220.

Haugen stated that this amendment moves a concrete repair project on Gateway Drive and Central Avenue from 2014 to 2013. He commented that one of the reasons for moving this project is because of MAP-21, and its emphasis on National Highways. He explained that Gateway Drive is on the National Highway System so they are trying to put money where the program is on this project.

- 2) Add federal funds to Kennedy Bridge Rehab Project

Haugen reported that in 2016 we programmed \$25,000,000 for the Kennedy Bridge project, with a 50/50 split between the two states, but, again because of MAP-21, MNDOT has changed their funding source from 100% State funded to the typical 80/20 federal funding split.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

Haugen reported that a public hearing was held last Wednesday at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting. No verbal or written comments were received, thus staff is recommending approval of the amendments as submitted.

***MOVED BY POKRZYWINSKI, SECONDED BY GRANDSTRAND, TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE FY 2012-2015 T.I.P.***

***Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Malm, Powers, Adams, Leigh, Strandell, Christensen, and Grandstrand.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE 2013-2014 UPWP**

Haugen reminded the board that at their November meeting they discussed whether or not they should adopt the 2013-2014 UPWP subject to comments from our partner agencies, and at that time what was in our work program were activities that we have been doing in the past, and which we had no inclination wouldn't be approved in the future, however since then the one activity Federal Highway has determined we should not do as an MPO is the Interchange Justification Report for 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue. He added that they also determined that some of the work we have done in the past on the pavement management system is no longer eligible for MPO funds to participate in. He explained that we can now only fund those that are federally aid eligible.

Haugen said, then, that in the work program we are swapping out the 47<sup>th</sup> Interchange Justification Report with a study to look at freight/rail access in the metro area. He explained that during our Long Range Transportation update, Ms. Ellis has been leading some discussions with our freight stakeholders, and they brought up some concerns about accessing the railroad system. He added that they also have a visit from the Economic Development Corporation from Grand Forks asking us to assist them in identifying rail access issues, so staff, along with the Technical Advisory Committee, are recommending that since we cannot do the IJR we do the freight rail access study instead. He stated that we have worked with our State and Federal Partners to ensure that they won't declare this to be ineligible, and they have approved the scope of work that we have in the work program, so in lieu of the IJR, and with some of the cost savings from the Pavement Management, we are placing the extra funds into the Freight/Rail Access Study.

Haugen commented that the last item, and we did discuss this a little before, is the indirect cost proposal. He explained that this relates to the City of East Grand Forks hiring their own City Planner, who will also do the transit administration. He stated that these are both things the MPO currently staffs for the City of East Grand Forks, so once a planner is in place, this will no longer be the case, therefore we will no longer need to do indirect cost billings, and new language will be added to the work program to reflect that during January the agencies will form a transition plan to identify how the MPO will modify its payment requests for work activities in 2013.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

Christensen asked how the IJR will get done for 47<sup>th</sup> then. Haugen responded that that will have to be financed with State, Local or Private funding; or a combination of all three. He stated that a lot of the information that will be coming from the IJR will be things that we produce as an MPO, we just cannot do the document. Christensen asked when it can be done. Haugen responded that in April or May we will be asked to amend our T.I.P. to include, as an illustrative project, the interchange, unless there is funding found before then. He stated that we need to have this in our T.I.P. in order to ensure that when the IJR is submitted to Federal Highway they can legally act on the report, so anytime after April it can be submitted to the State. Christensen asked if anyone has been hired to do this yet. Haugen responded that they have not, adding that that is something that the State, City, or Private Sector could do.

Christensen asked Grand Forks City staff if this is something they work with. Romness responded that they will be submitting a staff report, with recommendations on how to proceed with this, to City Council.

Powers asked why the IJR was declared ineligible. Haugen responded that the short answer is that it never should have been allowed in the past either. He added that it is considered engaging the NEPA process, and in the past there has always been a very sharp distinction between planning and NEPA. Malm asked what NEPA is. Haugen responded that it is the National Environmental Protection Act. He said that every federal project needs to make sure it is not harming the environment, and has to go through the Environmental Protection Act process to determine this. He added that we don't go through full NEPA in the planning process.

***MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY POWERS TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENTS TO THE 2013-2014 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM.***

***Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Malm, Powers, Adams, Leigh, Strandell, Christensen, and Grandstrand.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF ND HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM REQUESTS**

Haugen commented that even though we didn't adopt a 2013 T.I.P., we are already working on a 2014 document. He stated that the first projects that are really coming underneath our microscope are Highway Safety Improvement Program projects on the North Dakota side. He reported that the solicitation has taken place, and the City of Grand Forks, through action of their City Council, submitted three projects, and prioritizes them for us.

- 1) Continuing the pedestrian countdown at our traffic signals along the State Highway System.
- 2) Right turn lane at 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and South 34<sup>th</sup> Street.
- 3) Right turn lanes around the 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue/Columbia Road intersection.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

Haugen stated that there were no other projects submitted from any other entity, and the Technical Advisory Committee and staff are recommending we approve them and forward them on to the NDDOT as projects consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan and also in the priority the City of Grand Forks gave them.

Christensen asked what else the City of Grand Forks needs. Williams responded that these are primarily for State Highways at this time. She stated that we only have a request in, that has been approved for a couple City intersections, and the reason they are splitting these up is to save money. She added that their city staff electricians will install all of this, they won't have a contractor, so that allows us to do more for less money.

***MOVED BY CHRISTENSEN, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE NDDOT HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PROJECTS, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Malm, Powers, Adams, Leigh, Strandell, Christensen, and Grandstrand.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF PROPOSED CHANGES PER MAP-21**

Haugen reported that they are forewarning the MPO that with MAP-21 program changes some of the projects on Minnesota side that are currently programmed could be delayed. He stated that MNDOT has provided us with some results of some very thorough analyses of how MAP-21 changes the funding stream for things.

Haugen explained that last Thursday the Area Transportation Partnership (ATP), which in Minnesota who meet and make decisions concerning which projects get federal and state funds, met. He stated that East Grand Forks, every fourth year, gets what is called City Sub-Target funds out of the ATP, and the current project in 2014 slated for those funds is the Reconstruction of 17th Street N.E. in East Grand Forks, between Central and 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.E. He said that right now, as of last Thursday, MNDOT is not 100% able to tell us whether or not that project is safe in the year it is programmed, however what MNDOT staff privately says is that if it were in jeopardy we would have heard about it by now because they know that work is already being done on the NEPA process in order for it to be done in 2014, but it will be another month before we are 100% sure whether or not MAP-21 is causing any of our T.I.P. projects to be delayed.

Haugen stated that on the North Dakota side there was a phone conversation this morning between NDDOT and the 12 large cities in North Dakota concerning the Urban Program. He said that North Dakota made several proposals for those cities to consider as to how the changes in MAP-21 will be implemented in North Dakota.

Haugen explained that there will be further conversations concerning MAP-21 changes in January. He said that the encouraging news is that NDDOT is still making local projects held harmless, and North Dakota is considering doing some federally allowed flexibility of program dollars to enable for the projects that are currently in place will receive federal program dollars.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

Haugen reported that the real issue on the North Dakota side is that in the past they used an accounting system whereby if Grand Forks didn't spend its full allocation each year it could bank the remaining funds over into subsequent years, let it build up, and it wouldn't impact rescissions, wouldn't impact obligational limitation, so the spreadsheet distributed shows there was a healthy balance at the end, but NDDOT have now determined that that will not likely continue to be allowed so they want to ensure that that accounting system is balanced, thus the need for today's discussion.

Haugen stated that, ultimately, the good news is that North Dakota is finally communicating with its partners as to how it thinks MAP-21 is impacting the program. He added that the other good news is that they are trying to hold harmless the cities and counties from getting less federal funds than they currently are.

**MATTER OF SOLICITATION ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Haugen reported that with MAP-21 there are some things that both states are moving forward with to solicit projects, with the first one being a new program called "Transportation Alternatives". He explained that this is actually the old Transportation Enhancement program, and is the one that the Reconstruction of the trail on South 20<sup>th</sup> Street is being funded out of. He added that this program also absorbed the old Safe Routes To School program, so now they are soliciting for this new transportation alternatives program. He stated that North Dakota and the MPO are releasing a solicitation letter to our member jurisdictions.

Haugen commented that in the past, because Safe Routes To School projects could be processed through the local school district, a few of the Safe Routes to School on the North Dakota side went through the school district rather than through the City, but now, because it is going to be absorbed into the TAP program, any projects for Safe Routes To School or the old enhancement program will now have to be processed through the City.

Haugen reported that there is still "old" money left so North Dakota is soliciting Safe Routes To School under the old program.

Haugen commented that the deadline date for submittal of projects is the first Wednesday in February for both North Dakota and Minnesota projects.

Haugen reported that the other two programs are the JARC and New Freedom, which are federal transit programs.

Haugen stated that the City of Grand Forks, at their Service Safety Committee meeting heard an application for JARC funds to institute a new route that would connect the University area to the multi-family area growing around the Alerus Center, so with Campus Crest Apartments being built there, and with the continuation of the Garden View Apartments being added to, the City is proposing to run a new bus route connecting that area to the University five days a week when UND is in session, so it would be a route just focusing on the University tie between those developments and campus. He added that the City of Grand Forks also will be submitting an application for New Freedom funds to replace Demand Response System vehicles. He stated

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

that he believes the City Council approved both of these applications at their meeting this past Monday, so we will be receiving them at our January meeting for approval.

Haugen reported that the ATP decided to delay one month the deadline for submittal of any projects on the Minnesota side, so we will now be taking action on this in February rather than January. He stated that on the North Dakota side we are still waiting for the NDDOT to work with its partners as to how to implement the changes in MAP-21 before we formally start soliciting for the big projects.

**MATTER OF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OFFICER ELECTIONS**

Haugen stated that this is Mr. Strandell's last meeting of his two-year term as chair. He explained that the MPO By-Laws state that the current Secretary assumes the chair position for a two-year term, and that is Mr. Adams.

Haugen reported, however, that Mr. Adams' term on the MPO Policy Board expires at the end of December, and we will not hear whether or not he is reappointed to the board until the Planning Commission meeting in January. He said that in addition, we are also waiting to hear who Mr. Pokrzywinski's replacement will be on the board, as a representative from the East Grand Forks side will need to assume the Secretary position for a two-year term, after which that person will assume the chair position for another two- year term as well.

Haugen explained that with the possibility of board member changes, he would suggest that we wait until we know whether or not Mr. Adams is reappointed, and who the East Grand Forks representative will be before we move forward with Officer elections. After further discussion it was determined that officer elections be held until the February meeting, and that we continue meeting in the East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room until further notice.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY POKRZYWINSKI, TO ADJOURN THE DECEMBER 19<sup>TH</sup>, 2012, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:40 P.M.***

***Voting Aye: Pokrzywinski, Malm, Powers, Adams, Leigh, Strandell, Christensen, and Grandstrand.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager