

# **2014 MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD MINUTES**

**January 15, 2014**

**February 19, 2014**

**March 19, 2014**

**April 16, 2014**

**May 21, 2014**

**June 23, 2014**

**July 16, 2014**

**August 20, 2014**

**September 17, 2014**

**October 8, 2014**

**October 22, 2014**

**November 19, 2014**

**December 17, 2014**

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE  
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2014 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Steve Adams, Chairman, called the January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2014 meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:06 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

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

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

Guest(s): Roger Hille, MNDOT; Doug Abere, CH2M Hill, Inc.; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks; David Kuharenko, GF City Engineer; and Patty Olsen, Safe Kids.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Adams declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 18<sup>TH</sup>, 2013, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 18<sup>TH</sup>, 2013, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

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

**Kennedy Bridge**

Haugen reported that, as indicted in your staff report, the project team would like to meet with you and go over the study results they have to-date. He stated that Roger Hille, MnDOT District

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

2 Bridge Engineer; Les Noehre, NDDOT Grand Forks District Engineer; and Doug Abere, CH2M Hill are here for this discussion, and he believes the Mr. Abere will give a brief overview on the material that was forwarded to you, as well as the material that was just distributed.

Abere reported that if anyone needs a copy of the information distributed in order to follow along, he has some additional copies. He then referred to a slide presentation of the document distributed, and pointed out that there are a number of maps and exhibits included in document. He added that a lot of today's discussion will center around a matrix discussion, found on Page 5 of the document.

Abere reported that the way that the need for action was set up on this project was around the idea of maintaining the existing crossing. He pointed out that the first graphic gives a basic overview of the structure with the main truss and approach spans. He stated that the primary need required for any action is to maintain a structurally sound bridge, a structurally sound crossing; and the secondary need includes a reliable crossing for traffic demands and improvement of bicycle and pedestrian function at this location.

Abere commented that there are a number of other considerations that were identified, those include regulatory requirements for a historic structure; structural redundancy, which we may touch on briefly today.

Abere stated that this is a fracture critical bridge, fracture critical referring to the characteristics of the original design. He added that geo-technical conditions and river hydraulics movement of soils that creates complexity for any structures that are built in the Red River, and also plays into some of these factors.

Abere explained that you are all experts on local context so he won't spend much time on this section, however a quick summary is that the bridge is a four-lane structure, providing four lanes of capacity, and travel forecasts indicate that there is no pressing need to expand that capacity for vehicular travel. He stated that the bridge performs well in terms of its clearance above flood levels, however there is a dip in the approach roadway that has been recognized and will be looked at as part of further engineering design.

Abere commented that the historic and recreational setting, on the bottom of Page 2 of the document, discusses that we have the old St. Michael's hospital building, the Riverside District, other elements, and the bridge itself is considered eligible as a historic resource, so all of those things have to be considered in the review of the project.

Abere stated that, in terms of development of alternatives, the study they have gone through was broadly set up to look at both rehabilitation and replacement of the bridge, and they have provided comparisons and packages for both options.

Abere reported that, in terms of the rehabilitation elements; and this is included in Section 2.1 of the document, and is shown in the graphics he has on the screen; there are a number of elements it is important we address: Pier 6, which is the transition pier on the North Dakota end of the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

bridge, on the west end of the truss spans, has tilted, shifted, twisted, moved over the years, and thoughts are that consideration of either repairing or replacing that pier be done. He stated that the direction coming out of the study at this time will be to replace the pier because there are concerns about moving forward in a timely manner to address the issue. He added that the findings on that particular element were that the pier has essentially moved enough, and the questions we had going into the study were whether or not we could continue adjusting the bridge to the piers movement, and the answer to that was that you could, however other findings show that the pier has tilted enough on its foundation that it is prudent to replace it, which created questions about its current orientation and whether more movement should be accommodated, thus it was a fairly key element in this whole process.

Leigh asked what will be involved with replacing the pier in its present location, how do you support the bridge while replacing it. Aberer responded that they would temporarily support the bridge, and you can run traffic on it. He said that there would be short periods of closure for a process like that.

Hille commented that about five years ago they did a similar project, albeit on a smaller non-truss structure in St. Vincent, where they had a pier that had moved, and they had to do some supporting, some mud sills, and so-forth.

Leigh asked what they mean by “close for a short period of time”, what kind of time frame are you talking about. Hille responded that it will depend on whether or not you do the pier replacement as a stand-alone project, or in conjunction with the rehabilitation or deck replacement. He explained that the way this is feeling to them right now it would be prudent to replacing the pier in conjunction with the rehabilitation or deck replacement because it would cut down on the cost. Leigh stated that his concern is, if that is the road we chose to go down, that in closing the bridge for any amount of time it would be devastating because it is a major thoroughfare, and you just can’t funnel everything through the downtown.

Further discussion on bridge closure, and issues thereof, ensued.

Aberer commented that he doesn’t want to under-emphasize Pier 6 replacement because it is a pretty important motivation for moving forward on this project. He stated that the pier is being monitored for movement, and watched carefully, so it is a concern to keep an eye on.

Aberer stated that there are many other elements here, including repair and protection of the truss system. He explained that because of the bridge’s dynamic against the movement there is a need to reinforce the abutment bearings at the end of the bridge, which have also exhibited some shifting and some changes.

Aberer added that there is also the opportunity to look at the bicycle and pedestrian accommodations, which we will discuss in the next session of this discussion. He commented that a couple of choices that we have, as you know, are to look at this external structure, and he will show some graphics on this in a moment. He said that the study going in had been scoped to take a look at the feasibility of attaching an external trail to the bridge.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Abere referred to Page 4 of the document, and pointed out that a couple of things, as they have been considering this, an important consideration has come up as to whether the fracture critical nature of the bridge, and the importance of maintaining the bridge, a primary need, is whether there are any issues in terms of compromising it as they look at attaching a new structure to the truss, so there is a concern there; and then there is access to elements that exist out there, both in terms of the outside gusset plates, which would allow you a couple of feet of space to work, but those are very important connections on the bridge, the inside gusset plates on the opposite side, there is a problem with inspection vehicles and how they would be able to reach around, both in terms of construction and maintenance of those connections.

Leigh stated that he is getting the feeling that we aren't going to go down the road of replacing the bridge, but are instead look at rehabbing the bridge, so at what point is it more feasible if we want pedestrian access to include it with bridge replacement rather than rehab. Hille responded that he thinks the way the study has gone so far, it was necessary to look at the longevity of the structure, if there is life left in it and so forth, as well as the cost of replacement versus rehab, and it sure feels there is enough structure left there for rehabilitation, so he thinks their decision process, when they get into that phase of the project, will be pretty strong for it to be rehabbed.

Abere referred to Page 5 of the document, Table 1, and explained that this brings in the cost, the structural performance, that primary goal of maintaining the structure, the construction period and traffic impacts, which are important to the communities as they have heard concerns about this from the communities. He added that historic preservation is a reality for this project as there are many issues of review, and they kind of escalate as we go towards the bridge replacement option.

Hille commented that he appreciates all this, but he thinks we should go through the rest of the graphics and then spend some more time on this matrix, but, again, when we are talking about the elements that are pushing us towards that decision, the historical element here is also pushing us hard, and if a structure that is eligible for listing on the register can be prudently rehabbed, it is very difficult for us to go around that process as well.

Leigh said that he would like to publicly state that, with rehab, if they cannot have a separate cantilevered bike/ped attachment to the bridge he would not be in favor of having the pedestrians on the roadway with a marked bike lane on a major highway, he just doesn't think it is a safe environment. Abere said that time will move quickly, but we will discuss several issues here.

Abere referred to an aerial map of the project setting and pointed out that it shows the existing trail system on both sides, as well as the historic features on the North Dakota side. He added that the Minnesota side is not without constraints as well, with the campground setting over there, so your footprint is an issue with this project, and it grows with a bridge replacement concept.

Abere commented that some of the elements of rehabilitation are summarized on the Bridge Rehabilitation Alternative(s) - Various Elements/Options graphic. He pointed out that it shows the various cross-sections they looked at inside the truss that were driven by the need to have that contrasting look at how to handle this option.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Abere reported that the next graphic shows the plan view of a separate cantilevered structure that is attached to the truss system, but has a separate structure on the approach spans on foundations, so you drive-pile and develop foundations, so you would effectively have a new bridge at the approach spans, but would be taking advantage of the existing steel truss and attaching to that. He said that this is something that was asked at the beginning of the study, what is the feasibility of doing this, and this is what they came up with.

Abere stated that the next graphic illustrates options that accommodate bike/ped traffic inside the truss, constrained by the steel truss in particular. He then went over the options briefly.

Leigh asked, if you have a shared use trail, what kind of buffer or guard rail system would be used to keep pedestrians safe. Abere responded that it would just be a raised curb, and a one-foot off-set, which could be potentially played with more, and there is also the possibility of moving the joint, so there are a lot of very detailed design issues that start to come up when you look at these and take them into a more detailed design, there are a lot of other options when going into a more detailed design. Leigh said that his only thought would be if the shared use is just a raised curb, he would think you would need some kind of guardrail or something so the guy that is texting on his phone while riding his bike doesn't just go off into the roadway and get killed, because you know something like that will happen. Abere responded that things like that could happen, however they can say that this kind of design is not unprecedented, that these kinds of designs are done and so we aren't looking at something here that, while it might seem to be an unusual adaptation of this bridge compared to what your used to, but it is a proven approach, and in-fact there are facilities in various cities, particularly for bicycles that have a lot less buffer than this.

Noehre commented that there is already a shared use path on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue in Grand Forks, on the east end. Hille added that this is similar to what they used in Crookston, Roseau, and so forth. He stated that it is interesting because this is the same discussion he has had a number of times, and the counter to that is that whatever you put up there kind of gives one a false sense of confidence that they can be closer to that traffic, and certainly without a major concrete barrier of some sort that will eat up another two feet of lane, you're not going to prevent that car from coming up or from the bike going off. Abere added that in any urban situation you are trusting pedestrians and drivers to co-exist, and while it is a challenge, it is as different vision of how the precious space on this bridge can be allocated, but again, it is not unprecedented and it is meeting some support from a variety of internal levels at MnDOT, and has been circulated around the Minnesota Department of Transportation sufficiently so that there is some comfort level of perhaps going this direction.

Powers asked what the minimum width is for a shared use path. Hille responded that it is 10-foot, however 9-foot paths have been used when necessary. Abere added that some have said it can be as narrow as 8-feet, he has heard everything from 8-feet to 10-feet. Hille commented that he has heard a lot of discussion, and you are seeing two of probably twenty different variations of how we can accommodate both pedestrians and traffic inside the truss system. Powers said that the reason he asked this is because on the bottom of Page 4 of the document, in real fine print, it indicates that someone did a survey on three different days, a Tuesday, Wednesday and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Saturday, and thirteen people went across that bridge either on a bike or on foot, so he wonders what the need would be for a 9-foot wide path. He said that to him this would be wasting a lot of space that could be used for vehicular traffic. He asked if there has been any study done that would indicate that a ramped up elevation, or use of pedestrian/bike path on this thing because he doesn't see it. He said that he knows we need it, but... Aberer responded that it is a tricky comparison because there is a prohibition sign on the bridge currently, and the bridge really doesn't present itself as a friendly environment for pedestrians and bicycles right now, so the fact that you have people crossing it at all, and they can be observed, and he has been out enough that he has observed it himself more than once, and have seen people walking on the structure, so those are limited periods, so we have thirteen people over a period of three days, but they were very limited times of day as well, so we don't have any data that would really suggest what the average daily crossings are by pedestrians and bicyclists, but we know that it is a positive number, and that it is fairly regular so we can be confident that there is regular use by people that need to do it.

Powers asked, say you have a 9-foot shared path, could you possibly eliminate the path on the far left of the bridge. Aberer responded that this is a good question. Hille added that, it is a wonderful question, and in-fact that last two renditions they got from their bicycle/pedestrian folks suggest a raised sidewalk on both sides, so this input is very important to them. Powers explained that the reason he brings this up is that during his travels he spent some time down in Florida, and even in Minneapolis when you get on the freeway system if you have an accident or a breakdown there is no place to move over to get your vehicle retrieved, and he was thinking that might be a good place you could split it somehow or another. Aberer responded that a shoulder is always useful. He explained that one of the reasons a shoulder is helpful there is just offset from the railing because if a vehicle strays you don't want it to hit the railing, you would rather have it stray a lot before it hits the rail, so that would provide an extra buffer. He added that, again, whether or not you allow bicycles on it is a choice, it could just be a shoulder, and it need not be marked as allowable.

Hille stated that this is all very useful information. He added that that is what they are here for today, to get those types of comments; and you're putting some priorities on the primary need, or the traffic need, because the conversations over the last few weeks have been just focused on the pedestrian issues.

Aberer commented that limited shoulder space, he would note, is already part of the environment on Highway 2, in this location. He referred to an illustration of the top-cross section, and pointed out that it is very close to the existing bridge configuration, you only are looking at 4-feet to the outsides and a couple of feet to the inside, and that is not unlike what you have today except that you actually have a raised curb on the inside of the existing bridge, and Highway 2 east and west of the bridge has limited shoulder room, so a constrained cross-section is part of what you have to work with all along this highway in the vicinity of this bridge, in his observation.

Aberer referred to the document, and went over some of the primary considerations of the possible adjusted cross-sections:

- 1) Presence of a median is considered desirable – Hille commented that they heard this from this body, and from the City Council's as well, that you desire a center median

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

- from a safety standpoint. He added that they also heard from this body that 10-foot lanes are not an option, and he will take this information back for review.
- 2) 11-foot-wide travel lanes – Aberer commented that this is really working a lot of angles is the best way to summarize this consideration. He stated that 11-foot lanes are quite proven, there has been a fair amount of safety analysis of those and there hasn't been any significant suggestions that they are a problem, they are often used, they have been used in many sections of the freeway system in the Twin Cities.

Hille referred to the last two graphics of the document, and explained that they are basically some of the historic elements that need to be discussed. He said that anything that is done with this structure has a historic element, just the concept of: 1) How do we make sure that on a fracture-critical, non-redundant type structure that we put a stout enough rail on there so that an errant vehicle can hit that rail and not create a major disaster or a major failure of the structure, that is very important. He added, however, that getting that to the Secretary of Interior's standards is a challenge. He said that they have gone down that path, and Mr. Aberer has done a wonderful job of finding some areas, and although it has been challenging, they know that they can do it. He added that if they want to go even further, and try to hang something like that cantilevered structure, then the historic element becomes a much bigger challenge.

Aberer distributed a graphic illustrating a preliminary layout bike/ped connection concept and went over it briefly. He explained that it illustrates a multi-use trail that would be part of a conventional and known system that already exists, and then there could be places where you have sidewalks with pedestrians only while other places would allow for both pedestrians and bicyclists, and this is illustrating some thoughts around the cross-sections you just saw.

Aberer stated that the questions become one of, again, do you provide this section along the southside. He said that some of the advantages of that would be that it fits with an inter-loop concept that Mr. Haugen has advised him is consistent with local planning, to have a shorter loop for the Greenway, and emphasis the inside connection. He commented that he would note that at the levy on the west end the slope is really difficult to create an ADA connection so there might be an optional approach with stairs that could be considered, but to create a switch-back or some kind of ramping would be tricky within this limited space. Hille added that the challenge here is to make sure that what they provide will enable you to make an ADA connection to the structure. He said that this project doesn't intend to construct all of these connections, they are just illustrating them so that they can get input from this body so that if they end up with a shared use path, they know what is desired, what works best, and confirmation as to which is the preferred side for it to be constructed on. Aberer commented that on the north side there is an easy connection that already exists down in the Greenway, so that would be an advantage if it were facilitated. He reported that one thing he thinks would be a disadvantage of placing the structure on the north side of the bridge is that on the Minnesota side there is an entrance ramp onto the bridge, and that could create some safety issues for pedestrians and bicyclists, an exit ramp is a safer environment.

Strandell commented that he doesn't see any alternative for a totally separate structure, like a pedestrian bridge. He said that when he looks at the cost of putting a bike/ped feature on the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

bridge, \$13,000,000; and only a few million more to put a cantilevered structure on the bridge; he would like to know what the cost would be to build a separate bike/ped bridge. Aberer responded that the \$3,000,000 to \$4,000,000 is based on having that element attached to the truss, and then the separate structure on the approach spans, there might be a little bit of a savings with this over what you would have with a totally separate bridge; and when you get into a completely separate bridge structure, then you start to ask questions on where you would site it, why, how does it relate to other goals, and it becomes a much larger matter.

Aberer stated that there is a possibility, he supposes, of a separate consideration, if, for example there was no structure attached to this bridge as part of a rehab, it might raise the possibility of looking at this option, or other location options later. He said that in any case you do have the complexities of hydraulics, these are not minor issues when you put a new structure on the Red River, hydraulics and soil movement, those both play into any of these ideas that involve new structure, whether you go with the one that attaches to the truss or another.

Hille commented that he thinks that the original Corps study had a structure at the northend, and a structure at the southend, and a structure somewhere between the Sorlie and the Kennedy Bridges, that would service the greenway better than we are servicing it here. He said that, again, they are trying to make sure that they accommodate parallel traffic and still have something that would enable connections to that from the greenway. He added that our needs may well be served better by a separate structure down the road somewhere, no question about that as it would limit the amount of recreational type traffic over this structure, but he thinks that is beyond the scope of this particular project.

Aberer referred to the matrix on Page 5, and pointed out that there are many things on it, but perhaps the bottom row, in terms of looking at this from a project development standpoint, is one of the more important things to feature because you can, on one hand, dig into the details, or get into the weeds over design choices, which will happen no matter what, so any of these three choices are going to get you into a lot of considerations over design and engineering. He said, however, that the perspective they are taking here is more – what does it take to develop a project, and to do it in a timely manner – so the three columns, especially the bottom row, highlight the timeframes in particular that the reviews and the level of design consideration and environmental approvals would bring in with the external bike/ped structure, or bridge replacement, certainly being more involved.

Aberer added that in terms of bridge replacement, as they kind of eluded to, there doesn't seem to be anything that they have seen so far that really justifies that, and it is a high bar to clear because in order to go into bridge replacement you really need to demonstrate that you don't have a better option, especially with a historic structure, and they haven't seen any capacity issues that would indicate a need for expansion, so a lot of the choices are between the first two columns. He stated that there would be a little more risk, in terms of the project development process, with an external structure, in terms of getting through the review and approval processes, no question.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Hille thanked the board for having them here today. He stated that they would be glad to come back with future updates if desired. He added that, as they move forward their intent is to take comments they get from a lot of different agencies and individuals, and some of those comments are vehicular oriented, some are pedestrian oriented, and sit down with their partners in North Dakota and take those elements and made a final decision as to how they are going to move forward and determine how to compromise all those competing interests. He said that this is challenge, but added that they have done it before, and he knows they will do a nice job for both cities.

Haugen commented that he thought it was their intent to ask this body to reconsider their previous motion. Hille responded that they are here to present the information. He said that he knows there is a motion by the MPO Board, and with the information that has been presented he thought they might want to reconsider that motion. Christensen asked what would happen if the Board doesn't reconsider their motion. Hille responded that they will just take the same information back, but he can't say for sure whether or not it will cause a delay with the study. He explained that if they went with the external structure option; with the historic elements, and the process involved in determining how to deal with those elements, it would certainly add a lot of time to this project.

Powers asked if the Kennedy is considered historical now. Hille responded that it is eligible. Christensen added that it is only eligible, it isn't on the register. Abere stated that it is actually considered essentially equivalent if it is considered eligible or if it is on the register. Hille added that their process is the same, they have the Sorlie Bridge, which is on the register; and the Kennedy, which is eligible; but the process they need to go through for federal dollars is essentially the same.

Vetter stated that he is still coming at this from a safety standpoint, so in his mind that trumps any maintenance issues or historical issues. He said that if you don't want to go with the cantilevered option, then go with a separate structure to accommodate the pedestrian/bike traffic. He added that he doesn't think that is outside of the scope of this project, not in his eyes anyway. He said that part of the scope is to accommodate that bike/pedestrian traffic, and a separate structure, he sees as just another alternative to accomplish that primary goal.

Vetter stated that he doesn't want to put anyone on the spot, but looking at the Thompson Bridge that was just torn down a few years ago, he would venture to guess that the traffic lanes on it were not much over 11-feet. Malm agreed that it wasn't over that, and they had real trouble out there. Vetter added that we also have a lot of agricultural equipment that gets moved across the Kennedy as well, and with the width we have now it looks like it is scraping the guardrails, and granted there is probably a couple of feet on either side, but it doesn't look like much, and now you want to shrink that down to 11-feet and take away the buffer zones, the four or six feet of buffer we have now; you are just going to cause problems with the agricultural equipment, so from a safety standpoint, to him that trumps anything else.

Christensen commented that the picture they saw last meeting showed some kind of machine that had a claw or something hanging over the side of the bridge to do repairs to the cantilevered

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

structure. He stated that what he took away from that is that we can make it look like it is too difficult because we have to use a machine, and we think that machine will never be improved, but as far as the maintenance of the structure, we are very creative, we humans, and there will be a way to repair that structure if it is added to the side of the bridge, so he to suggest that you have to build it based upon what kind of equipment you have today begs the question because you will have better equipment tomorrow, so he doesn't think you convinced many people that there will be a problem with maintenance of the cantilevered structure. He added that it all goes back to what Mr. Vetter is saying about safety and functionality within this area.

Malm asked, if we want to proceed with the option Mr. Strandell mentioned, a separate structure, someone will have to go through this same battle again on the Sorlie Bridge, and that will be worse than this battle, so if somehow we could get a structure constructed between the two bridges that takes care of the pedestrian and bicycle traffic, you solve a lot of problems down the road. Christensen stated that it is his understanding that they have to have some pedestrian element on both structures, he doesn't think they can just do nothing. Hille responded that both structures have what they call 152 dollars, so they have to accommodate some sort of pedestrian element. Christensen asked if they were to do that, in North Dakota, on 47<sup>th</sup> they went to 8-foot lanes, is that something that could be done on these structures as well. Abere asked if he was talking about multi-use trails. Christensen responded that he was. Abere stated that MnDOT has put that out there as another dimension to consider. Hille asked if this means that if they went with something inside the truss, this body would be comfortable with an 8-foot shared path. Christensen responded that this is a team sport, and this team right now is saying they would prefer a separate structure, but of course you can do what you want because it is your money, we are just giving you our input. Hille said, however, that it is your city, and that is why they are here. Christensen responded that it isn't our immediate problem, its Minnesota's immediate problem, you have identified it as your problem. Hille agreed, adding that as they go away from this meeting there is certainly some work that needs to be done on the deck of this structure, and there is certainly some work that needs to be done on Pier 6 that won't wait, there is no question about that.

Hille commented that there is some reason and discussion in their department that recreational traffic is going to like the North Bridge, the South Bridge, and the Sorlie Bridge much more than this structure, there is no question about that, but they still are charged with making standards, with giving you something that you can enable ADA standards to, that they have to do. Malm said that he agrees, but added that they shouldn't go any further than that, don't try to do anything over and above that. Hille stated that that is why they are here. He added that they appreciate very much your comments, and there is a motion out there, and if you don't want to reconsider that motion that is fine, it is still input, but he thinks in order to keep this project on line, and accommodate all of those needs in a timely manner, he thinks we should think about putting a structure inside the truss. Christensen said that he doesn't disagree, but this MPO has expressed its opinion on taking its motion back and we understand we have to work with MnDOT, but we ask that you give us as wide a bridge as possible.

Hille summarized that they have some standards here, and they really appreciate this body giving them time to discuss all this. He added that they also appreciate the input this body has given them to take back and review. He commented that they have come a long way with this study,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

and they are looking a whole lot harder at the rehab options right now, and will now focus in on the various options more closely.

Information only.

**MATTER OF NORTH DAKOTA FTA #5339 CANDIDATE PROJECTS**

Kouba reported that this is a general, a request from mostly our Cities Area Transit, our Technical Advisory Committee met but they did not have a quorum so couldn't say yea or nay to this. She stated that the City Council from Grand Forks has approved this list, of course their first priority is their bus washer, and their second priority is their dispatch center renovations.

Kouba said that they have third, fourth, and fifth priorities as well, but given the amount of money it is highly doubtful that we would get money, but if it is out there they are definitely going to try to get that amount for anything else of their needs that they need.

Kouba reported that this is what they really wanted, as well as informing that there is also some New Freedom monies out there that they are looking to get for another bus route, they already have JARC monies, but they didn't get enough so they are trying to get New Freedom monies to get a bus route closer to UND from the new apartment buildings that are out along 42<sup>nd</sup>, so that is also out there as well which they are getting approval for.

Kouba said that they are looking for approval for this listing.

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION FOR 5339-BUS AND BUS FACILITIES GRANT PRIORITIZATION FORM CITIES AREA TRANSIT AND REQUEST FOR 5317-NEW FREEDOM FUNDING, AS SUBMITTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF NORTH DAKOTA RECREATIONAL TRAILS CANDIDATE PROJECTS**

Haugen reported that there were no projects submitted for North Dakota Recreational Trails funds so no action is required.

**MATTER OF FY2014 WORK PROGRAM**

Haugen reported that a year ago this body approved a two year work program, we have completed 2013 and are starting 2014, however there were some projects in our 2013 program year that we have to carry over into 2014, therefore we are requesting the MPO Executive Policy Board approve an amendment to our work program to continue those projects to completion in 2014.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen commented that the three projects being carried over are, we have NDSU-ATAC working with us on our traffic counting program on the North Dakota side where the video detection will allow us to be more up-to-date, and to streamline our process of collecting traffic counts. He added that we have a pavement management program, and have the digital right-of-way images completed in 2013, and the next step is to do the pavement analyses of the pavement conditions. He said that the last one is our Freight-Rail Access Study, which was presented to this body last month. He stated that they are asking that this study be carried over into 2014 as well.

Haugen said that this are the projects we know right now that need to be carried over, however a month or two from now we may have additional projects that we will ask be amended into the plan, but in order to allow us to complete these project we need to amend the work program to carry them over from 2013 to 2014.

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE 2014 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM.***

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

**MATTER OF STATUS OF MPO LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

Haugen reported that, as you will recall, at our last meeting it was mentioned that a letter was forthcoming from the Grand Forks County Board, a copy of that letter was included in today's packet.

Haugen stated that the other thing is that they did formally submit these to our partners for a thirty-day comment review period. He said that, verbally, he was informed that they are going to accept the documents, although we have not received the formal letter yet. He added that there is one corrective action they want us to do, and that is one of the work items we may be bringing to this body for approval next month. He explained that it is a fairly minor action that has to do with Environmental Justice, Title VI, and Limited English Proficiency requirements; so it is a fairly technical item that they are going to pinpoint us on for corrective action, but otherwise it appears that we were able to meet the timelines, get approvals done, and we are now waiting for a formal letter to that effect.

Haugen said that this means that our plan is approved, therefore in February he expects them to unfreeze our T.I.P. so that we will be able to amend our T.I.P. document to allow some 2014 projects be included in the T.I.P. so that they can be done in 2014.

Information only.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2014

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO ADJOURN THE JANUARY 15<sup>TH</sup>,  
2014, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:10 P.M.***

***Voting Aye: Powers, Strandell, Christensen, Malm, Adams, Vetter, 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, February 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Steve Adams, Chairman, called the February 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014 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: Steve Adams, Mike Powers, Gary Malm, Warren Strandell, Clarence Vetter, Doug Christensen, Greg Leigh, and Tyrone Grandstrand.

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

Guest(s): David Kuharenko, GF City Engineer.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Adams declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 15<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY CHRISTENSEN, TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 15<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

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

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that, as directed at our last meeting, where this body decided not to reconsider its resolution, he did approach both the East Grand Forks City Council and the Grand Forks City Council. He referred to the packet, and pointed out that included are copies of signed resolutions from the MPO, the City of East Grand Forks, and the City of Grand Forks. He explained that the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

MPO and City of East Grand Forks' resolutions mirror each other, but the Grand Forks City Council softened their language a bit, however did achieve the same result as the other two. He added that he believes the result we were looking for, and did achieve, was to continue to allow for the cantilevered bike/ped accommodation to continue on in project development.

Haugen commented that the resolutions and actions have been forwarded to the project team, and their reaction was to basically just say "thank you". He stated that the full draft report was supposed to be available to the public either this past Friday, or the first part of this week, however it still has not been released.

Haugen stated that once the draft report is released we will be able to review and comment on it; then there will be a final report, and sometime soon there will have to be a decision made on how to engage a consultant to prepare the NEPA and the Project Development document, and what alternatives they will want to spend money on having the consultant investigate.

Haugen referred to Table 1 on Page 9 of the packet, and explained that it discusses the three options that the project team is kind of framing their next steps off of. He pointed out that the option to the far right, Bridge Replacement, seems to be the most unlikely to happen; and the other two options focus on whether an internal, or inside the truss bike/ped facility, or an external bike/ped facility should be considered. He pointed out that it appears that project development risks and approval process to continue outside the truss does incorporate some risk, and some additional costs, and some additional time, so this is where they are trying to figure out their next steps.

Haugen commented that the project team is aware of what the resolutions adopted by both cities state, as well letters of support from local bike/ped interest groups such as Safe Kids Grand Forks, Greenway Users Group, etc.

Haugen stated that as soon as the draft report is available he will alert the board as to where they can download or review the document.

Malm asked if the project team can just not consider the cantilevered option at all. Haugen responded that they will accommodate the bike/ped inside the truss, so we will still be able to comment, but there isn't much we can do if the decision is to not do the cantilevered option. Leigh commented that since they are funding the project they can just say they won't fund it outside the truss, right. Haugen responded that they are already started making those type of comments, like they will do it outside the truss but someone else pays for it. He added, however they will have to document and explain their reasons as to why they don't want to consider it, so we will just have to wait to see what the report lays out.

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen stated that he would like to spend a little time discussing the Sorlie Bridge EIS document. He commented that this is a completely different type of study that's engaged, it is a very formal, federally regulated, prescribed process that North Dakota is doing on the Sorlie Bridge. He explained that right now they are almost finished with drafting the Purpose and Needs Statement. He reported that a meeting was held yesterday to discuss some of the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

participating and coordinating agencies comments on the draft document. He said that the only thing he wanted to spend a little time on, to get this board prepared for, is their traffic forecast is based on a 50-year forecast. He explained that normally we are operating essentially on either a 20-year forecast or to the end of the MPO horizon area, but this is taking that beyond an additional 15-years of traffic projection to it.

Haugen commented that we need to remember that it isn't just the bridge itself, but the study area is also including DeMers Avenue to 5<sup>th</sup> Street on the Grand Forks side and 4<sup>th</sup> Street on the Minnesota side, so when you get to those 50-year forecasts, they need to figure out how those forecasts work with DeMers and those intersections on either side of the bridge.

Haugen stated that he was somewhat confused as to some of the statements made in the document, and asked for clarification. He said that one thing they did clarify yesterday is that the main focus of the study, or the primary purpose is the bridge itself, so it is conceivable that they will address capacity with this project on the bridge at this time using the 50-year forecast, but then only address DeMers and the intersections using a 20-year projection.

Haugen commented that they also hinted, and we haven't gotten to this part of the study yet, but they did hint yesterday that up to our 2040 time horizon it is unlikely there will be a need for additional capacity on DeMers Avenue, or the bridge; but once we start getting out to the 50-year horizon we start to see concerns about capacity, so when we get into this there are agreements in place that try to keep the bridge in place, so you can't really add capacity to it, so when they start talking about 50-year capacity needs, they will be talking about either complete replacement with four or five lanes, or keeping what is there and doing a parallel type sister structure, but this is all preliminary.

Powers asked, if we go with Plan B, and they do the whole project, what is the projected life span, 50-years. Haugen responded that part of the intense discussion yesterday was on the rehab option, how many years after the project do they hope to get service out of that rehab, and the number mentioned was 50-years. He added that the debate was whether that 50-years was a hard number or if there were some rehabs that got you to 40-year or 45-years, and if that was still acceptable to be carried throughout the document. He said that the rehab, right now, would say 50-years, but that is debatable, and they will probably negotiate a range of rehab, and then for a while brand new structure they are looking at a life span of 75-years.

Haugen reported that they haven't released the purpose and need chapters, but they have allowed us to comment on it, and he did comment on, when you get to the 50-year forecast and you start talking about needing additional capacity, do you need to engage the MPO back into the transportation planning process to identify as to whether or not it is appropriate and consistent with our plan to have all that capacity added to DeMers Avenue and onto the Sorlie Bridge.

Haugen commented that, just as with the Kennedy Bridge, they are required to evaluate and bring up the bike/ped accommodations. He said that the existing sidewalk is cantilevered off, so whether they can widen it to make it more multi-modal, on one or both sides, or do another separate structure is still up for discussion.

**MATTER OF MINNESOTA SIDE CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE 2015-2018 T.I.P.**

a. TAP Project

Erickson reported that Safe Kids of Grand Forks submitted this application for the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). She explained that the TAP combines Transportation Enhancement, Safe Routes To School, and a few other programs that used to be separate funding sources into one funding source. She stated that they are looking at expanding the East Grand Forks school system with education, bike racks, and speed radar signs; and this application will help fund those things.

Erickson commented that they needed the City of East Grand Forks to act as the sponsoring agency, and they did receive approval to do that.

Erickson reported that the Safe Routes To School Coordinator of Minnesota has approved this application, and agreed that it follows their plan. She added that it follows our plan as well.

Erickson stated that Safe Kids presented the application to the Area Transportation Partnership staff at their meeting last week, and they approved of the project as well. She added that there were two other applications submitted, however there is adequate funding available to fund all three applications should the ATP determine all three are eligible projects.

Haugen reported that the Technical Advisory Committee met last Wednesday, and are recommending that the MPO Executive Policy Board grant approval this application as being eligible and consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan, and, since it is our only project, to give it a high priority ranking.

***MOVED BY STRANDELL, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO APPROVE THE SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL NON-INFRASTRUCTURE TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM (TAP) APPLICATION AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND TO GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

b. City Sub-Target Project

Haugen reported that this item is all the rest of the T.I.P. eligible projects for the 2015-2018 T.I.P.

Haugen stated that there were no State Highway Candidate projects submitted, which would be consistent with our recent Long Range Transportation Plan update where MNDOT said that for the next ten years, other than the two bridges they don't see any investment need in our MPO area. He added that we did not receive any project requests from Polk County that would have used federal funds inside our study area during this time frame either, so the only pool of monies in play is, every fourth year East Grand Forks is able to submit a project for the City Sub-Target

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

from the ATP, and East Grand Forks has submitted a project to convert a gravel road, 10<sup>th</sup> Street N.E. from 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.E. to 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.E., to a concrete pavement surface. He explained that the reason for this request is to start movement towards accessing American Crystal from the north to divert traffic away from 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.E./U.S. Business 2 route and get it to come in to American Crystal from the north.

Powers asked when this project will happen. Haugen responded that it is a 2018 construction project.

Haugen commented that when East Grand Forks prepared the application, the funding at that time was unknown as to what the federal funds would be, so they used the funding amount for the City Sub-Target Program in 2017; however in 2018 MnDOT revisited their distribution of federal funds across the state, and our ATP received a fairly nice increase in funding, and the dollar amount was raised to \$730,000, so these numbers are being reworked to show that the project will utilize that \$730,000 in federal funds, so any action taken today on this application will be submitted with the revised funding.

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE CITY SUB-TARGET PROJECT FOR THE FY2015-2018 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND TO GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF NDDOT LOCAL ROAD SAFETY PLAN**

Haugen reported that North Dakota is trying to take a different approach on how safety projects are identified. He stated that we are receiving some of the draft work, and the information in the packet is a portion of what they are providing.

Haugen explained that they are looking at not just intersections, but at segmental roadways, and ultimately each plan is separate; a separate plan for Grand Forks County, one for the City of Grand Forks, etc.. He added that the plans will include these project sheets, and what they are trying to establish with these sheets is, when we do a solicitation for a safety project, the City or the County would simply take this page from the back of the plan and submit it to us so it has all the information, all the justification, all of the cost estimates inflated to the year of expenditure, etc., and then we will have to process it through our local planning document.

Haugen stated that this is just an update to help you start to see the type of analysis they are utilizing to identify where we have crash concerns in the City of Grand Forks and Grand Forks County.

Haugen commented that this is also focusing on the fact that we have a crash concern in the City that entails bike/pedestrian traffic at signalized intersections, so there will be some project that will try to improve the bike/pedestrian crossings at those signals. He added that another thing that has been discussed is the issue of "red light running". He explained that at our traffic signals

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

there is a high concentration of accidents that resemble red light running, so one of the things that they are looking at is possibly installing a sort of light emitter on the back side of the signal so that you can have one police officer located downstream who will be able to look back at the signal, and when that light comes on it tells him that the light is red so any traffic that is still coming through towards him would be violating a red light and they can stop them, so it is an enforcement tool that is fairly inexpensive, and does aid, but you would still be required to have a physical police force presence, but without the light you would need to employ two officers, one ahead of the light that can communicate to the officer downstream that the light has turned red.

**MATTER OF STATUS OF MPO LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

Haugen reported that included in the packet are copies of the letters the MPO received from both states indicating that we met the January 31<sup>st</sup>, 2014 deadline, therefore they accept our planning documents and have officially unfrozen our T.I.P. document.

Haugen referred to the letters, and explained that every five years we have to come up, at a minimum, with an updated Transportation Plan, and they are saying that our next minimal due date will be January of 2019, so next year, in our work program, we will need to lay out a four year timeline as to how we are going to meet the January 2019 deadline.

Haugen commented that another thing they highlighted is that our Environmental Justice Document needs to be revised, updated. He explained that environmental justice is trying to identify whether we have concentrations of minority and low income populations, and whether or not any of our projects have an adverse impact on them. He stated that this came out as an executive order, and still is an executive order. He added that when it was first established there was little guidance, and a lot of leeway as to how it was addressed. He explained that our MPO took the view of trying to minimize its impact on our products and our projects, and was acceptable to our State and Federal partners, whereby we introduced a qualifier that had to be both low income and minority populations in a concentrated geographic area; using a number that was three times our average. He said that throughout the twenty year history of this document, we have only had to identify the University of North Dakota area as having an environmental justification population.

Haugen reported that last fall new guidance was distributed that said we could no longer use the “and” condition; it was an “either/or” , we have to identify whether it was just solely a minority concentration, or if it was just a low-income concentration, so we have to go back and review all our data and reanalyze it to see if there is a more geographical concentration of either low income or minority populations. He said that once we do this we will have to go back into our Long Range Transportation plan and look at all the projects to see if there is an impact, and if there is an impact whether it is adverse or not.

Haugen stated that this means we have approval of our documents, they are good to go with the exception that we have to update a map and do the analysis that the update will result against our projects. He said that this isn't a major issue, but it is something we have to address, and it will have a bit of an impact on our document.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

a. Status of 2014-2017 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that next month we will have the Draft 2014-2017 T.I.P. document for the board to adopt. He explained that when our T.I.P. was frozen they gave us a one-time opportunity to amend just transit and State DOTs to get their list of 2014 projects in the cue so that they can get constructed this year, however they didn't allow either City, or the County to put in any projects, so next month is when we can bring those projects into the T.I.P. document.

Haugen said that both States still allow the cities to regress towards getting those projects to the bid date, but until it is in the T.I.P. it can't go to bid, so next month we will have to give final approval of a 2014-2017 T.I.P. He added that it is likely that we will have a Draft 2015-2018 T.I.P. document as well.

b. Status of 2014 Work Program

Haugen reported that with the requirement made that we revisit our Environmental Justice Manual, we are still trying to address that impact to our Work Program. He said that, obviously, when this body approved it last year, we didn't anticipate that we would have to allocate funding resources to that project, so in March you will see another amendment to our Work Program so that we address the Environmental Justice issue, and figure out what products we will have to delay or start in 2014, and carry over into 2015, so there will be some impact with that Environmental Justice Manual comes through.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO ADJOURN THE FEBRUARY 19<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:33 P.M.***

***Voting Aye: Powers, Strandell, Christensen, Malm, Adams, Leigh, Vetter, 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, March 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Steve Adams, Chairman, called the March 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014 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: Steve Adams, Mike Powers, Gary Malm, Warren Strandell, Clarence Vetter, Doug Christensen, Greg Leigh, and Tyrone Grandstrand.

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

Guest(s): David Kuharenko, GF City Engineer and Alexandra Johnson, Citizen.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Adams declared a quorum was present.

**THANK YOU**

Grandstrand stated that he wanted to take a moment to thank the MPO staff, especially Stephanie Erickson, for helping with the bike markings on University Avenue, the sharrows, it is important that your aware it is much appreciated.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 19<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 19<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

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

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that last week he e-mailed the Executive Policy Board a link to the full draft report of the Kennedy Bridge Study, and he also attached a summary of that report as well. He explained that this draft report was put out into circulation for comments; and he did submit some comments to MnDOT.

He said that draft report states, on the one hand that rehabilitation is the priority action, it also states on the other hand that no decision has been made and that all options remain. So he is still trying to figure out what action they will take on it. He said that another comment he provided to them was in regard to the internal versus external bike/ped accommodations. The draft does not mention at all the resolutions that the MPO and two cities provided, but felt they should at least address and comment on that. The report keens on the possibility for the external structure, because it also adds a separate approach to connect the current bridge truss system, that they felt that elevated the risk of getting historical and environmental review agency, but later on in the report they talk about that if they do nothing for accommodating bike/ped traffic, that doesn't preclude a possible completely separate project coming through to provide that bike/ped accommodation as a completely separate structure, separate project from the Kennedy Bridge Project, and his comment to them was that your introducing greater risk to that project if you think adding just approach spans on the Kennedy Project has risks of agency approval, you are now talking about a complete new separate structure and all of this structural improvements that will impede flood flow and the flood protection system, you are just creating more risk to try to identify that a potentially complete separate project and structure might the route to go, so with those comments, and a couple more editorial type of corrections, those are the comments he provided on the Draft Report on the Kennedy Bridge.

Haugen added that this week is the week they are reviewing all of the comments received; and at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting last Wednesday, Roger Hille, who is the District 2 MnDOT Bridge Engineer, said that they are still going over the comments and had not met to make a decision on way or the other on how they will address them.

Haugen said, again, that you have the link where you can look at the complete report, and he did provide the first Executive Summary of that document to help you understand what is being drafted on the Kennedy Bridge.

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that they have still not publicly released the Purpose and Needs Statement. He stated, again, that they are going through the formal environmental impact statement process, and one of the very important and first steps in that process is to identify and state what the purpose of the project will be, and the need it is going to satisfy. He said that there have been several drafts of that document distributed for review and comments, and he believes they have reached the final draft, and he isn't sure why it hasn't been released to the public for review.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen commented that the other document that is now being worked on is what they term a “Methods Document”, which essentially says that any alternative put forward in the process must meet these certain criteria, and, for example one of the criteria for any bridge structure that will go through the rehab process, there is some debate about the year, but it originally stated that it had to meet a service life of 50-years or greater. He stated that, as a replacement to that the criteria is now that it has to meet a service life of 75-years or greater, so this Methods Document is laying out what is the criteria, the screening, that all alternatives proposed, that anything that proceeds further in the document meets these minimum criteria.

Haugen stated that the two comments he provided to that is that they didn’t identify fiscal constraint as one of the first criteria, and his comment was that in our Long Range Transportation Plan fiscal constraint is a real barrier to us to doing a lot of projects that otherwise we would want to have done over the life of the plan, so he felt that fiscal constraint should somehow be one of the original screening alternatives. He said that he hasn’t received a response to that comment.

Haugen reported that the other comment he provided was that they should also make sure that one of their criteria is that whether their alternative identifying fits in with any of the adopted plans that happened post-flood; obviously there is the flood protection system in place, there are downtown plans, redevelopment plans in place, plus our Transportation Plan, so he suggested that as one of the screening criteria is that they determine whether the alternative is consistent with the local planning documents.

Haugen commented that he would expect that the Purpose and Needs Statement will be out soon, and that the Methods Document will be released, and then the next step will be to identify all the different alternatives to potentially address purpose and need.

Information only.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF 2013 SELF-CERTIFICATION**

Haugen reported that we are about to approve our 2014-2017 T.I.P., and, annually, before we do that Federal Highway has asked us to include this as an agenda item because when we adopt the T.I.P. we are saying that for the last year we have met all of our planning requirements.

Haugen stated that, obviously, the major planning requirement is to have a current Long Range Transportation Plan. He explained that last December we adopted our most recent 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan, so it fairly easy for us to self-certify that we are current with our planning obligations. He referred to the document, and explained that it also gets into our Related Title VI, ADA, EJ, and other requirements that we have to meet, and the regulations that come with federal funds.

Haugen said that we have presented this Self-Certification to the Technical Advisory Committee, and they, along with MPO Staff, recommend that this board approve the 2013 Self-Certification for the MPO.

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE 2013 SELF-CERTIFICATION.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE FINAL 2014-2017 T.I.P.**

Haugen reported that this is a document we would normally be approving in August, but because of our Long Range Transportation Plan status, our T.I.P. was frozen until the end of January, so this is the first opportunity we have had to adopt a new T.I.P. document.

Haugen commented that because both States have already adopted their Statewide Transportation Improvement Programs (S.T.I.P.), our projects were reserved in those documents, so the monies have been set aside for all of our projects, and now that we are going to adopt this document, both States will have to go back and amend their documents to bring in the specific projects, their descriptions, and the dollar amounts.

Haugen stated that, if you will recall, in September of 2013, although our T.I.P. was frozen, the federal agencies allowed us to make an amendment to our T.I.P. to bring in 2014 projects for the State DOTs and the Transit Operators, so for them the adoption of this T.I.P. is not too critical because their 2014 projects are already in the cue and going forward. He said, however, that for the Cities of Grand Forks and East Grand Forks it is very important that the MPO adopt this document because their 2014 projects were not part of that amendment so their projects for both communities that are about to go to bid, and if we don't take action today, those projects will be delayed.

Haugen said that for the most part this document, because the two S.T.I.P.s are already out and approved, all the projects have been reserved, and are fairly secured, so it is known that these will be the projects that we will be approving with this 2014-2017 T.I.P. document.

Haugen reported that a public hearing was held at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting last Wednesday, there was no one present for discussion, nor were there any written comments received, thus the Technical Advisory Committee and MPO Staff recommend the Executive Policy Board approve the 2014-2017 T.I.P. and submit it our State Agencies.

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE 2014-2017 T.I.P., AS SUBMITTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF DRAFT RFP FOR PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT UPDATE**

Kouba reported that this is a kind of continuation of our Pavement Management Update. She explained that, as you will recall, last spring/fall we ran Right-of-Way Imagery so that we could do this particular analysis of our pavement management, for our pavement management system.

Kouba stated that we have provided the draft to our State and Federal Highway agencies, and they have submitted comments, which have been included in this Draft RFP. She said that the draft was also presented to the Technical Advisory Committee, and no additional comments or changes were received, thus MPO Staff is requesting approval of this Draft RFP.

Leigh asked how this differ from the Pavement Management System East Grand Forks already has. Kouba responded that it is just an update to that system. Leigh commented, however, that at their last City Council meeting, Mr. Boppre was asked by the Mayor if he could come up with streets that need repair, and he responded that we do have a pavement management system that they are in the process of updating, so how does that differ from this. Kouba responded that what Mr. Boppre was talking about is that we are in the process of doing an update, and we are now getting the numbers that allow for a more quantitative analysis of how the streets are, it won't override any decisions that the City Council makes, but it does give the council a better idea of what is really needed rather than what might be perceived is needed.

Haugen added that when Mr. Boppre is referring to the update, this is the update he is talking about. He stated that we first had to do the digital imagery, and now we are doing a condition analysis, so this is the update he referred to. Leigh said that Mr. Boppre is the City of East Grand Forks Consulting Engineer, but he didn't see any of the East Grand Forks streets on this proposal, so how would you be updating East Grand Forks' plan, he did not see any East Grand Forks intersections in that proposal. Kouba responded that there wouldn't be any specific intersections because it is the whole city. Haugen suggested that Mr. Leigh might be looking at a different document, that he might be confusing this RFP with the scope of work for the Traffic Counting Via Video.

Kouba commented that in summary, the Right-Of-Way Imagery we did took photographs of every street in both communities, so every street in both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks will be analyzed with this update.

***MOVED BY GRANDSTRAND, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT RFP FOR THE PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT UPDATE, AS SUBMITTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF DRAFT SCOPE-OF-WORK FOR TRAFFIC COUNTING VIA VIDEO**

Haugen reported that this is the counting program utilizing the video detection cameras at the signalized intersections, and because East Grand Forks does not use video detection for its traffic

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

signals, we can't use this study to do that for East Grand Forks.

Haugen commented that, if you will recall, Grand Forks has installed its Signal Coordination Timing Plans, we originally did this in 2008/2009, updated them in 2012, and in order to keep the timing plans relevant we have to go in and count traffic at signaled intersections. He explained that this used to be done manually, but because of the video detection cameras that are in place, which are capable of detecting and counting traffic at the same time, we can use them to do this. He added that, although their primary job is still for detection of the phasing of the signals, this will be a secondary thing that doesn't interfere at all with their primary purpose, so we asked ATAC do a pilot project on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue/So. Washington intersection to make sure that the cameras can indeed capture the appropriate movements that take place at the signalized intersections, and it proved that it can be done so this is the follow-up study and Scope-Of-Work to engage ATAC to go into all the cameras in Grand Forks, create a box, and essentially tell the cameras that when they see movement in these boxes count those as vehicles, and store that information and dump it into a server that will then dump it into a second server and allow ATAC to take the data and analyze it to help us create what our actual traffic trends are.

Haugen stated that, as part of their study, ATAC will also do a manual count to compare to what the videos show to ensure that we have a reasonable accuracy taking place, but eventually we will end up not having to have manual counts taking place, and we will also have a continuous count that allows us to develop timing plans based on seasons, when UND is in session and when it is not, and also different times of day, and week day versus weekend, so we will be able to do this in a more efficient and more continuous manner than we have in the past.

Grandstrand asked if this will help with the modeling, as the modeling traditionally isn't very accurate. Haugen responded that it will. He explained that part of what you will see in the Scope-Of-Work; whenever North Dakota comes, usually every three years, and Minnesota every five years to do their 48-hour tube counts, those counts are then factored for the method they are taken, for the days of the week they are taken, for the truck component, etc.; but our factoring in Grand Forks/East Grand Forks is at the mercy of the statewide factors, so this counting program will allow us to create our own factoring capabilities, so when they come and do these 48-hour tube counts we can tell them for our area these are the factors that you need to apply to those counts.

Grandstrand asked if this means we can control the factors in the model, which we know is why the modeling was off so much. Haugen responded that we can. He added that this has many benefits, the primary benefit being that our timing plans can be adjusted, maintained and updated in a more current cycle than our current three or more years; and the second is that we will have the ability to make conditions truly local rather than being at the mercy of the statewide data.

Adams asked if we have the \$19,000 programmed for this study. Haugen responded that we do, it is in our work program. He said that there was a concern with the amount of data that was going to be produced from this, and they met with the Grand Forks City IT Department, and when they found out what the actual data amount would be they were no longer concerned, so it should be ready to go with the board's action today.

***MOVED BY GRANDSTRAND, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO APPROVE THE SCOPE-OF-WORK FOR PHASE II OF THE TRAFFIC COUNTY STUDY, AS SUBMITTED.***

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

*Voting Nay: None.*

**MATTER OF DRAFT SCOPE-OF-WORK FOR ITS REGIONAL ARCHITECTURE UPDATE**

Haugen reported that this is a required element that we are supposed to maintain. He stated that it is secondary to our Long Range Transportation Plan, but it is an important component of the Long Range Transportation Plan. He explained that the ITS (Intelligent Transportation Systems) has an architecture so that when we install things its interoperable with the state-wide system that North Dakota puts in on the Grand Forks side. He stated that eventually we want to get to the point where here in Grand Forks/East Grand Forks our architecture is interoperable between the two State lines. He said that the intent of this architecture is to get us to that point, and it is something that we need to update every five years. He added that it was originally done in 2002, and our last update was in 2008, so now in 2014 we have identified in our work program that this update would be an activity we would do.

Haugen commented that ATAC has been the firm that we have gone to in North Dakota from the inception of Regional Architecture, including all the updates. He stated that they do this for both the State DOT and the other MPOs. He said that both MPO Staff and the Technical Advisory Committee recommended approval of the Draft Scope-Of-Work for the ITS Regional Architecture Update, and contract with ATAC.

Malm asked what is actually being done with this study. Haugen responded that, again, the architecture creates the ability for us to actually have traffic signals that all have video detection so that we can do the counting program we just approved. He said that all of our technical infrastructure is interoperable and able to communicate with one another and work together as a system. He added that an example that we are working towards; the intent of having a regional architecture, particularly when you have an MPO that crosses State lines, is so that when most states install their architecture, install their equipment, it is interoperable.

Haugen commented that one of the very first test cases they had was on the Minnesota side's pre-emption technology. He explained that MnDOT wanted to install pre-emption technology, and of course we have an optical system on the North Dakota side, so our architecture spelled out that we should have an optical pre-emption system on the Minnesota side as well since we have all these cross agreements for emergency services; however, Minnesota, because they get it on a statewide system did an audio pre-emption system, so ultimately how this should work is that when that happens next the State will be looking at our Regional Architecture and will see that they should be installing an optical pre-emption system here in Grand Forks/East Grand Forks.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Christensen asked, just out of curiosity, what are you going to do in the next “x” number of years to bring East Grand Forks into the picture with these video cameras. He said that it seems to him that East Grand Forks is getting the short end of the stick here. He commented that he supposes they could go talk to Colin Peterson about this, but in any event he would be for getting them this equipment as well. Haugen responded that they are working with MnDOT District Office out of Bemidji on this. Christensen asked what they are getting back for this. Haugen responded that they are trying to get Minnesota to program dollars so that they will upgrade the signals in East Grand Forks to the system. Christensen suggested that it might be a good idea to approve a resolution on behalf of this organization that we get this programmed for East Grand Forks, because he would like to have this done so that we can move forward to try to get the funding for it.

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY CHRISTENSEN, TO APPROVE THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD ADOPT A RESOLUTION THAT FUNDING BE PROGRAMMED TO UPGRADE THE CITY OF EAST GRAND FORKS TO AN OPTICAL PRE-EMPTION SIGNAL SYSTEM.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE SCOPE-OF-WORK FOR AN UPDATE TO OUR INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM (ITS) REGIONAL ARCHITECTURE, AND TO CONTRACT WITH ATAC.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF SPRING FLOOD OUTLOOK**

Haugen commented that the important part of the Flood Forecast and Bridge Closure Traffic Management Plan is to ensure that the contact information on the last page is current. He stated that this was distributed at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting last Wednesday, and no changes were made.

Haugen reported that this is a yearly agenda item. He explained that we agreed that we would include it on our agenda prior to each spring so that our Bridge Closure Management Plan remains current and up-to-date.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

- a. Minnesota Side

Haugen reported that the basics of the Proposed Revenue Increase For Transportation is to tax at the wholesale level, he believes a 5% gas tax on the wholesale level, so before it gets to the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

retailer the tax is collected and the revenue is raised, and then also part of it is a transit sales tax in the Twin Cities area. He said that this was introduced today, and it seems to have a lot of support.

Haugen commented that, if you recall, last year when we were discussing Minnesota's Statewide Highway Investment Plan (MnSHIP), we talked about there being a gap of thirty billion dollars, the revenue of this will raise upwards of ten billion dollars, so there will still be a significant gap, but it is Minnesota's effort to get more revenue into the Transportation System. He added that some of the monies will come back to the District and Cities.

Haugen stated that there are also some programs that they will be bonding for, if you will recall, we talked about Corridors of Commerce last year, and also about Transportation Economic Development, those are part of this proposal to be continued and there will be an opportunity for our East Side agencies to compete statewide for some of these additional dollars that the state is providing outside of the normal funding stream.

b. North Dakota Side

Haugen reported that there is an Interim Legislative Committee, Economic Impact Committee, that will be meeting in Grand Forks at the Alerus Center on April 1<sup>st</sup>. He said that he has been asked to present, as part of a total package, the transportation information and needs for the Grand Forks area to them.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY GRANDSTRAND, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO ADJOURN THE MARCH 19<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:36 P.M.***

***Voting Aye: Powers, Strandell, Christensen, Malm, Adams, Leigh, Vetter, 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, April 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Steve Adams, Chairman, called the April 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014 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: Steve Adams, Mike Powers, Gary Malm, Warren Strandell, Clarence Vetter, Doug Christensen, and Greg Leigh.

Absent: Tyrone Grandstrand

Staff: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Stephanie Erickson, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Kyle Economy, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

Guest(s): David Kuharenko, GF City Engineering Department.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Adams declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 19<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE MARCH 19<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

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

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that MNDOT is in the process of doing the final edits on the Draft Kennedy Bridge Study Report. He said that Roger Hille, MNDOT, indicated that when that report does come back out, he would like to present it to the Executive Policy Board again, and work with you, again, on the bike/ped accommodation – external versus internal. He stated that, apparently

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, April 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

there is some information in this Draft Report that has not been made available to us previously, so he is asking to be able to discuss that information at your May meeting. Haugen added that if they get the report out on their website in time, you will have a couple of weeks to review that documentation prior to the presentation.

Strandell asked when Mr. Hille is retiring. Haugen responded that he isn't sure of the exact date. Strandell said that it is his understanding that it will be sometime this summer, so we will end up with a new engineer on this project. Haugen agreed, adding that it might be a few months before they get that in place.

Christensen reported present.

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that, if you noticed, last week there were crews working on the Sorlie Bridge. He explained that they were doing one more inspection of the bridge just to make sure that as they move forward with the EIS that they have the latest and greatest condition of the bridge documented. He stated that other than this there isn't much to report on the Sorlie Bridge at this time.

Haugen commented that the Purpose and Needs Statement has still not yet been released to the public, and there haven't been any meetings held since the last time an update was presented to this board. He added that there will be some T.I.P. items when we get to the Draft 2015-2018 T.I.P. agenda item to discuss, but that is all at this time.

Leigh asked, on the Kennedy Bridge, are they going to try to convince us not to do the cantilevered bike/ped facility, is that what the word on the street is. Haugen responded that he has no basis to answer this other than to guess that that is what they are going to do.

Strandell commented that he sees that there is a website listed for the Sorlie Bridge project, is there one available for the Kennedy as well. Haugen responded that there is, and he will e-mail that to everyone. He said, however, that it only has the public notices for the two meetings that have been held, but no other information had been placed on the site the last time he checked it.

Information only.

**MATTER OF DRAFT MINNESOTA SIDE 2015-2018 T.I.P.**

Haugen reported that they did advertise that today was the day for the public hearing on the Draft Minnesota Side 2015-2018 T.I.P.

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY CHRISTENSEN, TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING.***

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

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, April 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

There was no one present for discussion.

Adams closed the public hearing.

Haugen commented that they also advertised that written comments be submitted by noon yesterday, and no such comments were received.

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that a full draft T.I.P. document was included, however he would like to focus on a couple of items.

Haugen stated that we are approving just the Minnesota side at this time. He explained that the NDDOT was not yet prepared to release their Draft T.I.P. at this time.

Haugen referred to the project tables, and stated that, for the most part as you learn through the Long Range Transportation Plan, that Minnesota, and MNDOT in particular, has no dollars set aside for investment in and around the Grand Forks/East Grand Forks MPO area, and our document shows that so for 2015 we show only the transit projects being programmed. He said in 2016 he would like to point out that on the Kennedy Bridge Project Minnesota has changed their funding sources for their half of the structure. He added that in our current T.I.P. document, and in MNDOT's current S.T.I.P. document it shows federal participation, but now it is showing that they have changed their funding source to their Chapter 152 Bridge Bonding Bill, so on their side of the river there will be no federal participation.

Malm asked how this change would affect local funding. Haugen responded that it really doesn't. He explained that it allows for them to relax a bit, from their perspective, on some of federal requirements, but the State of Minnesota Legislature probably gives them as much or more requirements than the feds would anyway, and the North Dakota side still has federal funds so as a total project it is still governed by federal and state law.

Haugen referred to Page 18, and said that, as you will recall we approved a Transportation Alternative Program application a few months ago, the Northwest ATP has awarded the requested \$28,000 to do some safe route to school education in East Grand Forks.

Haugen reported that in 2017 we once again have our standard transit projects shown, but at our TAC meeting last Wednesday, MNDOT pointed out that in the remark section for the Sorlie Bridge project it indicates that NDDOT is trying to fund their half of the project cost in 2017 while MNDOT is funding theirs in 2018, and MNDOT is questioning if this should be included in our draft Minnesota side T.I.P. document. Our reply was that because it is our T.I.P. and not their S.T.I.P. that for a project we need to show where the total funding will come from, so MNDOT may not show the NDDOT funding source in their S.T.I.P. document even though, because this is our local document, we will show it as we need to show where 100% of the funding for a project is coming from.

Haugen commented that in 2018 we do show the Minnesota half of the Sorlie Bridge project. He pointed out that they are funding 100% of their half through their Bridge Bonding as well, so from their perspective, again, they have no federal investment on the Sorlie Bridge in this document.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, April 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen explained that 2018 is the last year that Bridge Bonds will be available in Minnesota, so, depending on how projects are bid and eat up the funding, again, this might be subject to change but right now they are showing 100% of their half being funded through the bonding bill.

Haugen stated that the last project is the East Grand Forks every fourth year project that came from you, after it went through the City Council, and that is converting 10<sup>th</sup> Street, just east of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.E., from gravel to an urban concrete section.

Haugen commented that because of the bridge projects there is a very significant dollar amount involved here, which is atypical for the Minnesota side, but we have over \$15,000,000 being invested over a four year period when typically we would have probably a tenth of that over a four year period.

Haugen said that both the Technical Advisory Committee and staff are recommending approval of the Draft Minnesota Side 2015-2018 T.I.P.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO APPROVE THE 2015-2018 T.I.P., AS SUBMITTED.***

Malm said that, we keep referring all the time to the Bridge Bonding Bill, but it sounded like it would run out of money so will there be money available in the bonding bill, it is actually written into the bonding bill. Haugen responded that the legislature, several sessions ago, issued \$10 billion in bonds for State bridges in response to the I-35 W collapse, and it was to last until 2018. He said that as they are managing that \$10 billion dollars, 2018 was the last year monies would be available, and they have been getting some good project bids lately, which is why the Kennedy Bridge was converted from federal funds to the bonding bill. He said that one thing they have said about 2018 is that, unless they continue to have really good bid prices, this dollar amount you see as their half is fairly constrained for the bridge to come in as a complete reconstruction at a \$29 million dollar cost estimate, so they are really saying that they only have \$14.5 million dollars available for that bridge project, so the EIS process might conclude that a replacement is necessary, but if Minnesota doesn't have the funds to do it it won't be replaced as soon as 2018.

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF DRAFT RFP FOR U.S.#2 ACCESS MANAGEMENT PLAN**

Haugen reported that this is in the MPO's Annual Work Program to be completed in 2014. He explained that this is a request from the NDDOT-Grand Forks District office. He pointed out the location of the study area, and stated that we have been asked to work with the land owners and the different jurisdictions; the county, township, City and the District to develop an Access Management Plan for this corridor.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, April 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen said that as development is beginning to occur along this corridor, there are currently up to three different access spacing regulations in play, so the end result of this study is to try to come up with a uniform spacing along this section of Highway #2.

Haugen reported that the RFP has gone through the different agencies for review and comment. He said that last week the Technical Advisory Committee, along with MPO staff, recommend approval of the RFP so that we can get it out and consultants hired by the end of May to get the study completed by the end of this year.

Christensen asked, out of curiosity, what are we doing out there by the Airport. Haugen responded that the intersection at the Airport entrance is one the NDDOT wanted us to include in this study because it is a signalized intersection that has some crash history. Christensen asked if there were a lot of crashes at that location. Haugen responded there were several. Leigh added that that is the location of the crash between a semi and a van in which two children were killed. Malm iterated that there are quite a few out there. Christensen responded that he doesn't care about the crashes, he is trying to figure out what we are doing out there, we are a little bit out of our lane here, so what is going on. Haugen responded that we are looking at this stretch of U.S. Highway #2, and identifying existing access points, and determining whether or not they should remain as is or if they should be modified, and as development gets spread, typically east to west, identifying what access points NDDOT wants on their U.S. Highway #2. Malm asked if they have the final say in this. Haugen responded that they do.

Christensen asked if this area is within the City's two-mile jurisdiction. Haugen referred to a map of the area and pointed out where the City's two-mile jurisdiction ends, but added that it is within the MPO study area, which is why we are going out to the full extent of that area.

Christensen asked how much has been budgeted for this study. Haugen responded that it is in the 2014 budget, with a budget not to exceed \$55,000.

Christensen asked, out of curiosity, what is there to study, you know where your section lines are. Haugen responded that it is the access points between the section lines, and, again there are three different jurisdictions involved, and the City, NDDOT and the County all have different spacing guidelines so we are trying to come up with a cohesive spacing agreement that, as existing development expands, should their access be modified, should they remain open, and as new business comes in there would be an agreed to identification of what accesses will be allowed on U.S. Highway #2 along this stretch. Leigh asked if they will make a determination of at what point they need a service road. Haugen responded they would. He added that there is a frontage road that exists for a portion.

Haugen referred to a photo showing where Wal-Mart is located, and pointed out that the Wivoda Carpet building itself is an impediment to the north as a normal access point, and that at the half-mile line we have full access, and it is fairly open with not much inflection, so what they are trying to identify is how to create a uniform access plan.

Christensen asked, out of curiosity, and this is a rhetorical question, he can drive out there in his vehicle and take a picture of everything, so why do you think you're going to change the access

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, April 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

of Wivoda Carpet, as you just told us, what do I do, he means does he say, rather than study how do I solve the problem, how do I fix the problem. Haugen asked, if this is a rhetorical question, do you want me to answer the question. Christensen responded that, of course he does, he means, you have \$55,000 to do the obvious, which is drive up and down, and you see how you get on or off the stupid highway, and you're going to get a hundred pictures, and you're going to have it go on the shelf, and he is just curious, what is the purpose of all the study, if you do this then do we get federal funds, can we get the money, do you have to have the study first to get the money, apparently. Haugen responded that that would be correct, you basically need to do the planning first. Christensen said that if he were doing this deal he would be saying, okay, there is no further expansion at the corner for the carpet business, and no one does anything because after that we are going to take it, we will take it as a governmental entity so we will have a decent investment in Highway #2, so we don't need a study, we need a conclusion.

Malm commented that there is a very simple solution, you build two frontage roads. Christensen agreed, adding that we don't need the study, we can just take the \$55,000 and put it toward building the road. He said that this is just like the Kennedy Bridge project, you have gone in a complete circle and now there isn't any money for the damn thing.

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE RFP FOR THE U.S. HIGHWAY #2 ACCESS MANAGEMENT STUDY.***

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

***Voting Nay: Christensen.***

**MATTER OF FY2015 NORTH DAKOTA STATE AID PROJECT APPLICATION**

Haugen reported that this is a Cities Area Transit request for North Dakota State Aid funds. He explained that this is an unusual application as in most cases applications have some financial request attached, the NDDOT does not ask for that information. He said that the reason for this is because the NDDOT distributes out State Aid based on a formula that is in the Century Code.

Haugen commented that there is a total of \$10,000,000 available throughout the State of North Dakota, and it is distributed in three different ways, and there is a base amount established for all 33 transit operators in North Dakota, and then it is divided by county population, and then, it is divided by the number of elderly and disabled ridership on the individual services, and the end result is essentially that Cities Area Transit in the Grand Forks County allocation received 99.5% of the funds allocated to Grand Forks County, and that is roughly around \$350,000, so, again, it is a bit unusual that we have an application that does not have any financial information behind it, it just basically details what the operation is, how many rides they have last year, how many vehicles they have and their ages.

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE FY2015 NORTH DAKOTA STATE AID PROJECT, AS SUBMITTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF FY2015 NORTH DAKOTA FTA 5310 PROJECT APPLICATION**

Haugen reported that this is again for Cities Area Transit. He said that it is for the FTA 5310 Program, which is for the elderly and disabled program.

Haugen stated that they do advertise that not just the Cities Area Transit, but all of our Human Service Agencies that provide transportation can apply for these funds, however, as in the past, we only received an application from Cities Area Transit.

Haugen commented that Cities Area Transit is looking for about \$112,000 to be split between two replacement vehicles for their demand response service, and to continue their Mobility Manager position.

Haugen stated that these projects did come through the City Council for our review, and they are a continuation of their existing services, and no other applications were received, so both the Technical Advisory Committee and MPO Staff are recommending approval in the priority order provided to us.

Powers asked for more information on the Mobility Manager position. Haugen responded that it is a position that was created four years ago to manage the ridership on the more costly demand response services, and also to manage the one-click one-call service. He added that in addition to managing the demand response services, the Mobility Manager is also training individuals so that they can ride the fixed route system, so they hold training workshops in different human service agencies operations.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE NORTH DAKOTA TRANSIT FY2015 STATE AID APPLICATION IN THE PRIORITY ORDER SUBMITTED.***

Malm asked, it says only the City applied, who else would have been eligible and did we request from other entities. Haugen responded that we did notify other Human Service organizations of the program including Social Services, NDAC, Options, Community Action Agency, Red River Community Action, Developmental Homes, etc. Malm asked if any of these agencies have ever applied. Haugen responded they have not. He explained that the limiting factor for many of these organizations are the matching funds.

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

**MATTER OF FINAL FREIGHT RAIL ACCESS STUDY**

Haugen reported that this was study was the result of a request from Economic Development Corporation, along with the City of Grand Forks, to assist in identifying what sites along the existing rail tracks could be good candidates for development of spurs.

Haugen commented that there is a four step process in getting to the point where you are providing sites for development, and we are basically fulfilling the first two with this study.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, April 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

He added that at the conclusion of this study someone will be able to put together the marketing to go out and promote those sites, and then work toward getting them developed.

Haugen referred to a power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request), and gave a brief overview of the results of the study. He mentioned that we did identify one site in East Grand Forks that has potential but is very challenged by the general business climate in Minnesota. For Grand Forks, there are two general areas with sites. The differences between the two is that for one, which is on the Amtrak route, an automatic \$1.2M switch is required so the initial site development costs start at this point. The other site along N. 42<sup>nd</sup> St, does not require this so the initial site development costs start at zero. However, the N. 42<sup>nd</sup> St sites will impact existing traffic corridors, i.e. Gateway and University, etc., that while you do not have the site development costs you do have potential higher public investments at the railroad crossings, which are off site and traditionally not part of the site development costs.

Powers asked with all the discussion lately about railroad car shortages, does that impact this at all. He asked why we would consider staging areas and expanding track for businesses when we really can't take care of what we have now. Haugen responded that there is a lot of increased need for freight rail, and BNSF is scrambling to try to satisfy that need. Powers asked if they would have a pretty good impact on this, are they a player. Haugen responded that they were on the committee and participated in this study.

Christensen commented that the reason they did this is because they had so many calls about that fertilizer company, and that company will be needing a bunch of rail, and the other reason they did this is because they had a trucking company that needed rail and they ended up buying someplace else because of whatever rail they could get there, and the powers that be seem to believe that they need this so they can convince people where we have rail access. He said that the issue is going to become, when someone buys that ground, they are going to want rail, and someone is going to pay for it and it will be whether or not whatever council exists at that point in time chooses to sell the bonds to pay for it for 120 jobs, that is what this is all about.

Christensen said that as far as BNSF is concerned, he knows nothing other than he knows where the lines are that leave Grand Forks and get to Williston, as do you, and they aren't going to put any more lines out there for a while, so you will have another study going on the shelf because you have to have serious, serious money to build one of those hundred car train dumps.

Powers commented that he understands all that, but, again, with all the discussion on railroad car shortages, does that impact this. Christensen responded that the answer is no. He explained that what happens is, before anyone can build a fertilizer plant they are going to have to make sure it is part of the deal so they have a way to get the fertilizer put on rail cars and to market. Powers asked if he was referring to the plant north of town. Christensen responded he was.

Christensen stated that there are all kinds of intermodal in this country right now, it's just not here yet. He said that you see a lot of those trains elsewhere.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, April 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen agreed that this doesn't impact the study, but it does impacts whether any site can be developed because they will invest a couple million dollars to ensure that they will have the traffic coming in and out of there.

Information only.

**MATTER OF MPO COMMUTER PROFILE**

Haugen commented that Kyle Economy, Grand Forks/East Grand Forks MPO Intern, will be taking us through this item. However he would first like to explain that as we have been identifying changes in our traffic pattern. While we do have a count program now that is going to be established to help us be more on a month to month, if not day to day or week to week ability to look at our traffic trends instead of every three years or so. Haugen stated that he asked Kyle to see if any of the census data could give us an insight as to what might be causing some of our traffic changes, and he has a presentation that will give us some interesting data.

Economy referred to a power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request), and gave a brief overview.

Haugen reiterated that the reason they asked Kyle to go deeper into this was because the commute by car versus population discrepancy, we grew by 3,500 people yet the commute by car only grew by 50 or so between 2000 and 2012.

Christensen asked how they got their data, how did you get the numbers for that data. Economy responded that he got it off the US Census Bureau website, the US Census Bureau surveys they send out. Christensen asked if this was something they would send out, and he would fill in how he gets to work. Haugen responded that that would be correct. Christensen said that obviously the data doesn't compute because you have all those people in the south end, which is his ward, and there is all kinds of traffic out there.

Christensen asked why we have so much, of all the traffic that goes through downtown Grand Forks into East Grand Forks, where is that traffic coming from, is it coming from the north end of East Grand Forks. He added that he doesn't see anyone using the Point Bridge, there isn't a whole backlog of traffic on the Point Bridge. Haugen responded that most of the traffic crossing the Sorlie Bridge, about half of it is destined to and coming from East Grand Forks' downtown, not past 4<sup>th</sup> Street. Christensen asked what they are doing there, are they going to the used clothing shop, or what is going on down there that gets them over there. Haugen responded that the restaurants, theater and Cabela's are the three big draws. He added that the traffic is coming from Grand Forks and is stopping at those establishments.

Leigh commented that there are a lot of people who live in East Grand Forks but work in Grand Forks, and there are people that come from Thief River, Warren, Alvarado, that come into to town to work. Christensen stated that he isn't trying to knock East Grand Forks, but he is wondering why they are going that way because if they are going to go to the strip mall it is easy to drop down Columbia Road. Vetter responded that it is because they are usually stopping by Cabela's first and then crossing into Grand Forks.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, April 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Christensen referred to the map, and pointed out that you have all that green down there, so those people are going someplace, they are going to Cabela's or the movie theater or whatever, and they are working in Grand Forks, but those people aren't taking bikes, and there is no bus traffic to speak of out there, so obviously you have a big disconnect as to how those 3,500 people are moving around. Haugen agreed, and said that Kyle is looking at each of those census tracts individually to see how those shifts are being done, and that is how we found out that right here is where we have the largest drop, geographically, of that 3,500. He said that 900 less people here are saying they are commuting by car although there are more people here than there were in 2000, and more of them are the employment age, so it is just a matter of determining that this age group, that is predominantly collage age, don't use a car as much as compared to the rest of our community.

Christensen said, however, that if you ask Kyle how he and his buddies get around, it's by car, so that is the conclusion, but whatever, it defies the obvious. He stated that if your data is taking the 2000 census and you're looking at something that is 2005, you have no way of asking the question in 2005 that you are relying on in 2000. He added that the answers that were given in 2000 on the data that he is using don't have that much significance in 2005, and he isn't a statistician, he doesn't do what he does, but it is obvious that something else is going on. To go to that conclusion, that the college kids are taking buses, it is pretty easy, you have bus traffic out there, count the college kids and see how many get on and off the bus.

Haugen commented, again, the 2012 data is saying there is less people using the bus to get to work here, less people using cars to get to work than there were in 2000, but there are more people there. He added that because it is a college area there is less discretionary funds, things are costlier, so there is less discretionary funds available.

Adams asked, then, if they are going to do further analysis of this and report back. Haugen responded that they will.

Christensen commented that it has a lot of impact on car travel because there are a lot of people on their side, with the guy you have there is going to just say we need more biking on the north end of Grand Forks; and, again it's not hard to just have cameras set up and see how many people actually travel. He said you can do it at your crossroads, where your stop lights are. Haugen agreed.

Information only.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

a. Office Space Changes

Haugen reported that he just wants to inform the Executive Policy Board of the office change. He explained that our lease agreement with Grand Forks City Hall is going to be modified. He stated that they asked us to - they are merging their Planning Department with their Urban Development Department and they want to bring the Urban Development staff, who are currently off-site, into Grand Forks City Hall - so they have asked us to release some of our space in Grand Forks City Hall so that they can have their Urban people come in. He said that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, April 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

we also lease space here in East Grand Forks so by July 1<sup>st</sup> most of the MPO staff will be working out of East Grand Forks, but we will maintain one working station over in Grand Forks City Hall.

Haugen commented that he has been told that this is about a two-year time period of transition in the Grand Forks City Hall as they will be going through a study of how it can be reconfigured for better use of space, so in two years, if that is accomplished, they are saying that they will have space available for us again, but currently in order to make this merger happen sooner they have asked us, and we have the space, so we agreed temporarily to have most of the MPO staff here in East Grand Forks beginning July 1<sup>st</sup>. He stated that our phone numbers will roll over to East Grand Forks, and our PO Box in Grand Forks and all that other stuff will remain the same.

Information only.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO ADJOURN THE APRIL 16<sup>TH</sup>, 2014,  
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:05 P.M.***

***Voting Aye: Powers, Strandell, Malm, Adams, Leigh, Vetter, 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 21<sup>st</sup>, 2014 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Steve Adams, Chairman, called the May 21<sup>st</sup>, 2014 meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:04 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

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

Absent: Tyrone Grandstrand

Staff: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Stephanie Erickson, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Kyle Economy, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

Guest(s): Junelle Mulroy, Brady Martz; Jane Williams, GF City Engineering Department; Mike Yavarow, GF City Engineering Department; Roger Hille, MNDOT Bridge Division; and David Kuharenko, GF City Engineering Department.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Adams declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 16<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE APRIL 16<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2013 MPO AUDIT**

Haugen introduced Janelle Mulroy, Brady Martz, who was present for a brief overview of the 2013 MPO Audit findings.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 21<sup>st</sup>, 2014**

Mulroy referred to the 2013 MPO Audit report, included in the packets, and stated that, as in the past, she will just highlight some things from the report.

Mulroy commented that Page 2 of the report actually details out their opinion, and pointed out that there is a paragraph there titled “Opinion”, where it states that they gave an unqualified, or clean opinion based on the audit.

Mulroy pointed out that there is also some required supplementary information in the financial statements, that being the Management Discussion and Analysis and the Budgetary Comparison information, that she will go through as well. She explained that while they really don’t audit this, and they aren’t giving an opinion on it, it is information that is required by the standards be in the financial statements, so it is there for your information.

Mulroy reported that there is some additional information included that is made up of the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards, and they do audit that and give an opinion, so she will also discuss that as well.

Christensen reported present.

Overview of the narrative and financial statements in the document ensued.

Mulroy referred to Page 10, Statement of Governmental Fund Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance Statement of Activities for the Year Ended December 31, 2013, and explained that 77% of the total \$673,452.00 in revenues were made up of federal funds that were received and spent, and those federal funds were in excess of the \$500,000 threshold, which meant we had to do a single audit over the federal program this year.

Mulroy summarized by saying that Page 23 is where they actually give their opinion over their federal program audit, and it was a clean, or unmodified opinion, so they did not have any findings or compliance issues with regard to the audit of the federal program.

Mulroy pointed out that on Page 26, at the bottom of the page, one of the items is “Auditee qualified as low-risk auditee? She explained that the reason it is marked no is because the MPO did not have a single audit over the federal programs the previous year and you have to have two consecutive clean audits over the federal programs to be able to mark that yes, so it is not the result of any findings or anything other than the fact that there was not a single audit the previous year.

Mulroy referred to Page 27, and commented that it discusses the one significant deficiency found, similar to what has been discussed in the past in that it highlights the fact that Brady Martz helped draft the financial statements and they propose audit adjustments, so as a result of that there are auditing standards that require them to disclose it as a significant deficiency. She said at the very bottom of Page 27 it also does state that there were no findings with regard to the federal programs, so there is nothing to disclose there.

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO APPROVE THE 2013 MPO AUDIT REPORT, AS SUBMITTED.***

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

*Voting Nay: None.*

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

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that Roger Hille, MNDOT, is present today to give a brief update on the Draft Kennedy Bridge Report. He added that, as many of you are aware, over the last couple of weeks both City Councils have had briefings on the status of the Kennedy Bridge.

Haugen stated that he included a couple things in the packet; three things he points out in the staff report are: 1) NDDOT developed what is labeled as a preferred alternative from their side, and it includes a bike/ped accommodation inside the truss. He stated that the difference from many of the previous ones you have seen is that they do include more of a barrier between the bike/peds from the vehicles, which seems to be a significant safety improvement than was shown in the previous concepts of putting a bike/ped facility inside the truss.

Leigh asked if they are planning on getting rid of the median that goes down the middle of the bridge, the one that protects vehicles from crossing over. Haugen responded that this drawing doesn't show that, but it isn't the final design. He added, however, that you have informed Mr. Hille at several meetings that it is important to keep that median, and he has made a commitment to keep it. Hille added that he won't say that it will stay or go at this time, but right now it appears that they will be able to keep it, and they have identified that as a request of the council and they will do everything they can to keep it. He stated that how this thing will look at the end has a lot to do with redesigning the approach spans, and it is seeming a little more each day that they can do that, they can make some adjustments in that longitudinal joint, so it looks like they can have a curb of some sort down the middle of the bridge. He said that he will keep both councils informed as they go through this project.

Hille pointed out that the barrier between the pedestrians and the traffic takes some space, the curb down the middle takes some space, and we have limited space to work with, so you may have to determine which one is the higher priority. Leigh stated that if it were up to him; the way he feels about this is that we have had that bridge there since 1963, and it hasn't been a successful pedestrian bridge, and while that is important, he thinks it is more important, because he has witnessed numerous accidents on the East Grand Forks side when vehicles come up the on ramp and hit the bridge and spin around and the only thing that stops them from hitting another vehicle and hurting or killing someone is that barrier in the middle, so he would really hate to see it removed. Hille said, again, that he hopes everyone realizes how important these comments are, and they will be looking at this very hard, but if they think it can't be done they will be back in this room and will explain why they think it can't, but as of now they are going to do everything they can to keep it.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 21<sup>st</sup>, 2014**

Christensen asked where the barrier is, he said he is looking at Page 5, and he is wondering where the barrier is in regard to the existing bridge. Haugen referred to a slide illustrating both drawings and explained where the preferred barrier is in relation to the existing structure.

Discussion on Mr. Leigh's comment on the accidents he has witnessed, and why the middle barrier should be kept, ensued.

Hille said, again, that what they have laid out is absolutely everything they know, and they have looked at six different alternatives, and they cannot select an alternative without knowing more about what they can do with that center longitudinal joint. He stated that consideration as to whether or not it is possible to put the center median in there is something they will look at it pretty hard. He added that there are considerations, and this organization understands, there is a difference between a curb and a barrier, and often times in high traffic areas they stay away from curbs into barriers because they call them launch-able objects, in other words if one hits it going fast enough it will launch a vehicle. He said that he doesn't think it is an issue here because of the lower speed limit, however, but it is something to consider.

Hille stated that he is a simple designer, and he will work through the design, but they have traffic folks, and federal highway standards, and those sorts of things that they have to consider, and they can't afford to bring those people in until they get past the initial stage of the study, but they feel that they are on the right path and have gotten concurrence from the Grand Forks council that they are on that path with rehabbing this structure, and being able to somehow fit the traffic inside the truss to keep the project on schedule.

Powers referred to Page 9, and asked about the 10-foot lane to the right, if it is a shared bike/ped path. Hille responded that that concept is that that area would be a shared use path, and does not include a bikepath on the opposite side of the structure. Powers asked if they would ever consider a narrower path, take two feet off the path and put it in the middle, and thus keep Mr. Leigh and himself happy. Hille responded that they are convinced that there will be what they call a design exception, in other words this alternative is kind of the minimum standard, but there will have to be a design exception here and they expect it will be in that 10-feet.

Leigh asked what the width of the sidewalk is on the Sorlie Bridge. Hille responded it is 6-feet, adding, however, that a lot of people don't comply with the sign that says they need to push their bike across the bridge, so they would like to have the path wide enough to allow for bikers to ride their bikes across yet still maintain 12-foot lanes, and some kind of barrier.

Strandell asked if the speed of the bicycle traffic an issue. Hille responded that he isn't well educated on bikeways, but he knows there are standards they need to meet, and he knows that when it is at a certain width then they ask the bicyclists to push their bikes across.

Hille commented that the great thing about this discussion is that your concerns are the same as theirs, and they aren't going to take something and shove it down your throat and say this is what you're going to get, they go into planning and design and they are going to look at their design

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 21<sup>st</sup>, 2014**

with safety tiers along with their design standards, and in this case, one of the biggest challenges is the historic nature of this structure, and if a center median like this detracts from the historic fabric, or does not meet the Secretary of Interior's standards, that will be a challenge. He added that the nature, and he is getting into more detail than he intended, but the nature of historic review on a structure like this does not ask the question; is this okay, is it not okay, it's more about combining all those issues and give and take kind of collaborative process instead of what kind of rail can we use, can we or can't we have a divider here, and so-forth. He said it has a whole lot to do with how the structure looks, not only to the traveling public, but to the community to the north and south.

Hille reported that, again, on a project of this magnitude you just can't afford to bring all those folks up in this early stage of the process. He stated that this study was to determine whether there is enough structural value in the truss to save it, and both MnDOT and NDDOT are thinking that from a cost/benefit ratio there is.

Powers asked, then, if they have completely abandoned the idea of a suspended walkway for pedestrians and bicyclists. Hille responded that he would pretty much say that is the case. He added that some of the issues are because you have a 500-year floodway, and anything that they do within the floodway would have to have no effect on a 500-year flood, so just figuring out how you would mitigate the results of adding an additional flood structure units on the approaches, he thinks it would be measured in terms of many many months, and maybe years instead of months, and it would be a major issue. He said, too, that there would be the issue of added costs and so forth, so if they can get the traffic safely across, and, again, you aren't talking about a tremendous amount of pedestrian and bike traffic on this structure, he thinks they can safely do it within the truss. He added, however, that if this structure didn't have 680-feet of approach spans he thinks both DOTs, as well as this group, would say it should be hung over the side just like we did on the Sorlie, but those approach spans make it so much more challenging.

Haugen reported that both staff and the Technical Advisory Committee are looking for concurrence on three issues:

- 1) Whether to rehab or replace the structure – they are recommending rehabbing it.
- 2) Whether to do an internal or external bike/ped accommodations – they are recommending an internal solution.
- 3) Whether to place the bike/ped accommodation on the north or south side – they are recommending the north side.

Haugen commented that these are the same three things the Grand Forks City Council passed at their Monday night meeting – concurrence with MnDOT; so that is what we are asking this board to concur with as well.

Leigh stated, then, that what your asking is for us to decide whether or not we concur with the report as we have seen and reviewed it, and the direction they are going with the project. He said that, as much as it would be nice to have an external bikepath, after reading the report it is

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 21<sup>st</sup>, 2014**

evident that it really isn't feasible and adds considerable cost to the project, so he doesn't have a problem with it, but, as he said before he would skip the pedestrian part of the project in order to keep the center median, he just thinks it is that important.

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO APPROVE THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD DOES CONCUR WITH THE FINAL PLANNING STUDY REPORT FOR THE KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECT.***

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

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that there isn't much to report on the Sorlie Bridge project. Hille stated that the Structural Review Team was up, and although he doesn't have the final report, if there had been any substantial problems he would have been notified, so it certainly feels to him like they will most likely be moving toward a rehab instead of a replacement project.

**MATTER OF T.I.P. AMENDMENT FOR CITIES AREA TRANSIT CAPITAL PROJECTS**

Haugen reported that we did receive a request to amend our T.I.P. to bring in some federal transit monies to make some capital purchases for the Grand Forks Cities Area Transit.

Leigh said that he knows this pertains to Grand Forks, but we are getting some federal dollars and are amending the T.I.P., but it will also cost an additional \$69,000 to somebody, who pays that. Haugen responded that it will be paid by the City of Grand Forks, and the State of North Dakota.

Haugen commented that these are all requests that the Grand Forks City Council approved, and we submitted, and the State of North Dakota went through a statewide competitive process to award these three projects to Grand Forks, and the next step in the process is for us to amend it into our T.I.P. to show that they are consistent with our planning documents, which they are.

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE FY2014-2017 T.I.P. AMENDMENTS, AS SUBMITTED.***

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

**MATTER OF DRAFT SCOPE-OF-WORK FOR ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MANUAL UPDATE**

Kouba reported that this is the Environmental Justice Scope-of-Work. She said that back when we were doing our Long Range Transportation Plan, one of the caveats for approval was that we

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 21<sup>st</sup>, 2014**

go back and look at our environmental justice areas, which we are now going back and re-evaluating these areas and this is the scope-of-work for it. She stated that we plan to be finished with this by, the initial work of it, by the end of September; and then we will look through all of our Long Range Transportation projects and, in relation to the new environmental justice areas, and that should be done by the November time-frame. She said that they are looking for approval of this project.

Leigh asked how the minority and low-income concentrations affect a project, can they stop it. Kouba responded that the project will have to be either mitigated or some sort of mitigation will have to be done if minorities or low-income populations are negatively impacted by the project. Leigh asked for an example. Kouba responded that nationwide, in the past, things have happened where whole neighborhoods of low-income populations have been totally decimated and removed because of a freeway project. She stated that we have never had anything of that nature in our area, but federal government standards have looked at seeing this and they are saying we can't continue doing this anymore.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MANUAL UPDATE SCOPE-OF-WORK.***

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

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF CONTRACT FOR PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT  
CONDITION RATING**

Kouba reported that this is a continuation of the update of our pavement management system. She said that they are basically looking at doing the initial, we did the imagery last year, and now we are doing the analysis this time around. She added that they only have one proposal, and they had to go through the process of gaining approval through NDDOT and FHWA, which they have, so now they are just looking for approval of the contract.

Kouba commented that the MPO will only do the classified roadways, and each City has agreed to do their local roadways as well, so we have costs for both cities and the University of North Dakota. She added that everything the MPO is going to be doing is covered under the budget we have set aside.

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE ENTERING INTO A CONTRACT WITH GOODPOINT TECHNOLOGIES TO DO THE PAVEMENT CONDITION ANALYSIS.***

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

**MATTER OF REQUEST FOR NDDOT FUNDING MPO**

Haugen reported that the three MPOs have been working with the NDDOT for the past twelve months. He said that part of that discussion has been seeking for the NDDOT to place a line item in their budget some State funds to help off-set the local match that we currently enjoy. He explained that Director Levi has indicated a willingness to consider that, however he wanted a joint letter adopted by all three MPOs formally requesting the consideration.

Haugen commented that a draft of the letter was included in the packet, and it does identify that, similar to how Fargo/Moorhead COG and the GF/EGF MPO enjoy the State of Minnesota money to help off-set our local cause, we are seeking NDDOT to do the same and have identified a \$100,000 total budget split-up based on our current method of distributing federal funds.

Haugen stated that both staff and the Technical Advisory Committee recommend approval. He added that it was approved by Fargo/Moorhead earlier, and will be addressed by Bismarck/Mandan next week. He said that it is an attempt to get some State dollars to lessen the local match provided by Grand Forks and East Grand Forks similar to the State funds we get from Minnesota.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE A LETTER TO NDDOT REQUESTING FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE MPO.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

**OTHER BUSINESS**

a. Matter Of Draft Freight Plan

Haugen reported that North Dakota has drafted a Freight Plan. He explained that one of the things MAP-21 laid out, but did not fund, was a separate freight program. He said that one of the conditions of MAP-21, in order to be eligible if they ever did fund a freight program, was to have Statewide Freight Plans developed, so North Dakota drafted a plan that identifies a three-tier priority of their highway system, in our area our highways are in the top tier. He said that it also identifies railroad issues and pipeline issues, as well.

Haugen stated that this draft is available for your review. He added that they can do a more in-depth presentation of the plan if anyone is interested.

b. Matter Of MAP-21 Reauthorization

Haugen reported that in the packet was the President's proposal; which is a four-year bill that substantially increased the funding, substantially invested in the freight system, and actually put dollars to the freight program. He stated that the Senate's Public Environment and Public Works

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 21<sup>st</sup>, 2014**

Committee, which is the major committee in the Senate tasked to produce the bill, adopted theirs last week. He said that it is a six-year bill, and is really a continuation of MAP-21 with a few tweaks. He commented that the main tweak would be to actually fund the freight program, but their funding would be in incremental steps with no dollars the first year, and small amounts in succeeding years with the last year putting a couple billion dollars towards freight.

Haugen stated that with both of these programs the dollar amounts are still a struggle because even the Senate's bill, which is continuing MAP-21, is \$18 Billion dollars short each year; and the President's proposal was closer to \$30 Billion dollars short in revenue identification.

Haugen reported that MAP-21 expires at the end of September, and the Highway Trust Fund is expected to basically be broke in early August, and if nothing happens there will really be no federal program available for highway construction in 2015.

c. Matter Of MnDOT Bike Plan Public Meeting

Erickson reported that MnDOT will be visiting us May 29<sup>th</sup> to do a Statewide Bicycle Plan. She explained that they are trying to get input from the public on what they like for bike facilities.

Erickson stated that there will be a structured workshop from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. and an open house from 8:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. on May 29<sup>th</sup> in the East Grand Forks City Hall Training Room.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO ADJOURN THE MAY 21<sup>ST</sup>, 2014,  
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:43 P.M.***

***Voting Aye: Powers, Strandell, Malm, Adams, Leigh, Vetter, 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**

**Monday, June 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2014 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Steve Adams, Chairman, called the June 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2014 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: Steve Adams, Mike Powers, Gary Malm, Warren Strandell, Clarence Vetter, and Doug Christensen.

Absent: Tyrone Grandstrand and Greg Leigh

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

Guest(s): Jane Williams, GF City Engineering Department and David Kuharenko, GF City Engineering Department.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Adams declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MAY 21<sup>ST</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE MAY 21<sup>ST</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Adams, Powers, Malm, Strandell, and Vetter.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF AMENDMENT TO THE 2013-2014 UPWP**

Haugen reported that the two items on today's agenda both focus on the U.S. Highway #2 Access Study. He reminded the board that six months ago they approved the 2014 Work Program, and agreed that we would study U.S. Highway #2 for access and traffic operations. He added that a couple of months ago you also authorized the release of an RFP for the access study, and during the time that the RFP was out for proposals a couple things happened, which is why

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Monday, June 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2014**

we are now asking you to consider amending the work program to increase the scope-of-work for the study.

Haugen commented that the two primary things causing the increase to the scope-of-work are:

- 1) The proposed nitrogen plant in Grand Forks County, which seems to have passed a critical threshold and is in need of some analysis that we need to incorporate, or count for in the U.S. #2 Access Study. He explained that the primary destination or distribution point for the plant will be U.S. Highway #2, and likely either at 69<sup>th</sup> Street or 55<sup>th</sup> Street. He stated that part of what this access study will be investigating is which of the two is the more appropriate location to be the main entry and exit points for the plant. He added that even though the plant is going to be located roughly three miles north of U.S. Highway 2, it is saying that it will rely on U.S. Highway #2 as its main entrance and exit points.

Haugen stated that part of the proposed amendment is to include the traffic that might be generated from the plant. He said that when we did our 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan we did account for some growth out along U.S. Highway #2, however at that time the plant was more conceptual, and was subject to a lot of things needing to be figured out before it could be constructed, but it is now moving forward so we need to account for that traffic in this study.

- 2) Haugen commented that the second part that we are also asking you to consider with this amendment is; when we looked at our 2040 traffic forecasts we found that the Interchange at I-29 and U.S. Highway #2 has capacity issues, and so the NDDOT thought that if we are going to be doing a lot of work in U.S. Highway #2 instead of terminating just on the west side of the interstate as originally planned, we might as well include all of the I-29 interchanges as part of this study, so we felt it was appropriate to add in to the work program to look at the I-29 and U.S. Highway #2 interchange as well.

Haugen added that another small add on that is included in the work program is that the nitrogen plant is also going to access North Washington, or actually Grand Forks County 11 north of the North Washington Interchange, and we were asked to sort of do a spot analysis of that intersection to see if there is any need for improvements.

Powers asked what is on the other side of the interchange. Haugen responded that it is northwest of the interchanges access he is talking about, on the north side. He said that it is about a quarter of a mile north of the North Washington interchange itself. He added that it is going to be a very secondary route to the plant, so we don't anticipate a lot of improvements being necessary.

Haugen reported that the cost of the study will increase up to, but not to exceed \$120,000. He said that both staff and the Technical Advisory Committee recommend approval of this proposed change to the 2014 work program. He added that in order to make this fit our budget, we were going to do a traffic incident management plan this year, but because of delays primarily due to some Federal Highway action that needs to occur first, we are transferring monies from that project to this one.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Monday, June 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2014**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO  
THE 2013-2014 UPWP, AS SUBMITTED, AS SUBMITTED.***

Christensen reported present.

Christensen asked how much this study is going to cost. Haugen responded that we are amending the work program to do these additional studies. He added that the next agenda item will deal with the actual consultant cost.

Vetter asked if there would be any increase to the local match. Haugen responded that there would not be any increase. He reiterated that we are just shifting monies from one project to another, about \$60,000.00.

Malm asked if we are just looking at the interchange out there; what is this study going to do. Haugen responded that from the interchange, and now including the analysis of the interchange ramps, all the way out to the west edge of the airport, or where Grand Forks County 5 goes north of U.S. Highway #2, we are looking at all the access points to try to help determine where future ones should be located, where current ones could be closed or modified so that you don't have full turning movements, to account for the crashes that occur along the corridor, as well as potential development that wants access at points where it might be a little difficult to provide under our normal spacing.

Malm said, then, that his question is do we ever consider, because we are going out there where there isn't anyone yet, do we ever consider a frontage road so we don't have to put all those accesses in. Haugen responded that that would be one of the treatments, although frontage roads have a cost as well. Malm commented that it just seems like we never seem to study frontage roads. Haugen responded that there are several options including frontage roads, backage, <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> access, etc. available.

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF AUTHORIZING CONTRACT WITH KLJ FOR U.S. HIGHWAY #2  
ACCESS MANAGEMENT STUDY**

Haugen reported that, again, we advertised the RFP to look at the U.S. Highway #2 Access Management Study, and received five proposals. He said that the Selection Committee reviewed all five proposals and invited three firms to come for an interview. He stated that as a result of the Selection Committee's work, they are recommending that we hire KLJ to do the study.

Haugen commented that after we selected a consultant we then approached them to tell them about the additional work, and asked them if they would consider changing their scope-of-work to include those activities. He stated that the Selection Committee and the consultant have worked on incorporating those activities into a new scope-of-work, and it has been reviewed and received no comments back.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Monday, June 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2014**

Haugen stated that KLJ is incorporating the interchange, the nitrogen plant, and, to assist with the public engagement of some of these alternatives; we are recommending we include some animation be done. He commented that, if you will recall, when we did our Washington Street Underpass Study, we had some animation done to help the public understand some of the alternative concepts that were being proposed.

Haugen said that in the end the consultant costs are just under \$120,000 to complete the study as we have now scoped it out. He added that, again, we are adding the nitrogen plant at the request of both the City of Grand Forks and the NDDOT; and the interchange at the request of the NDDOT and the Selection Committee.

Haugen stated that, with this new scope-of-work, we are asking that you authorize the chairman to execute a contract with KLJ to do the U.S. Highway 2 Access Study not to exceed \$120,000.

***MOVED BY STRANDELL, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING THE CHAIRMAN EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH KLJ TO DO THE U.S. #2 ACCESS STUDY NOT TO EXCEED \$120,000.00.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

**OTHER BUSINESS**

1. MPO Office Move

Haugen reported that MPO staff has completed their move from the Grand Forks City Hall to the East Grand Forks City Hall, however we did retain one cubicle in the Grand Forks City Hall. He said that Peggy and himself would primarily be located in the East Grand Forks City Hall, and Stephanie and Teri would continue to alternate days at both City Halls.

Haugen stated that we also moved all of our records and equipment, so after the meeting you are more than welcome to come up to see our mess in progress.

Information only.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY CHRISTENSEN, SECONDED BY MALM, TO ADJOURN THE JUNE 23<sup>RD</sup>, 2014, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:15 P.M.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE  
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

**Wednesday, July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Steve Adams, Chairman, called the July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014 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: Steve Adams, Greg Leigh, Mike Powers, Gary Malm, Warren Strandell, Clarence Vetter, and Jeannie Mock.

Absent: Ken Vein

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

Guest(s): Jane Williams, GF City Engineering.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Adams declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 23RD, 2014, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE JUNE 23<sup>RD</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

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

**Sorlie Bridge**

Haugen reported that this is our monthly bridge report. He stated that there is really nothing to report on the Sorlie Bridge, there has been no new information shared other than the discussion you have heard in the past of how things seem to be moving in the rehab direction rather than the complete replacement direction.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that they have made the decision on the Kennedy Bridge project that they are going to do a rehab project and are proceeding with the project development portion of the project.

Haugen referred to the staff report, and pointed out that it states that the cost estimate for this project is \$16,000,000 for the bridge work; \$2,000,000 for work on the approaches, however, because they have not gone into the formal project development and historic preservation mitigation they can't really tell us exactly what the work will be on the approaches, but they are budgeting \$2,000,000 for it. He added that you will also see that they will be replacing Pier 6, and incorporating bike/ped facilities inside the truss, as well as some other modifications.

Haugen stated that they are also using a basic 10% increase for the construction engineering costs as well.

Leigh asked if they are going to leave the median in the road. Haugen responded that they have not made those types of decisions yet. He explained that those types of decisions are part of the project development, and they still have to go through the historic preservation process as well before any decisions such as that are made.

Leigh commented that it seems like even though the East Grand Forks City Council, the Grand Forks City Council, and this board all wanted the bike/ped facility on the outside of the bridge structure, it was a lost effort because we can pass all the resolutions we want, but in the end it seems that they can do whatever they want, so even if we really want that barrier in there, they can just decide on their own not to put it in there, right. Haugen responded that that it is a cooperative process.

Haugen reported that the people who are now more directly working on project development will be your local engineers and a consulting engineer. So you need to keep directing your local engineers to represent your council views as they go through the project development stage, keep the pressure on that way. He added that they will still be getting updates, and the MPO will still be getting opportunities to comment on what is being programmed, at least one more time because we will have to do a 2016 T.I.P., and this cost estimate will be refined after the project development process has been completed, so you will still have the opportunity to agree to program the dollar amount or not to program it, but now it is in the project development stage and it is really in the engineers hands through that process and the historic mitigation process because there are things that the Historic Preservation group may decide is very important to remain that may not allow do things that the rest of the community wants.

Haugen stated that one other thing he would like to add is that since the decision to rehab the bridge has been made there has been some staff discussion between cities and the DOTs in terms of possibly adding some amenities to the bridge such as decorative lighting, signature signage, etc.

Mock reported present.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Adams suspended the agenda to welcome Jeannie Mock, the new Grand Forks City Council representative to the MPO Executive Policy Board. He asked that everyone please introduce themselves and state which entity they are representing.

Haugen reiterated that there has been some discussion taking place about taking the opportunity, while working on the bridge, to do some signature add-ons, or enhancements or amenities to it to make it more of a signature bridge for our community. He said that this is being somewhat led by the engineering staffs of both communities. He added that one thing that Mr. Vein indicated to him this morning, in addition to his not being able to attend today's meeting, was that he did want to stress the importance of working with the Minnesota side in particular in getting that little dip in the road on U.S. #2 raised as part of this project if possible, and if not to do it as a separate project as near as possible to this project.

Leigh asked which dip he was referring to. Haugen responded that it is the one between the bridge over River Road and the actual Kennedy Bridge, the low spot that we have to protect during a flood event over 52 feet.

Haugen stated that the initial response from MnDOT to this request was that it would not be done as part of the Kennedy Bridge project because it is "off-site", if you will. He said that in the past MnDOT did try to get some special State funds to raise that road, so we are asking if those opportunities are available to do it now.

Malm commented that he finds it very interesting that they won't spend money on bike passage over the bridge, but they will spend money on enhancements. He asked who looks at the lights on the bridge, signage on the bridge. Leigh added that the lights they put on the Sorlie don't even work. Malm said that his point is that you would be spending money on something that nobody even asked for in the first place. He asked how we stop them from doing it. Haugen responded that most of those things will be identified as "betterment" projects, which means 100% local costs. He said that how you stop it would be to not agree to fund it locally. Leigh asked, though, why we aren't being consulted in the whole thing in the first place, why are they having these big conversations and then they have to come to us to ask us to fund, we should be asked first if we want to spend any money on these things, and is there any money to spend on them.

Powers stated that, again, we have been telling them what we want for a year now, and they don't seem to listen to our recommendations. Leigh agreed, and added that it would make more sense to fix the dip in the road before spending money on enhancements so we don't have to build a dike all the time. Malm said that, to be honest, sometimes he wonders why we sit here, we told them what we think is right.

Haugen said that, now that you have heard that your staff, your consulting staff, are having conversations it is time to communicate with them that you feel strongly that you want the dip fixed instead of spending a lot of time talking about amenities. Adams asked if the consulting staff would be coming before this body soon, can we ask them to come to a meeting. Haugen responded that there is a standing offer for MnDOT and NDDOT to come here and talk about these two bridge projects. Adams suggested that we should invite them back.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

***MOVED BY MALM TO INVITE THE ENGINEERS TO OUR NEXT MEETING.***

Vetter asked if Mr. Malm was talking about the engineers or the DOTs. Malm responded that he is talking about anybody that can override us. Leigh stated that he would like to talk to whoever is in charge of coming up with all these extra ideas, because if they are going to come to us and ask us to fund these things, he would like to have them come and get our input. Malm asked who it is that we should talk to about this. Haugen responded that it is your engineering staff, primarily, on both sides of the river, your local engineering staff. Malm asked if they talk to each other. Adams responded that at some point they do. Leigh asked who the engineers are on this project. Haugen responded that on the Kennedy Bridge, which is still a MnDOT led project; Roger Hille is the District Bridge Engineer, and Joe McKinnon is the District Project Engineer, so those are the two names that are the lead MnDOT staff on the Kennedy Bridge project. Leigh asked if they are the ones that are coming up with the ideas for the extra amenities. Haugen responded that that would most likely be the local engineering staff on both sides of the river. He said that he is sure they are getting some push from a council member or two. Leigh asked who it would be on the Minnesota side. Haugen responded that it would be your consulting engineer. Leigh said, then, that it would be WSN. Haugen agreed, adding that they are being included in part of the discussion. Leigh said that he just wants to know who he needs to contact, and it appears that would be Greg Boppre. Haugen added that he isn't sure how often, or how many discussions they had, but there is that discussion going on that now that they have decided to rehab the bridge instead of replacing it, what is the opportunity for those other enhancements/amenities to be done, which is quite common.

Adams asked if Mr. Haugen would invite DOT engineers involved to come to our next meeting. Haugen responded he would. He added that by then they will probably have the RFP out for the next stage, to get the consultant on board to actually do the project development, so we should know what the actual scope of work they are asking the consultant to do is, so there should be some news.

***NO SECOND WAS MADE TO THE MOTION.***

Williams asked, for clarification purposes so she is sure she is taking the right message back, but you want that dip in the road fixed more than we want amenities done. Leigh responded that that would be his vote, but he is only one person. Powers stated that he agrees with Mr. Leigh, adding that the aesthetic things are minor, we need to deal with safety issues first. Williams said that she agrees compared to what we dealing with here. She said that we need lighting, but if the lighting is sufficient that we have then we don't need to add more. Powers asked if the lighting has ever been a safety issue or are there any other issues the way it is now. Williams responded that she has never looked at it because the lighting on the bridge is taken care of by the DOTs, the approach of the bridge is the City's responsibility, and they have never had a problem there, but she has never assessed the bridge lighting. Leigh commented that he has been across it many times at night and he feels the lighting is just fine. He added that on the Sorlie more than half the lights don't work, but the Kennedy seems fine.

Haugen commented that there will be upgrades to the lighting because when they do add the bike/ped accommodation they will have to change the lighting to work with that type of traffic, which is different than vehicle traffic. He said that the enhanced lighting would, perhaps involve

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

outlining the truss structures, or outlining underneath the flood lamps, that is the type of decorative lighting or enhancements they might be discussing; or instead of using your standard street light they might do something like the vintage ones used in the downtown, which would be an upgrade and would cost more, those would be the type of amenities that might be added in, or betterments. He added that some of them they will cost share with, some of them are eligible for those other special federal programs, and some of them are just 100% local cost.

**MATTER OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FY2014 ANNUAL ELEMENT IN THE 2014-2017 T.I.P.**

Haugen reported that originally they had two requests, one from each side of the river, to amend the T.I.P. for 2014, however the East Grand Forks request has been tabled and is no longer being pursued so we will focus just on the Grand Forks request.

Haugen explained that in 2017 we had programmed some federal funds for two projects that added turn lanes at two intersections, 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and 38<sup>th</sup> Street and 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Columbia Road. He said that as part of the development of those turn lane projects it became clear that something should be done sooner than 2017 on these intersections, and also the monies that were originally programmed aren't enough to do them, so it was worked out that in 2017 the federal funds will be consolidated into one project, and that is the Columbia Road/17<sup>th</sup> Avenue intersection turn lanes; and in 2014 the City of Grand Forks will spend 100% local funds to do improvements at 34<sup>th</sup> Street/32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue intersection.

Haugen referred to the table in the packet, and pointed out that they did strike out in 2017 the references to the project on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and 38<sup>th</sup> Street and instead increase the cost estimate for federal dollars on the 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Columbia Road project; and in 2014 we moved the 34<sup>th</sup> Street/32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Intersection project and show 100% local funding.

Haugen reported that we held a public meeting at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting last Wednesday, and they had no one present for discussion, and no written comments were received by noon that day. He said that the Technical Advisory Committee and staff recommend approval.

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FY2014 ANNUAL ELEMENT IN THE 2014-2017 T.I.P., SUBJECT TO EXCLUSION OF THE EAST GRAND FORKS REQUEST.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF DRAFT NORTH DAKOTA SIDE T.I.P. FOR FY2015-2018**

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that a copy of a power point presentation was included. He said that he would be using that today rather than trying to go through the actual T.I.P. document itself. He added that we would normally be doing this in April, but for various reasons North Dakota was delayed in coming up with the new Draft for 2015-2018.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen commented that, again, just to highlight what our responsibilities are, we need to make sure that the projects are consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan. He referred to the power point presentation and went over the components of that plan, adding that we also need to prioritize those projects within the funding available.

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

Haugen referred to a map of the MPO Study Area and pointed out that the area in grey is our Urbanized Federal Aid area. He said that we have different funding sources for this area, however our full study area extends out beyond both Cities, so any project of any significance within the entire area should be included in our T.I.P. document.

Haugen reported that the T.I.P. process is really almost a 12-month process, typically started in the fall. He said that once we complete a T.I.P. we start soliciting for projects for the next T.I.P. cycle.

Haugen explained that what we do today is subject to change, and perhaps major change down the road. He said that it is no secret that the Highway Trust Fund, at the federal level, is in a crisis. He stated that the short term solution that appears to be working its way through Congress is to extend the current bill out to the end of May, and leave the long term solution to the new Congress. He said that we are assuming that, basically the status quo will be carried out to 2018 with the document your about to entertain.

Haugen commented that there are some issues that he will get into, particularly about the year of expenditure, as far as costs, so keep that in mind. He added that he will talk about our current projects, and also projects that are new:

Transit

Haugen stated that every year we have the regular operations that go on, but then for each new year there are opportunities for transit to go after capital funds, primarily, and the #5339 Capital Program and the #5310 Senior/Elderly Program are the two federal transit programs that are annually available to transit for funding. He explained that, focusing on the North Dakota side, Cities Area Transit are looking at replacing some coaches that are on the fixed route, also some demand response vehicle replacements, and, for around the fifth year they are asking for continue funding of the Mobility Manager position.

Haugen commented that these are anticipated requests, and this is the one exception where we are approving something in the draft that has not formally been presented to the City Council, but they will be presented shortly. He explained that the reason for that is that North Dakota formally hasn't opened the window for solicitation of funds from these programs.

Transportation Alternatives Program

Haugen reported that back in December we submitted four projects to the Transportation Alternatives Program, however none of them were funded.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

New V Current Regional Projects

Haugen commented that there are some projects that are being slipped years in our current program, both on the State Highway and Local Highway Systems.

Haugen pointed out that I-29 has some projects programmed for this year that are being slipped to 2015. He added that costs, as you can see, have increased considerably on these projects, which is one reason why they are being moved.

Haugen stated that because of North Dakota's "Mega Bridge Projects" DeMers Avenue is slipping from 2016 to 2017, again 2017 is a year when we hope there isn't a project on the Kennedy Bridge, or on the Sorlie Bridge, so instead of having DeMers Avenue also under construction in 2016 it made sense to move it to 2017.

Haugen said that, as previously noted, the cost for the Kennedy Bridge project scope of work changed, and the cost of the project decreased.

Haugen reported that something new that occurred this week is that there is also work that was schedule to happen in 2014 on the North Washington Interchange of I-29, that has also been slipped one year to 2015. He explained that part of the reason for this is that the cost of the project increased significantly as well.

Haugen commented that on the local side, this is where we get back to the year of expenditure issue, for many years we have known that they slipped Phase 2 of the Columbia Road project, between 11<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Avenues, from 2014 to 2016. He explained that when they made that delay of two years they didn't adjust the cost to reflect inflation for those two years, so we have been asking them to, instead of funding it at \$4.0 million to fund it at \$4.8 million. He said that they are now funding at that \$4.8 million, but as they correct this problem they created another problem, in that we had programmed Columbia Road south of 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and in 2017 they are now moving it to 2018, but again they did not make the adjustment for inflation, so we are asking them now between the draft and the final to make that \$120,000 in federal participation in the project.

New T.I.P. Year 2018 Projects

Haugen stated that 2018 is the new year in the T.I.P. document. He said that the City of Grand Forks requested funds to reconstruct 42<sup>nd</sup> Street between Gateway Drive and University Avenue, and that is being programmed. He added that the NDDOT also wanted to do a sort of minor rehab project on North Washington between Gateway Drive and the I-29 Interchange, and that is also being funded.

Regional Projects One Year Beyond 2018

Haugen reported that beyond 2018 North Dakota wants to know what is out there on the Regional System, and because of the work in 2018 on the Sorlie Bridge, North Dakota is looking at doing some work on the rest of U.S. Business 2 to bring it up to a better performance

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

pavement wise. He stated, however, that we aren't formally approving this project, nor this request at this time.

Summary

Haugen said then, that in summary, we do have some transit vehicle replacements and continue to fund the Mobility Manager position; we received no funding for our TAP projects; several projects have slipped a year and there were some cost increases; but we did get full funding of our two 2018 Project Requests.

Haugen stated that with all those changes in the current 2015, 2016, and 2017 T.I.P. years, plus the new projects in 2018, both the Technical Advisory Committee and staff are recommending approval of the Draft North Dakota Side T.I.P., as contained in your packet with the one addition of the 2015 Project on I-29/North Washington Interchange.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT NORTH DAKOTA SIDE T.I.P. FOR FY2015-2018, SUBJECT TO INCLUSION OF THE 2015 I-29/NORTH WASHINGTON INTERCHANGE PROJECT.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

Leigh asked, going back one step, if we were to go back to when we approved the changes to the 2014-2017 T.I.P., what if we wouldn't have approved that, doesn't this body make the recommendations to the City Council. Haugen responded that the MPO Executive Policy Board does not make recommendations to the City Council. He explained that we receive the projects from the City Councils, and then we determine whether or not they are consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan, and whether the priorities given to us are also our priorities. He said that, as in the past, this board has changed the City Council's priorities, and that has created all sorts of discussion afterwards, but this board does have the ability to decide what its priorities are and program those priorities.

Haugen commented that, going back to the Kennedy Bridge discussion, you as a board can; let's say that next year they say this is our final project which is now programmed at \$20,000,000.00 because they are doing all sorts of neon lights, and even though both City Councils have said that they want this, you as a board can say no, that that isn't where the money should go, and then there will be discussions, and ultimately you will have the ability to either program it in the T.I.P. or not. Leigh said, then, that this body can kill anything that the City Council wants to do because we control the use of the dollars coming in. Haugen agreed, adding that the T.I.P. is incorporated into the S.T.I.P. without modifications, so what you approve is what goes into the S.T.I.P. He said that way back when we had a big presentation he talked about those powers, and maybe we can do that again, but the way it was described is that we have sort of mutual veto power over each other, so you, as a board can tell the State that you don't want a particular project done on the Kennedy Bridge, and then the State can say that they don't want to do projects in your MPO. He added that they can prioritize funds elsewhere and not submit projects to us for us to consider, and that is the cooperative process we have to enjoy and work through, and if there is a strong difference of opinion, you make that known and put as strong a foot

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

forward as we can and have discussions. He stated that the City Council's resolution and the MPO's resolution on inside the truss/outside the truss really forced that study team to go into more depth as to whether that outside the truss option was even possible or not. He said that if you had not made those motions they quickly would have dismissed that and only looked at inside the truss activities.

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON SCHOOL SAFETY STUDIES**

Erickson referred to a power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and went over it briefly.

Erickson reported that in the past the Grand Forks-East Grand Forks area has seen an increase in safety concerns around the schools so the MPO contacted ATAC to have them conduct a study at all the schools to determine what improvements they suggest that we should do for the schools, and the main objectives they came up with were:

1. To evaluate pedestrian safety and traffic circulation at each school.
2. Ensure that the latest recommended guidelines and manuals are followed.
3. To recommend short, medium, and long term improvement measures.
4. Minimize conflicts and streamline traffic to enhance safety and improve operations.

Erickson stated that she is currently having the different stakeholders look at the studies that have been done between 2004 and 2012, to determine what has been done and what is still needed.

Erickson said that they are also looking at the safe-routes-to-school maps and getting them updated since school boundaries have been changed.

Erickson referred to the power point and explained that the next couple of slides are examples of some of the suggestions ATAC came up with for the different schools, such as safety education, which has been completed as Safe Kids conducts school-wide assemblies and safety education at most schools, increased enforcement, cross-walks, how pick-up and drop-off is conducted at the school, etc.

Leigh said, then, that this particular study, East Grand Forks isn't in here, but as he recalls was it last year or the year before that we had that view. Haugen responded that that study will be reviewed again. Leigh asked if this was just a continuation of that study. Haugen responded that it is a review of what was done to see if things have been completed, if not why not, and should it still be pursued in the future, so instead of going after a whole new school, and creating a whole new study, our decision was to go back and look at all the studies we had done and update them to see what has been done and what still should be done. Leigh asked, then, if this is a work in progress. Haugen responded it is.

Erickson referred to an illustration of the old school map, and the new school map, and explained that they are still in the process of updating the new Safe Routes To School maps, and as of

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

today they have added more of the boundaries, and they are up for review. Haugen said, then, that every elementary and middle school in both communities will have updated maps.

Leigh asked if they were meeting with the school administrators. Erickson responded that she is in contact with them, and added that they are hoping to have these all updated before school starts in the fall.

Leigh said that the last time he was told that there was no funding available for improvements. Haugen responded that there is funding available. Leigh said, though, that it is for Safe Routes To School projects, but things like the parking and such, you give the school a recommendation, but basically the funding is in their hands. Haugen responded that that is true for some of these, but some are eligible for the federal and state transportation funds, but some of them are truly just on-site off the street network are local funding issues.

Leigh asked what would, in these studies, be locally funded. Haugen responded that signage, parking lot expansions, new parking lots, those would be on-site that are off the street network so those would be 100% local projects.

Leigh asked what type of school upgrades would be eligible for funding. Haugen responded that some of signage that is on the streets would be eligible. Leigh said though, is that physically on the school grounds, would it be like safe to school day signage or such. Haugen responded it would. He added that they worked with each individual school principal, and the district administration, and the PTOs when we first came up with these recommendations of what to do, so as we review them we will follow that same process; first it is an internal staff review, then we engage the schools for the next stage, then once school starts we will go out to get the neighborhood/parents/school engaged to see if they are in agreement with what is being proposed, and update them on what has been done and what is left to be done.

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE REVIEW**

Kouba reported that, basically they have had an Environmental Justice Manual previously, and the reason we are revisiting it this time around is because our federal partners asked us to, mostly to reflect some of the changes that have happened for environmental justice.

Kouba stated that the major change is that there will basically be different maps; one will be a minority map and one will be a low income map and projects will be related in those areas and reviewed.

Kouba said that so far they have gone to a Fundamentals of Environmental Justice course, and have gathered up the data, and now have an idea of where the populations are now. She stated that they are currently in the process of writing up the draft document, and once it has gone through the process of looking at human services coordination group, as well as some public meetings, we will then bring the final document to the Technical Advisory Committee and the MPO Executive Policy Board.

Kouba stated that once the process has been completed then we will review our Long Range Transportation Projects against the document.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Leigh asked if the reason for this whole process is to determine where buses run to provide low income people alternative transportation, what is the purpose of this. Kouba responded that the purpose is mostly because whenever we are reviewing a project, any kind of project, whether it is a transit project or a road construction project, or anything else we want to make sure that they aren't adversely affecting those populations. She stated that in the past, nationwide, projects such as a freeway have completely eliminated a neighborhood, and it was all low income housing. She said that she has not seen this happen here, but that isn't to say that it hasn't. She added that they are just making sure that anywhere federal funds are used that this doesn't happen.

Kouba commented that the basic changes we have done for the current manual are; previously they were looking at using both census blocks and census block groups, but we have now gone to just using census blocks for our geographic analysis. She said that, once again this is just for the MPO areas, we are not doing an analysis for individual projects, that is up to the project manager or engineers to do.

Kouba reported that for the minority changes, the changes for the minority populations they are using 5-Year American Community Survey block group data from 2008 to 2012. She said that they used three times the total average percent for concentration purposes. She stated that this isn't really different, but because they are using a block group instead of a block that is where the populations are located has changed.

Kouba referred to a map and pointed out where the block groups are shown and stated that there are several more concentrated areas, a few in East Grand Forks and several in Grand Forks. She stated that it shows that they are mostly concentrated in Grand Forks with the block group usage.

Haugen explained that the map on the right is the old one using blocks, but because it was a much smaller geography, the three-times concentration shows up a lot more; when they went to larger geography block groups only a few areas showed up, none in East Grand Forks.

Kouba said that, once again, in the new manual coming up we will have used the 5-Year American Community Survey block group from 2008 to 2012, previously it was 2006 to 2010. She added that how we define the, how we calculated it was using the census in this current one, in the new one coming up the new manual uses the census definition of poverty and a ratio of, that households income, whether it is a five person household or a two person household, and used that net ratio to define what low income is so that when, and in our maps we used different, in the current manual we use three times the total average population, this time we considered 50% as significant, mostly because when we figured the three times the population it ended up to be over 80% and just seeing that it just doesn't make sense, we felt that it was missing a lot of people so we went to the 50%.

Kouba reported that the three times ended up being just the university area. She said that when they used 50% in this timeframe, in this current-new manual, yes the university area is but there is also the near southside that has been highlighted, as well as some of the apartment areas along South Washington.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Kouba pointed out that, as you can see, in the previous map on the left that is in the current manual there are a few of those areas that are highlighted, but they didn't meet the requirements that were set forth today, so once again we are going to go for public comment period with public and human services, Technical Advisory Committee approval, and finish up with doing our review with our Long Range Transportation Plan projects.

Haugen commented that a general rule of thumb in the past was that you could use a concentration, and we used three times, or 50%, but on the minority we never really came close to 50% of an area having minority population, so that is where the three times rule was. He added that on the low income population, in the past we didn't have over 50% except for where we had the three times, but now we do have these block groups that are over 50%, but are short of three times, but since they are over 50% that is sort of the Federal rule of thumb that that means that they should be highlighted, so that is the reason why we dropped down for the income to that 50% threshold.

Haugen stated that for our planning purposes we will look at our projects that are in the Long Range Transportation Plan and assess them if they are going through any of these neighborhoods, and also if there is an impact and whether it is an adverse or positive impact, but when each of the individual projects, then, go through the project development phase, they will have to do a similar assessment, and that assessment will probably have to go down to tighter geography if they can so they may not be able to use the block group. He said that for their planning purposes it is okay, for project specific they probably might need to go back to blocks or other census geographies, but that isn't your concern, but just to explain that when you sit in your seat and you see a project, and you see a project identifying different area for low income than what we have identified, this is just giving you a heads up that it might happen.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

1. State Funding For MPO Planning Letter

Haugen reported that a while back the three MPOs in North Dakota sent a letter to the State that essentially highlighted that the State of Minnesota provides a match to our federal funds and we were wondering if the State of North Dakota would consider doing the same. He stated that the response they got back from North Dakota was essentially, no they can't provide direct match, State law doesn't allow that.

Haugen said that the three MPO Directors did meet with Grant Levi, NDDOT Director, last week, and during the course of their discussion he asked that we submit specific projects in our MPO area that he would consider providing the match for, so the subtle difference is that he just can't give a blanket match to any and all activities the MPO does, but he will consider a specific match for a specific project, so by the end of July he has asked for those to be in so he is working on a list of projects to be submitted, and obviously he is focusing on the State Highway system. He explained that we could then ask for the State to provide the match for them, and therefore reducing what the local match has been in the past, so it is a no from a specific point of view, but then it is a little yes if they think there is an opportunity they will explore it. Adams commented, then, that it is a definite possible maybe. Vetter said that they want to do it one item at a time.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen responded that that is correct, and added that that is how the Minnesota match started out.

Vetter stated that he would suggest that copies of these letters, with a cover letter, be sent to your State Legislators in order for them to consider changing the State Law. Haugen responded that it the Director asked we be more discreet , so let's try this legislative session this way .

2. Infusion Of Funds

Haugen reported that he would like to give you a heads up on another opportunity for infusion of funds to us. He said that, some of you might recall, a few years ago Bismarck/Mandan could not use all of its federal funds for planning, and we were given \$400,000 of their funds, and Fargo/Moorehead may be in a similar position, so he hopes in September to have before this body a budget amendment to bring in a couple hundred thousand of their funds into our work program to do work in 2015. He said that, again, it is billed as a one-time only situation.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO ADJOURN THE JULY 16<sup>TH</sup>, 2014,  
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:58 P.M.***

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

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE  
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2014 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

In Chairman, Steve Adams', absence, Mike Powers, Secretary, called the August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2014 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, Gary Malm, Clarence Vetter, Ken Vein, Greg Leigh, and Jeannie Mock.

Absent: Warren Strandell and Steve Adams.

Staff: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Stephanie Erickson, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; Sarah Erickson, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

Guest(s): Roger Hille, MnDOT Bridge Division; Jane Williams, GF City Engineering Department; Mike Yavarow, GF City Engineering Department; and David Kuharenko, GF City Engineering Department.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

Powers stated that because there are some new faces here, and also we have some honored guests, he would ask that everyone please introduce themselves.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Powers declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JULY 16<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO APPROVE THE JULY 20<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Powers, Malm, Vein, Leigh, Vetter, and Mock.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

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

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that included in the packet was a staff report. He said that there is new information, which we heard at last Wednesday's Technical Advisory Committee, concerning the Sorlie Bridge project. He stated that since Mr. Noehre is present today, and he gave the update, he is wondering if he would like to do the same for this body. Noehre responded that he didn't bring his notes for this, so hopefully he remembers everything he discussed at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

Noehre commented that they went through an extensive analysis of the current condition of the Sorlie Bridge, and the bottom line is that we determine, through that analysis and more detailed inspections, that the Sorlie Bridge is actually in much better condition than we currently thought.

Noehre stated that it is in such good condition today that we probably wouldn't have even started this process had we known this a year ago, but since we have already started looking at it, we are looking at continuing some sort of minor rehab project, maybe updating the bridge railing, painting it, those types of things.

Malm asked about bicycle movement on the bridge. Noehre responded that it isn't like the Kennedy, there are pedestrian facilities already on the Sorlie. He added that there are also three lanes going across the bridge, but we are only using two as driving lanes so we could look at possibly doing something within the truss as well, however, would we be looking at adding on to the bridge or making it wider, no they wouldn't. Malm said, however, that once you get one bicycle on the sidewalk you now have blocked off all the walking traffic and are pushing everyone out into the street.

Leigh commented that in terms of lighting, there are lights on the Sorlie now, but what about upgrading the lighting on it. Noehre responded that that would be a possibility. Leigh stated that he gets complaints that half the lights are out most of the time, and he doesn't know if it is a wiring issue or a maintenance issue. Malm asked who was responsible for the lights. Noehre responded that his understanding is that the two cities are responsible. Vein said that East Grand Forks is responsible. Malm said that he thinks that is the problem, that nobody knows who should be doing it.

Noehre said that, as we will discuss with the Kennedy, just because lighting is a potential, it doesn't mean that the sky's the limit, and the State is going to pay for whatever we want to be done, that isn't what he is suggesting. Vein stated, however, that there would be the potential to do a betterment though if either of the communities wanted to upgrade the lighting beyond what would be required, minimum required federal standards, correct. Noehre responded that he would suspect that would be the case, yes.

Haugen reported that the lighting that was added to the Sorlie Bridge was done at the same time the two cities agreed to rehab/repaint the Point Bridge, and it was paid for 100% locally, and at

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

the time the Downtown Leadership Group was in existence, and they developed a concept that was quite a bit more expensive than the final product that was allowed on the bridge, so those lights are all of maybe six years old. Noehre commented that because the bridge is on the National Register there are certainly going to be limitations as to what is or isn't allowed to be done.

Powers asked if it is felt the lighting is adequate. Noehre responded that that will all be part of the project development.

Haugen commented that he thinks the other point is that the DOTs, with consultant, KLJ, are trying to schedule a presentation to both councils and the MPO Board on their current findings on the Sorlie.

Vein asked if the lead based paint has all been removed previously. Noehre responded that he doesn't know, but he thinks it was just removed up to the splash line.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reminded the board that at their meeting last month they were informed of the effort to look at signature items, aesthetic features, betterments, or enhancements for the Kennedy Bridge. He stated that since that meeting there was a meeting scheduled and arranged by Grand Forks Engineering Staff to begin conversations on this issue.

Haugen stated that, as sort of an introduction as to why these items are being considered, he included an excerpt from MnDOT's Bridge Manual in the staff report (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request). He pointed out that they do recognize the importance of aesthetics and have a practice of investing additional funds in a structure for special aesthetic treatments when warranted, up to 15% above the cost of normal aesthetics.

Haugen reported that MPO staff did attend the meeting. He said that Stephanie Erickson attended as he was out of town, but he and Stephanie did meet and discussed that we needed to make sure that that committee, or that group, understood some of the concerns the MPO Executive Policy Board expressed about the costs, and how the board felt that some of the safety features were not being priced into the cost estimate, yet there appears to be monies available to do these aesthetic things.

Haugen commented that this issue was also discussed at the Technical Advisory Committee last Wednesday. He explained that Minnesota and North Dakota do not have the exact same policy, or mirror the exact same procedures, so there might be some things that come out of this process that are agreeable to MnDOT to share in the cost of, yet there also might be some things on the North Dakota side for their cost share that aren't exactly matching up some of their policies. He said that there is a process, and he would ask either Mr. Hille or Mr. Noehre to explain how that process will proceed, and how the aesthetic features will be determined.

Hille responded that he thinks what Mr. Haugen is referring to is the policies on new bridges where they don't have the challenges of historic areas adjacent to the structure, or a structure that is eligible for registry.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Hille reported that North Dakota and MnDOT have had some internal discussions about participation in aesthetic lighting, if that is what the communities want. He stated that they put some dollars in to make sure that their consultant will price some different options, if that is what the communities want, but if they don't want to do anything that is acceptable as well.

Hille stated that the reason this is on the table now is because the RFP will be going out soon and if they don't have some thoughts and ideas that are compatible with the Secretary of Interior Standards, it will be very difficult to make anything happen, so we have to have some thoughts and ideas, and MnDOT has shared what they have done on some other projects to help with this issue, and have laid it out to the City Engineering Staff on both sides.

Hille commented, however, that exactly what the cost of these features will be, and can they be 15% over the normal cost of such features, he can't say until we find out whether or not they will meet the Secretary of Interior Standards. He said, however, that we have to move on this soon or it won't happen.

Noehre added that with Transportation Enhancement funds under SAFETEA-LU and other such previous bills, some of these things could be eligible, and they have spent dollars from the funding source in North Dakota on other bridges on things like pull-outs or medallions, and those kinds of things, even entrance features, but with MAP-21 they now have TAP funds and a lot of those kinds of things are no longer eligible for funding.

Noehre commented that to look back to see what was done on other bridges may or may not apply to today because federal rules are different today than they were a few years ago. He added that as far as NDDOT is concerned, they wouldn't use a percentage, they would have to look at what each individual item was and how they could partner or fund it. He said that, as with the Sorlie, if they are looking at additional lighting on the Kennedy they might be able to participate in some level of additional lighting, but that wouldn't mean that the sky's the limit, or if they were looking at additional enhanced signage, they might be willing to participate up to a certain level of what they would normally sign for, and if you want to go beyond that it might be a local cost, so ultimately he can't say that they will spend X amount of dollars, or X percentage on whatever you might want because that isn't the case, they have to look at each individual item and its cost.

Haugen reported that a major change that MAP-21 did for those TAP funds, or the old enhancements, is to say that State DOTs are no longer eligible recipients of those funds, and of course this is a bridge project being done by the State DOTs.

Haugen said that he thinks, perhaps, that a follow up question would be to ask just how you're going to manage all of these aesthetic concepts that might get thrown into the process. He reiterated that there is that committee that met, but also the local newspaper put out an opinion that everyone should submit their ideas and concepts to the paper, so, he talked to Darren Laesch, MnDOT District #2 Planning Engineer, about how your project development consultant is going to just manage that process of going through all of those concepts, and ultimately how the decision will be made.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Leigh commented that he will be interested to find out when you rehab the bridge, and you put the pedestrian facility on it, what kind of lighting will be planned, and what would be considered enhanced lighting. Hille responded that they shared some of those concepts with City Engineering Staff; what is considered adequate, and what would be considered enhanced. He added that they are only doing this as a courtesy because if they don't garner input from the councils at this point, it will be the same as it is now with some enhanced white light, so if you want additional amenities it has to be worked through your City Engineering Staffs because if you just wait and you get a ton of ideas and throw it at the consultant, you're not going to have time to manage that, so this is a courtesy and they have folks available to work with you.

Hille stated that he finds it very difficult to throw out something to the public that says: "give me your idea"; when they have all of these restrictions on what those ideas can be because the community is going to come back and say: "you asked for my idea and now you're saying you can't do it"; that is why he thinks those ideas have to be called or processed through the engineering departments so we know what we are doing. He added that in the case of the Kennedy, there are some real hurdles because of the historic district, and the historic facility that exists there will be considered by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, Standard 106, so we will have to consider that as well.

Hille reported that MnDOT and the NDDOT have pretty much agreed that some of the things that are happening on the bridge will be paid by them 100%. He explained that they need to make a new curb and safety rail that meets those standards, and it will be substantially more expensive than a retro-fit, so they are going to pay for things like that. He added that they will also pay for first class white lights, but beyond that...if nothing comes in, and the cities decide that they just want a bridge, they will do that, but if you want something additional it will need to be worked through your engineering departments and the architect that is on staff. He said, again, if you wait and talk about it for six months, this is probably as fast track a job as he has ever been involved with.

Leigh said that he is in favor of the bridge, and that's it, but his question is, the Sorlie Bridge, he has a different opinion because it is located downtown and is part of the entertainment district, so he can see spending some money to jazz it up a bit, but the Kennedy Bridge is mostly vehicle traffic, with a pedestrian facility once it is put on it, but as long as it is well lit that's all he would be in favor of. Hille stated that that is fine, as long as they get that brief from your council, he just wants you to know that the courtesy is extended, what you do with it is your business. Noehre added that they aren't mandating it, they are just asking the question now, and need it answered now, not when the project is already done.

Hille suggested that, since they are going to be putting a few million dollars into this bridge project, even he, who doesn't usually think much about aesthetics, feels that after having this bridge all painted up and new curbing put in, it would be a shame to put the traditional green street type signage back on it, and he thinks some of those minor issues they can jazz up a little bit and make it look nice and still not cost you a fortune, so he thinks it is worth processing some ideas, but he thinks the big ideas of things that are going to cost 15% or 20% of the total project are probably already in there with the curb and such.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Vein commented that, because in part the Grand Forks Herald threw out this thing about getting ideas out, apparently if people listen to that, there is no formal process for that so you are trying to understand how we should implement a process to take in that input and then have a decision making process between the MPO and the two different communities about how that ultimately might look, and what he is hearing is that time is of the essence because we need to get those in now so that they can be incorporated into the design process and estimated. Hille responded that that is a lot less words, but it is what he said, yes. Haugen stated that the only thing he would add in that is are both sides willing to pony up dollars to make it work, and he isn't sure both sides might be willing to put up the funds. Vein asked if in some way they are talking about both bridges when you say that, or just the Kennedy. Haugen responded that he is just focusing on the Kennedy. Vein said that he would think that everyone agrees that that is a major transportation bridge, it isn't downtown entertainment, as Mr. Leigh pointed out, that would have a higher need for aesthetics that he would think both communities would agree with, but we still have to funnel, if there are ideas, communicate that we are going to accept them and have them brought forth in some manner, and he is almost thinking that as the MPO we should have a discussion on what we would like to have and then take it back to both councils. Leigh responded that we need to know what kind of dollars we are talking about, because they are on a limited budget, so we can determine how much we want to throw at that bridge, locally. He added that his biggest complaint, at the last meeting, is that we sit on the MPO and we aren't invited to any of the meetings where they talk about spending money, while we are on the council where we are authorized to spend money, so everybody that is going to come up with all these ideas are going to have to come to us, so he would at least like to be involved in that process so they can take it back to the council, and find out if they are even interested, because if they aren't interested in spending money we are wasting our time.

Leigh stated that he doesn't know that it is up to our local engineers to make these decisions, they can be involved in the process, but he thinks it should be the council's decision. Vein asked if Mr. Leigh was thinking there should be a subcommittee of the MPO that would be involved in this. Leigh responded that he knows that Grand Forks was kind enough to have a meeting, and it is all fine and dandy, but he doesn't think the right people were at the meeting, at least not all of the right people, particularly someone from this board should have been at that meeting because we are going to make the decision so we should be kept informed of the discussions. He added that if you are a city council member, they are the ones making the final decision as to what will be spent locally, so he would think a representative from there should be on it so they can take it back to the council and share the ideas with them, as well as the potential cost of those ideas, to see if they are interested.

Vein asked if we could create a subcommittee where we have someone from the East Grand Forks City Council, East Grand Forks Engineering, Grand Forks City Council, Grand Forks Engineering, and the MPO, because you see a lot of grandiose ideas, but who can afford to do them, but if you want to propose them that is fine but the idea is that at \$2,000,000 we can't afford to do it. He stated that some ideas are no brainers, others may need further justification as to what their costs might be, and furthermore, how do you share in that cost. He said that we won't be able to solve that here, but wouldn't it make sense to get something like that implemented sooner than later. Haugen responded that Grand Forks Engineering did assemble a

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

group of people. He said that the MPO was invited to the meeting, but weren't involved with how it was set up. He added that they will talk with Mark Walker and he knows that Councilmember Schneider represents the Grand Forks Council. He said that they also asked Hal Gershman to participate in at as well, but he isn't sure whether or not they invited East Grand Forks Councilmembers at all. Leigh responded that Henry Tweten, East Grand Forks City Councilman, found out about it at the last minute, and attended.

Malm said that there is no way you can have any idea what anyone will come up with. He commented that they want ideas; you look at a bridge and have you made any decision yourself how it should be aesthetically. He stated that they built a bridge over the Red River at Thompson and they didn't put any aesthetics in it at all, they built a bridge. Leigh said that he thinks it looks nice. Malm agreed, and added that it functions well. He said that he would also say that that is exactly what we should do with the Kennedy Bridge, what you are going to do is hammer yourself into a corner with the Historical Preservation people again, even though there isn't anything historical down there. He added that someday we have to wake up and realize that there are things we shouldn't be doing, we should provide transportation, although he agrees that for the downtown you have to look at it differently, but out there he doesn't think we even need to look at it, let the engineers design a bridge.

Hille reiterated, again, that all the Department of Transportation's goal is to extend you a courtesy, and if your answer is to build a bridge forgo aesthetics, they are fine with that; but he just wants to make sure that the offer was extended. He added that, again, when you start talking about dollars he is on public boards too, and the reason that the engineering folks need to be involved early on is so that the East Grand Forks City Council doesn't have to worry about this proposal that might cost them a ton of money when that proposal wouldn't be acceptable to the historical standards. He said that, as long as you know the offer is extended, and if you say you want no aesthetics, you only have to send us an email to that effect.

Haugen said, just to focus on lighting, if you want to go above and beyond what you would do just because of all the work you're doing on the bridge already, MnDOT, he believes said at the Technical Advisory Committee that they are willing to pay 50% of the additional cost of the lighting, so does that mean East Grand Forks will have any cost in the lighting, they might not because if it is truly 50/50, the 50% on the Minnesota side would be covered. He added that you need to be careful about saying you want to do nothing, because there are some things you might get above and beyond that you don't have to pay for.

Vein added that he thinks there are also some advantages to doing some aesthetic things. He said that if you're in the greenway, and you want to make that into something more pleasingly aesthetic there may be some value to doing it. Haugen said that if you want to do a resolution that you are willing to entertain zero dollars, or X amount of dollars, you can give some parameters as to what your side is willing to help fund. Malm commented that his disagreement with that at this point is that they have no control over any dollars. He added that they can make a recommendation, and his recommendation would certainly be that they do nothing for aesthetics, and if the City Council's want to put it in let them put it in. Haugen responded that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

that is what he was referring to, the councils with the resolution. Vetter asked, however, if it isn't the MPO's job to vet all those different ideas. Malm responded that that is something he hasn't ever figured out, as he got the impression at the last meeting that we were just sitting here. Vetter said that that was why Mr. Leigh and himself got a little upset when they heard about that meeting because they feel that the MPO should be vetting all those different ideas, and it should come from the MPO and not the East Grand Forks Engineers getting a meeting together and saying that this is what they want; or the Grand Forks Engineers getting together and saying this is what they want; and somehow or other trying to get it all to their City Councils, it needs to come to the MPO and we take it to our respective councils for approval. Malm asked if he means what you like as in enhancements. Vetter responded that that is why we extend the olive branch to the different engineering groups, the downtown group and everyone else and say: "we are going to have a special meeting of the MPO, bring your ideas here and let's talk about them and decide what we want to carry forth". Vein agreed, adding that we could just have an open house and allow them to come in and make their pitch.

U.S. #2 Low Spot In East Grand Forks

Haugen referred to a drawing of the area, and explained the issue with the low spot on U.S. #2 in East Grand Forks.

Haugen said that, as we discussed at the last MPO meeting, we have had conversations with MnDOT and the Corps of Engineers as to whether or not we can do this project. He stated that the short answer is that they can maybe raise it a foot, but it will not allow a whole lot of additional protection to keep the bridge open during flood events, but even possibly raising that to a foot and three inches has an impact on the total floodway, and Grand Forks staff was saying that if it has any impact we want to make sure it is mitigated so that the flood protection system is not compromised.

Haugen commented that MnDOT indicated that it is really in the hands of the Corps of Engineers. He said that if it is a small project, they will do it with the Kennedy Bridge project, but if it gets into a project that requires a lot of mitigation then it has to go through its own standard project process.

Vein sees Highway #2 as the major transportation system pass through the northern part of the State and through both communities. He said that he doesn't remember which one of the floods we had where they were trying to put levees on both sides of the low area so that they could keep traffic flowing, especially for emergency vehicles, because once it is closed it becomes a safety issue. He stated that we built a levee system that protects both communities to the 200 year flood, but our transportation system is still back to what it was in the pre-flood basis, so it would seem to him that if we were going to build a brand new bridge we would built it up, and obviously if you raise that, the intent of that low area is that it acts as a water controller, so if you do raise it up you have to compensate for that additional water that would be held back so it would involve additional culverts under the road, or whatever it would be, but he is thinking that we have this chance now to do this, and he thinks it is the responsible thing to do to get that road

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

raised up so that we don't have a major flood and traffic can't go back and forth on Highway #2. He added that it isn't just emergency services that are affected either, it also affects cargo, trucking, all those things come to a halt during a flood event, and it isn't even that high of a flood, and then we do like we said before and we build levees on both sides to try to continue to use it you're already causing problems so why wouldn't we, at this time, knowing that this is isn't a matter of if it it's when, we've done all this with our levee system to make sure that the major transportation port between the communities is upgraded accordingly. He said, again, that this is the time to do it or it will never get done, and he would think that both DOTs, knowing the value of this would want it to happen too. Powers asked if Mr. Vein wanted to make a motion to that effect. Vein responded that he would, but he asked if it was in order to do so. Haugen commented that this is being considered, and they have the potential of raising it a foot to a foot and three inches, that is what they are considering. Vein said that he thinks, and he will pursue this on the North Dakota side, and he doesn't know where anybody else is with this, but he thinks that we have to be pushing hard for this raise, because the is our highest bridge during floods and raising it up more, that needs to be pushed, and a foot isn't enough, a foot is helpful, but he thinks it needs to more than that.

Powers asked if anyone knows how high it would have to be raised to keep it open at a 50-foot some level. Haugen responded that there are physical constraints, as described at our Technical Advisory Committee meeting. He explained that the Kennedy Bridge project was dealing with the bridge itself, the other bridge and interchange with River Road has a controlling factor as to what can be raised, and as he understands, and the engineers are more informed, but they have to raise this structure in order to get more than that foot raised up, so now you're talking about a much different project, scope and cost and everything else. Vein said that he would agree with that, as there are limits to how much you can do, but he would like to understand a little more what that limit really is, are there variances or things that could allow you to get up to whatever level we need. He added that he was looking at the one foot to one foot three inches, but for mitigation purposes, not what would be geometrically possible.

Hille reported that they have extended the limits on the Minnesota side 750-feet to incorporate this project. He said that if it becomes a slam dunk that they can raise it, they have folks looking at it, and if it doesn't have to be mitigated he thinks it can be incorporated into this project, but if it gets deeper than that it isn't worth delaying the bridge project for this project, but they are looking at it and he doesn't know if they need a resolution because the DOT is looking at it in both ways, if it can be added to the bridge project or does it need to be done separately.

Vetter asked if we want to set up a separate meeting where we can vet some of the aesthetics issues, have the MPO staff reach out to the engineers. Powers suggested he make a motion and see where it goes. Vetter said that he would suggest bringing this group back together, along with others that can show up, and reach out to engineering staff to see what we can come up with. Mock asked if we shouldn't also reach out to the Grand Forks Herald to see what comments they have received. Vetter agreed that that would be a good idea. Haugen asked Stephanie if they had set a time and date when the other group would meet again. Erickson responded that they hadn't, that they were looking at meeting again in sixty to ninety days.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Malm said that he thinks Mr. Vetter is right, we should just bring everyone back, hold a special meeting and try to get more information on what is in the enhancement, etc.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONED BY VEIN, TO APPROVE A REQUEST THAT MPO STAFF TO SET UP A MEETING WITH BOTH CITIES' ENGINEERS, THE GRAND FORKS HERALD, THE DOTS, AND THE PUBLIC TO DISCUSS AESTHETIC, ETC. FOR THE KENNEDY BRIDGE.***

Haugen asked if this meeting would be touching on both bridges, or are we just going to focus on the Kennedy Bridge. Leigh responded that he thinks we should just focus on the Kennedy right now, but you could do both. Vein agreed, stating that it is doable, and everyone would then have their opportunity to voice their ideas and concerns. Malm said that he thinks you need to split them up because you're going to have too much confusion if you're trying to run both at the same time. Powers agreed. Malm commented that we need to get everybody on the same page on the Kennedy, which is going to be the first one and will have the biggest effect, and we were just told that not much is needed on the Sorlie, it has been there a hundred years, and will last another hundred.

***Voting Aye: Powers, Malm, Vein, Leigh, Vetter, and Mock.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE LETTING THE DOTS KNOW THAT WE WANT THEM TO IDENTIFY EVERY OPPORTUNITY POSSIBLE TO ALLEVIATE THE LOW AREA THE CURRENTLY EXISTS ON U.S. HIGHWAY #2.***

***Voting Aye: Powers, Malm, Vein, Leigh, Vetter, and Mock.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MANUAL UPDATE**

Kouba reported that they are looking for preliminary approval of our manual. She explained that last month she discussed how they went about getting some of the numbers in the manual to figure out what our areas are for environmental justice. She pointed out that those same maps are in this manual that she presented at the last meeting as well.

Kouba commented that, basically they want to get the board's approval so that they can move forward. She added, however, that they still need to get public opinion on this, and they still need to present it to their human services committee, but they are just starting the process of finalizing this manual so that they can move forward with it.

Kouba said that once it is approved they will also be looking at the Long Range Transportation Plan and relating the projects that we have in that plan to the areas that are highlighted in both our high minority area, as well as our low-income areas.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Kouba stated that one of the biggest differences in this manual, compared to our current manual, is the fact that we are separating the minority and low-income areas. She explained that previously it was only the areas that had combined minority and low-income populations.

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY MALM, TO GRANT PRELIMINARY APPROVAL  
OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MANUAL, AS SUBMITTED.***

Vein referred to the manual; the fundamental principles section on Page 2: “to prevent the denial, reduction, or delays in the receipt of benefits by minority populations and/or low-income populations”, and asked if that is happening now because he has never heard or seen this occurring. Kouba responded that it is not something that has a history of occurring in this area, but in larger areas, such as San Francisco, where a highway being built literally went through low income areas because that is where the land was cheapest, it does occur. She explained that it is just the federal government’s way of making sure that if there is an adverse effect with any project, that there is some sort of mitigation for minority and/or low-income populations.

***Voting Aye: Powers, Malm, Vein, Leigh, Vetter, and Mock.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF MINNESOTA FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION REVISIONS**

Haugen referred to the staff report, and pointed out that it discusses Minnesota’s reaction to a few things. He said that the first thing is FHWA’s updated guidance on functional classification. He explained that they had 30-year old guidance as to what should be classified in our functional classification roadways, and last fall they come up with some new guidance, and our Long Range Transportation Plan was almost held up forcing us to react to this new guidance, but we were able to say it is too new to hang up on it.

Haugen stated that another thing that happened was, with the 2010 Census, the Census Bureau defined a new geography of urbanized area. He explained that under the old practice when a functionally classified roadway entered into the urbanized area it was raised up in the functional class, so we had to react to those new geographies.

Haugen said that the third thing was that MAP-21 has placed most of the funding into the National Highway Performance Program, or the NHS system, and as part of that process they automatically upgraded all Principle Arterials into this NHS system. He explained that as he goes through the MNDOT Power Point Presentation, initially they started this process and got a lot of feedback saying that people didn’t want to have to fight over these principle arterials because the fight was over whether they should remain in the NHS designation with allowed them to be eligible for the bigger pot of monies at the federal level. He stated that initially MNDOT agreed with this philosophy, and so in January when we met the outcome of the meeting was that we would just focus on some of these minor issues like urbanization boundaries, etc., and the created some new definitions of expressways and such; but then they got a memorandum from Federal Highways giving them a “reading of the tea-leaves” that there

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

is a reason why Federal Highway came up with new guidance, and they really wanted us to look at our NHS system to make sure it is truly the system we want as a nation to invest our funding in. He added that another thing is that the new guidance creates, or requires that the urban area splits its collector systems like the rural systems do, with minor and major, and that also has a potential funding ramification in the future.

Haugen stated that before, in the urban areas, we were able to just call everything collector, and by doing that everything was federally eligible for funds. He added that in the rural area, for a long time they have required everyone have major collectors designated versus minor collectors designated. He said that major collectors in the rural areas are the only ones that are federally eligible, so part of that “reading the tea-leaves”, that Minnesota Federal Highways was telling MnDOT was that you really need, if you’re going to do any sort of effort on the bump to reclass you have to go all the way through the process and designate these things because there is something that probably is coming down the road that is going to become an important factor for you.

Haugen commented that the two major outcomes that we are struggling with is; when you get to the criteria, the difference between major collector and minor collector, one of the biggest factors we look at is what the volume is of the traffic on the roadway, but under the guidance they are really saying that something that carries the same traffic can be separate when you designate it is a minor collector versus a major collector, so it is really going to be an art, so they are figuring out what should be deemed minor versus major.

Haugen said that another thing is, the principle arterial in East Grand Forks, in the Point area is something you will notice MnDOT wants to downgrade to a minor arterial. He explained that their justification for doing that is that it does not connect to another principle arterial. He said that the new federal guidance no longer carries that general rule that once you change your geography you raise or drop your functional class roadways, that you truly don’t look at political boundaries or other things, you just look at what the road functions as and carry that function all the way through that roadway. He stated, then, that while we may disagree, and we might have good arguments for this, it will be a difficult climb to get over their initial thoughts that it should not be a principle arterial anymore.

Vein asked if this roadway transitions from an urban to a rural section at that point, is that what they are saying. Haugen responded that it does. Vein said, however, that there could be a future extension of the urban section where the rural is now. Haugen referred to a drawing of the roadway, and pointed out that it actually transitions at a logical termini, which is this intersection, and the urban section itself, curb and gutter stands out past the Middle School.

Vetter asked if there was a process to go through to try to keep this roadway as a principle arterial. Haugen responded that this will be the process. He added that we will review what they proposed and give them feedback as to what we think it should be. He explained the process they put in place, and how it affects this roadway/area.

Discussion ensued.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen reiterated that back in January, MnDOT was convinced they weren't going to follow this new guidance, but then they met with Federal Highway Minnesota, and were convinced they have to do it.

Vein asked what the impacts of this downgrade will be, is it funding. Haugen responded that it is primarily just funding that will be impacted. Vein asked if it will impact any replacement or rehabilitation plans. Haugen responded that, you have to remember that MAP-21 put the bulk of the funding into the NHS system, so as the East Grand Forks side tries to get federal funding for local streets, there is less of a pot now on the Minnesota side. Vein said that if it goes from a major to a minor it will be in a different category.

Leigh asked if the stretch from 13<sup>th</sup> to O'Leary Park, if it was changed what funding would be available if it needs repair; is it local dollars, is it MnDOT funds. Haugen responded that it is still federally eligible, there are just a lot less federal funds available that your statewide competition makes it less likely it will get funded, that is the biggest ramification. He said, however, on the positive side you probably don't have national highway standards that you need to build to, or to maintain.

Powers commented that he is surprised that the Point Bridge area isn't considered a principle arterial. Haugen responded that it never has been, it has always been a minor arterial. Powers asked if they take into consideration how important that area is during a flood event, it is the only way out of town. Haugen commented that you do need to recall that Polk County has entertained a turn-back of this not being a state highway. He said that this would mean that maintaining a principle arterial connection will be difficult.

Haugen reported that minor and major collectors, that is something that they will need to work with East Grand Forks on to try to decipher and make that fine decision as to what is and what isn't. He said that they are scheduled to be on the first work session in September to begin this process. He added that they are not going to formally ask for adoption until after we have gone through this give and take, hopefully, with MnDOT, and possibly with this advisory committee, but early next year we will be asking the East Grand Forks City Council to adopt a functional class and the MPO will endorse it as well.

Haugen commented that on the North Dakota side, they are nowhere near anything like this effort. He said that the way they arrange their federal funding program hasn't changed and reacted to MAP-21 whereas MnDOT did react and change their funding programs. He added that North Dakota also hasn't felt the need to separate out the collector system between major and minor collectors, so we are on a holding pattern on the North Dakota side. He stated that they have already addressed the urbanized issue last year, but on the Minnesota side we have to go through this process.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

**MATTER OF U.S. HIGHWAY #2 ACCESS STUDY**

Haugen reported that he included a copy of the agenda, and the presentation given at the first Steering Committee meeting. He said that he did include the membership roster, showing who the members are and who they are representing, as well.

Haugen referred to the power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request), and commented that they talked a little about why they are studying the area, the crash history, and what our critical intersections will be. He said that there have been some communications with the Airport Authority about the Airport Drive intersection.

Haugen stated that, as many of you are aware, the NDDOT went through and did a Grand Forks County and a Grand Forks City Local Roads Safety Program process in which they looked at all the crashes and came up with a kind of strategy as to how to mitigate them. He briefly went over the concept developed for the Airport Drive intersection with U.S. #2, which involves removal of the traffic signals, eliminate left turns and throughs, and place them upstream as median turns.

Vein asked what the speed limit is through that section. Haugen responded that it is 65 mph or more one way, and 55 mph the other way. Vein said that they aren't saying change the speeds, just the geometrics. Haugen agreed, adding that that is what this program came up with, to remove the traffic signals. He added that the purpose of our study is to say that that is one alternative, what other things might we do. He commented that the Airport Authority reacted quite negatively to the suggestion of removing the signals.

Haugen commented that they also spent some time just informing the committee, and as part of your packet, of the Grand Forks Strategic Growth Initiatives that they have going on in the area. He said that the area is being primed for development, and there is some infrastructure plans that will be requiring approval over the next couple of years. He stated that the Planning Commission in Grand Forks did receive, and looked at this development proposal, so they already have the landowner starting the process of designating what the future land uses will be for that area.

Haugen reported that the next activity you will hear about on this study is, we are tentatively scheduling something for either the second or third week of September, an open house, but we are also going to have an invite to all of the property owners along the whole corridor to come in and have one-on-one meetings with the project team to kind of find out what their development plans might be, as well as to get them up to speed as to what the study entails.

Vein asked who the project team is. Haugen responded that KLJ is the consultant on this project. Vein asked if this is an MPO project. Haugen responded it is. He referred to the committee roster, and went over it briefly.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

**MATTER OF SOLICITATION OF 2015-2016 WORK PROGRAM ACTIVITIES**

Haugen reported that we do a two year work program that identifies all of the activities and studies that we will be doing with our federal funds over those two years.

Haugen commented that as we come to the end of our 2014 work year we have to establish a new two year work program so we are now soliciting for projects, activities for the next two years. He said that if you have any ideas now would be the time to communicate them to MPO staff as they will ultimately need to be approved by your individual governing bodies before we can consider they be included in our program.

Haugen stated that there is a new process this year; the federal entities are requiring we identify that our next update to our Long Range Transportation Plan is due by the end of 2019, so we need to tell them how we are going to reach that date with all the different studies, so we have identified how we are going to do that. He said that we would normally be working next year, and through half of June 2016 updating each Cities Land Use Plans; and in 2016 and 2017 updating our Bike/Ped and Transit Plans; and then engaging in our Long Range Transportation Plan is about a two year process as well, so you will see at your City Council meetings, through your Planning Departments' portion of the work activities asking the MPO to assist with updating your Land Use Plans.

Haugen reiterated that the reason this is on the agenda is to inform you that we are soliciting work activities, so give us your ideas and vet them through either himself or your engineering staff will vet it through to make sure it is eligible for us, and then you can go through our council before we can formally consider it as a work activity for the MPO.

Information only.

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON SAFETY INTEGRATION INTO THE LONG RANGE  
TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

Haugen introduced Sarah Erickson, MPO Intern, and stated that she has worked for the MPO this summer. He stated that, as we processed the Long Range Transportation Plan, we said ?? soon, one of the reasons was because those local roads safety program plans have redeveloped, primarily when the North Dakota side got a new funding opportunity and new funding screen that we can incorporate into the plan, so Sarah has been working these past three months in trying to get us to a point where we can propose how we will amend the plan to integrate these projects.

Erickson referred to a power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request), and explained that she would be going over it briefly.

Vein asked if he is correct that MAP-21 has a sunset attached to it. Haugen responded that it does. Vein asked if it is coming on. Haugen responded that it has been extended to May 30<sup>th</sup>, 2015. Vein said, though, that if we lose funding it changes, a lot. Haugen responded that that is

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

correct. He added that besides funding, all of the proposals for the next authorization bill have carried these concepts through, the only thing that they are bickering about is the funding portion of it. Vein said, however, that the reality is that there is less federal monies today than in the past, correct. Haugen responded that it purchases less. He explained that the actual dollar amount is more, but it purchases less.

Presentation ensued.

Information only.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Possible Additional Monies

Vetter asked, since we aren't spending nearly what we thought we were going to spend on these bridges, will there be any opportunity to move the remaining funds to other projects. Haugen responded that the funds could not be shifted to other projects or locations. Haugen added that the only opportunity would be if you can convince the DOTs to fund those enhancements, betterments, those types of activities with those funds that were set aside and would normally have been used towards a major rehab or replacement of those bridges. He added that all those enhancements or betterments that have been discussed are eligible under the main funding program the State DOTs are using for those bridges, so, the short answer is they can't just tell you to go after TAP money, but you can tell them that what we are proposing is eligible in your project program, and you had so much money and you are saving millions of dollars, so that would be an argument you can use.

Information only.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY MALM, TO ADJOURN THE AUGUST 20<sup>TH</sup>, 2014,  
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:33 P.M.***

***Voting Aye: Powers, Malm, Vein, Leigh, Vetter, and Mock.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE  
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

In Chairman, Steve Adams', absence, Mike Powers, Secretary, called the September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014 meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:01 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Mike Powers, Gary Malm, Clarence Vetter, Warren Strandell, Greg Leigh, and Jeannie Mock.

Absent: Steve Adams and Ken Vein.

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

Guest(s): Jane Williams, GF City Engineering Department; Mike Yavarow, GF City Engineering Department; and David Kuharenko, GF City Engineering Department.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Powers declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 20<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 20<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Powers, Malm, Strandell, Leigh, and Vetter.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

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

**Sorlie Bridge**

Haugen reported that, as indicated in the staff report, on the Sorlie Bridge they announced last month that the project has been scaled back to a mostly minor rehab project, and that there would

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

be a presentation scheduled. He said that that presentation has still not been scheduled, so there really isn't much more to update you on, on the Sorlie at this time.

Haugen commented, however, that you will see in another agenda item that we are still programming close to \$30,000,000 for this project as the planned minor rehab has still not been made official, thus the dollar amount has not yet been changed.

Haugen stated that he thinks it is just a matter of meshing schedules that is causing the delay in giving the presentation, so it is hoped that it will be scheduled in October so we can become more informed of what the minor rehab activities will be.

Mock reported present.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen stated that he would like to begin with the issue of the low area in East Grand Forks. He reiterated that at last month's meeting that MnDOT did extend the Kennedy Bridge project limits beyond the low area, and told us that, depending on the Corps of Engineers determination, if a minor fill can be done to fix the problem they would do it as part of the Kennedy Bridge project; however, if it requires mitigation to the flood protection system it would be outside the project and wouldn't be done.

Haugen reported that he did include, just for reference, information from our Bridge Closure Management Plan in the packet. He referred to a table showing the levels at which the bridges would be closed during a flood event, and went over it briefly.

Haugen commented that on the Kennedy Bridge, with the two ramps on the Minnesota side, we can add temporary berms to get an additional two feet of protection. He said, however, that when we did this document, there are some that felt, and he included a comment that was received right before the Technical Advisory Committee meeting last week, that there are a lot of conditions that have to happen, and approval that has to be gotten before the temporary earth and berm can be put in place, so we probably should still focus on the fact that it is a 52-foot protection level.

Haugen stated that he heard from MnDOT that their preliminary analysis was showing that maybe a foot to a foot and a quarter road raise, and a temporary earthen dam would get us two feet of protection, but we are still waiting for the Corps of Engineer's decision on that.

Haugen said that, going back to the issue of signature features, we are looking at holding our public meeting on the 29<sup>th</sup> or 30<sup>th</sup> of this month, here in this room, from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. He explained that the month of September has five Mondays and five Tuesdays so there shouldn't be a conflict with any of the City Council meetings. He added that they are still trying to schedule some of the staff people from the two DOTs to ensure the right people are in attendance.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen reported that there has been some movement yet this morning regarding signature features, the first being that the NDDOT announced that they would contribute up to \$200,000 toward any signature features, or roughly 1% of the \$20,000,000 project. He added that 80% of the \$200,000 would be federal funds, and 20% would come from the State of North Dakota since the bridge is on the primary system.

Leigh asked, when you say signature features, could you give us an example other than lighting and signage. Haugen responded that that is still to be determined, such as creating landscaping, or flower beds, or different colored paint schemes on the truss system, or a commemorative plaque. He added that one thing that both the NDDOT and MnDOT stressed is that whatever signature features can't prolong the environmental review process, so they want to make sure that everything is contained within the existing right-of-way, and that the features that might be added don't get into significant historical preservation issues.

Leigh asked if the meeting would be addressing what features could be done so we don't go down the road of picking features that will be turned down anyway. Haugen responded that they would be doing that. He added that they are going to try to manage the expectations of the suggestions that are put forth. He cited the Sorlie Bridge lighting project, and how the original concept plan that the Downtown Leadership Group put out was much bigger than what was actually approved after the project development process and the historic mitigation process was completed. He said that he thinks this is a good visual tool as to managing some expectations of what can happen versus what happens from a good concept or a real pronounced concept in real life, so we are going to do our best to try to manage that.

Haugen stated that the NDDOT did not limit their \$200,000 to just those previous items discussed, although they cited them as examples of things that the \$200,000 could go towards. He said that we have MnDOT saying that in the instance of the decorative lighting, they would fund 100% of their portion, and NDDOT is now contributing \$200,000 towards any signature features.

Haugen said that the another thing he wants to spend a little time on is that by extending the project limits for the low area, that also caused, what he thinks would be a signature feature issue to be resolved. He explained that originally when we talk about the bike/ped facilities, the project limits themselves were going to end at the end of the guardrail, so whatever bike/ped facilities MnDOT would participate in would end right there, and would get you over and across the bridge into North Dakota, so it seemed reasonable that if we are talking about amenities or signature features, connecting the end of the bike/ped system to the existing bike/ped trail would be a good signature feature. He said, however, that because they are trying to limit the environmental issues and staying within the right-of-way, MnDOT would be able to get us to the bottom of the ramp within the right-of-way, which would get us closer to the existing facility, so they have come quite a way to connecting it to the trail system, but we will need to figure out how to make the final connection. He stated that we aren't talking about trying to cover from the bridge itself to the trail, which is a much shorter distance.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Leigh asked why we wouldn't go the shorter distance, what is the difference. Haugen responded that it is all involving that right-of-way. He explained that MnDOT's project cannot go outside their existing right-of-way, and to make the connection to the greenway trail would be outside of that right-of-way. Leigh asked if it was DNR property. Haugen responded that a lot of the property is DNR property. Leigh said, then, that it belongs to the State of Minnesota, and by their allowing this to be done it would save the taxpayer a lot of money if they would just do the shortcut, which would make more sense.

Haugen said, then, that instead of having the bike/ped facility stop at the end of the guardrail on the Minnesota side, they are now committing to get it to stop further down, so we just need to figure out where to connect it to the greenway trail system. He explained that they can only participate in this to the right-of-way line, and the right-of-way line pretty much follows the slope of the ramp.

Leigh asked what the process would be to contact the DNR to see if we could all work together to shorten that connection up. Haugen responded that the DNR has their Legacy Grant process, their Legacy Trail process, so we could go that route; and there is also the Transportation Alternatives Program process that this would be an eligible project for, so there are a couple of funding opportunities that would be right in step timewise with the bridge project.

Leigh said that the only other thought he would have would be extending it down would be that the incline wouldn't quite as severe as if you went straight down the middle. Haugen responded that we would have to work with the ADA slope requirements.

Powers asked if there has been any discussion on the merge issues with the ramp that exists onto the bridge from East Grand Forks. Haugen responded that they have heard our concerns with that ramp. Powers stated that it would be nice if they could do something like they did down by the fire hall in Grand Forks on DeMers where they made it more of an angle turn than a curved turn. Haugen responded that by extending the project limits the ramp is more into play, where before their project limits ended before the ramp. Leigh commented that he would rather see it curved a little bit, but you wouldn't want to stop traffic altogether because then you would be taking off from a dead stop onto a highway, but, of course it is only 35-miles an hour. Powers stated that it is sometimes hard to merge off that ramp because you're looking back over your shoulder and it is hard to see. He added that he is actually surprised that there aren't more rear-end accidents on that ramp.

Haugen said that he doesn't know if this body wants to make comments on the \$200,000 as to whether it is too much or too little. He added that he isn't sure how they came up with that value.

Haugen reported that on the North Dakota side, just focusing on the bike/ped issues, obviously there is a connection already right at the bridge itself down into the greenway trail system, but we should try to figure out how to connect to where the bikeway system comes underneath the bridge and heads west. He explained that there is actually a gap in the system there, so a connection would be desirable. He added that going through the alley would seem like the most logical solution. Malm pointed out that that is a historical district, and it is all residential through

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

that area for the first block. Haugen stated that this could be a TAP application from the City of Grand Forks to do this.

Information only.

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

Haugen reported that this is a request that came from the City of Grand Forks and the NDDOT. He said that you may recall that at the Columbia Road/24<sup>th</sup> Avenue intersection, the traffic signals foundation needs to be replaced. He commented that at one time the cost estimate to do the work was \$24,000, but the most recent cost estimate has it closer to \$300,000. He stated that the original federal amount was \$16,000, and it is now \$166,000, so we need to amend the T.I.P. to reflect that significant increase in federal participation.

Haugen commented that, as you look through the information in the packet, you will see that we are really doing some clean-up work, and a lot of the activity that should have waited for this T.I.P. amendment has already occurred, so we are trying to get the necessary changes made now with this T.I.P. amendment.

Haugen reported that a public hearing was held at last Wednesday's Technical Advisory Committee meeting, and received no comment, so both staff and the Technical Advisory Committee are recommending approval of this T.I.P. amendment to increase the federal participation for the Signal Foundations at Columbia Road and 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue South.

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE FY2014-2017 T.I.P. AMENDMENT, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Powers, Malm, Strandell, Leigh, Vetter, and Mock.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF 2015-2018 MINNESOTA SIDE T.I.P.**

Haugen reported that this is the final Minnesota side only 2015-2018 T.I.P. He reiterated that we just amended the 2014-2017 T.I.P., and typically we would be adopting a combined North Dakota and Minnesota T.I.P., however North Dakota is not prepared for us to take action this month on their portion of the T.I.P.

Haugen commented that we did advertise that a public hearing would take place at today's meeting. He added that in the advertisement we did state that people could provide written comments up until 11:00 a.m. this morning, however none were received.

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

***Voting Aye: Powers, Malm, Strandell, Leigh, Vetter, and Mock.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

There was no one present for discussion.

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

***Voting Aye: Powers, Malm, Strandell, Leigh, Vetter, and Mock.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

Leigh asked what Projects 12 and 16 are. Haugen responded that there is a disconnect between our numbering system and the private listing, unfortunately. He explained that the one project, 12, is the preliminary engineering for the Sorlie Bridge; and 16 is the actual project itself, so they both affect the Sorlie Bridge, but funding for Project 12 comes from 2017 funds and is for the preliminary engineering portion of the project, and is scoped out as their half of the full EIS process, so it is a high dollar amount, \$3,000,000; and Project 16 is the actual Sorlie Bridge project in 2018.

Haugen commented that all the other projects have been vetted through the City Council and also the MPO and were found to be consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan and were prioritized. He added that they have tried to iron out any and all discrepancies between our document and the State's document, and we feel this is good to go with the exception of correcting the numbering on the map.

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT FINAL  
FY2015-2018 MINNESOTA SIDE T.I.P., AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Powers, Malm, Strandell, Leigh, Vetter, and Mock.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF U.S. HIGHWAY #2 ACCESS MANAGEMENT STUDY UPDATE**

Haugen reported that they held a public open house yesterday evening on the U.S. Highway #2 Access Management Study. He displayed a photo from the meeting, and explained that it was taken last evening. He said that they had twenty-five people attend, which is a very good turnout. He explained that something they did this time that they haven't in the past was to send out an individual mailing to all the property owners inviting them to the meeting, and also did a follow-up phone call to the majority of those owners to remind them of the meeting.

Haugen commented that prior to the public meeting, at 9:00 a.m. in the morning they met with the Regional Airport Authority and many of the tenants and services around the airport. He explained that the reason for this was due to some excitement being generated about an option the local road safety program document shows for the Airport/US Highway 2 intersection.

Haugen referred to a drawing illustrating the proposed option, and went over it briefly. He stated that at the meeting they tried to dispel that this is a concluded solution to that intersection by saying that: "Yes, this document does identify this as a solution, but we are taking a guarded approach by saying that it is an alternative that we will look at, but it has not been decided that this is the solution for that intersection."

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Leigh asked how you get from north to south using this proposed solution. Haugen responded that you would turn right from the Airport, go down a bit and do a median crossover. He added that to do a left turn out you would essentially do the same. He said that this option has been successful where they have been implemented, and do considerably reduce crashes at such locations as this, but whether we know for a fact that this is the right solution for this intersection, that hasn't been analyzed yet, but it will be analyzed as one of the alternatives.

Haugen stated that ultimately his impression of the airport meeting was that everyone felt that we had already made a decision on a solution without any input, and their message to them was that we are just starting the process; and while this is an alternative that has been identified, they certainly haven't concluded that it is the solution we will choose.

Haugen reported that the public meeting was fairly well attended, and a lot of good comments were received. He added that some particular issues of property owners were raised and will be considered as they move forward with the study.

Discussion on the proposed alternative and the crash data information from that intersection ensued.

Haugen stated that a good portion of the public meeting involved discussion on development along the corridor and how, perhaps what is currently out there isn't conducive to extending or keeping some of the existing facilities and access points, but they all generally agreed that we are going to sort of set the plan for how it is going to grow. He pointed out that if, and when it migrates west we would develop a core concept of how the rest of it will continue to develop with the road and access points.

Leigh asked at what point a service road would be put in there. Haugen responded that there already is a service road for part of that area, and that, in-and-of itself has a lot of issues at both ends of it so it may not be something they recommend remain in place. Leigh asked if a service road would eliminate access points. Haugen responded it would. He added that this concept is actually referred to as a frontage road. He pointed out that behind Happy Harry's, and on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue in front of Wal-Mart is a backage service road. He explained that the advantage of a backage road versus the frontage road is that you are able to service two pieces of property on either side of it to help pay for the cost of maintenance.

Haugen referred to the map, and pointed out that number 5 on the map is a wastewater lift station, and is in the City of Grand Forks' budget to be built next year. He said that it will service all the surrounding area, so the City has "primed the pump" to get development going here. Leigh asked if they aren't going to put one in the southwest part of the City as well, out by 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue South. Haugen responded that they were considering putting on south and west of Revolutions Sport Center, or U.S. Foods on 32<sup>nd</sup>.

Malm commented that he doesn't feel that there will be much residential out there because the soil is saline and it is almost impossible to grow grass or anything. He said that you can put a parking lot in there, and then mound up and put a nice landscape affect, but the soil doesn't grow anything.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen reported that two meetings ago the Grand Forks Planning Commission received a development concept for that area where the lift station is proposed to be installed. He referred to a photo of the area, and pointed out the property owned by the Adams Family, and went over their concept for that property, which includes higher density residential, lower density residential, combination parks, stormwater, higher density residential, and then some extension of industrial kind of uses along the railroad. He said that that is the concept that was presented, although no formal action was taken, but as this is our initial thought of how we could develop this land, the City is installing that lift station to help.

Haugen stated that what they are trying to figure out, and you can see they sort of have a backage road concept instead of a frontage road, is whether that is the right way to service and prevent access points up here, because if they start it they would like to extend it as they go west to maintain continuity. Malm asked what they will do when they get to the drainway. Haugen responded that that is going to be an impediment they will have to cross, and is part of the cost of developing this half of the section both north and south.

Information only.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

1. 2015-2016 Work Program

Haugen reported that he did send the e-mail showing this body the action the Fargo Metropolitan Council of Governments might take tomorrow. He explained that it involves \$300,000 additional federal funds they may allocate to us.

Haugen stated that our 2015 Work Program will be bumped up from its normal \$750,000 budget to over a million dollars, and as that staff report, and the letter that will follow will state is that Fargo/Moorhead is in no way implying that the distribution formula is flawed, this is just a one-time problem in that they have too much money and they can't use it at this time.

Powers asked if action is required on this in order to be able to spend the funds. Haugen responded that we can't take action until we are formally offered the funds. Leigh added that once we get the money then we can propose how to spend it. Haugen agreed, adding that we will just roll it into our work program activities for 2015, and we already have the solicitation for project out and staff are in the process of determining what projects they would like to have considered.

Haugen commented that we also asked the NDDOT to provide some State Funds to help local match. He said that their written answer was no, they couldn't do that, and that was in specific response to just offering local assistance for overall MPO activity; however, they have since said that they will offset local money for studies specific to their State Highway System, so we have identified some potential studies, and are going through the cycle, so there may be one or two of those studies that show up as something we recommend we undertake in 2015. He explained that we normally follow an 80/20 split, with the 20% being split between North Dakota and Minnesota, so they will provide half of North Dakotas' portion of the 20% local match.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen said, then, that in October you will have to decide if you want to accept the \$300,000, and then if you do accept it identify what work activities we are going to undertake in 2015 and 2016, are specific North Dakota State Highway projects.

Information only.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO ADJOURN THE SEPTEMBER 17<sup>TH</sup>,  
2014, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:46 P.M.***

***Voting Aye: Powers, Malm, Strandell, Leigh, Vetter, and Mock.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE  
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Steve Adams, Chairman, called the October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014 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, Gary Malm, Clarence Vetter, Greg Leigh, and Jeannie Mock.

Absent: Warren Strandell and Ken Vein.

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

Guest(s): Mike Yavarow, GF City Engineering Department; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; and Kris Bakkegard, KLJ.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Powers declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF SORLIE BRIDGE PROJECT PRESENTATION**

Haugen reported that Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; and Kris Bakkegard, KLJ are present today to give a presentation on the Sorlie Bridge Project.

Noehre stated that just over 18-months ago the North Dakota and Minnesota Departments of Transportation retained the services of a consultant team lead by Kadrmas, Lee and Jackson (KLJ) to start the project development process on the Sorlie Bridge. He said that their first task was to review all existing inspection reports and complete their own minor review of the structure to come up with a recommendation to the DOTs on the type of environmental document that they should pursue. He stated that, based on those initial findings, it was decided that we would pursue an Environmental Impact Statement, or EIS, which is the highest form of environmental documentation.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Noehre commented that the next phase of the project development was to follow the EIS process and to also look at the entire bridge in greater depth, inspecting each individual member and each individual connection. He said that this in-depth analysis; along with some recent updates; and national standards on evaluating this type of bridge; we were led to a different conclusion than was initially anticipated.

Noehre introduced Kris Bakkegard, the project manager for KLJ, and explained that he is present today to outline their findings and go over the future proposed steps for the project development for the Sorlie Bridge.

Bakkegard said that Mr. Noehre has given highlights of the process to-date, and he would now like to fill in the gaps, as well as talk about what is expected moving forward.

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

Bakkegard explained that, as Mr. Noehre noted, their team did recommend starting this project as an EIS. He said that this was based on what they knew going into the project, which at that time was a concern that maybe all of the gusset plates (the plates that connect the main truss members together), may need to be replaced, and in order to do that you really have to do an extensive amount of work, including closing the bridge, remove the existing deck, and repair each plate individually as you march across the bridge, and it is very time consuming and would take probably a year or two to complete.

Bakkegard stated that in their initial review it appeared that such an extensive repair would actually lead us close to the cost of replacement of the bridge entirely, so through discussions with the two DOTs an agreement was reached to look at all options, including repairing the existing bridge, but also potentially replacing it or building a new one. He commented that, with all of this information, and with the historic nature of the bridge, and the complexity of the project they determined that an EIS should be started as there would likely be some significant level of impact somewhere, either from a traffic standpoint or a closure standpoint or an historic standpoint, so they led off the project with an EIS.

Bakkegard commented that one of the first steps in the EIS process is to develop what the purpose and need of the project is, which is a federal requirement, and what is shown on the slide are the two statements that they developed for the project, and as they move forward they don't see it changing much. He added that they are basically saying that this is an important crossing and you need to maintain a safe and reliable crossing for the public at this location going into the future.

Bakkegard reported that one of the first tasks they needed to do was their own independent review of the bridge. He said that the first step they took was to take all the data off the existing plans and begin doing an evaluation and rating; a calculation of what the capacity of the bridge is and determine whether or not they agree with the numbers that have been calculated over the years.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Bakkegard stated that one of the first things they noted was that Federal Highway had to come out with a new guidance on rating these connection plates, specifically the gusset plates, since the last full rating had been done on the structure. He explained that through research that Federal Highway did over the course of many years, they concluded that there were some loadings and some stresses that engineers like themselves used in their rating calculations that those plates never really saw. He said that there was some conservativeness there, which is kind of their engineering nature, in that they said that they were going to look at all possible ways this plate could see loading and they were going to analyze it, and based on that they did their ratings according to the new guidance, and found that the plates had more capacity than what they were originally rated at.

Bakkegard reported that this then became a discussion point with the two DOTs; that maybe we don't have to replace them all, that they are in pretty good shape, and it isn't like it is a major deterioration issue, but rather how they are being rated and what their capacity is. He said that at that point the two DOTs said that that is fine, they would keep evaluating this, but that they would like KLJ to go out and take a deep look at the bridge, do a top-to-bottom inspection and tell them if there is anything else that might push them right back into this being a very extensive project with a very drawn out construction schedule. He said they did that last spring, and they found that the bridge is really in very good condition, but it does need some work, although nothing of any real significance.

Bakkegard stated that they finalized their work on the report and it is currently being reviewed by the DOTs, and they are now determining how to move forward from here. He said that, basically, where they are as a team now is recommending to the DOTs that the repair work that is left, after they take away these major gusset plate replacements, is really more of a maintenance type of project, there are not any kind of major structural issues, and time elements would be much shorter. He added that there is a good likelihood that they will be able to do most of this work and still maintain at least a lane of traffic on the bridge, which certainly wouldn't have been the case previously, so based on this they are recommending to the DOTs that we move forward with a scaled down project, we move away from the EIS process, move away from evaluating these structures and focus more on just a maintenance project for the structure itself.

Bakkegard commented that in looking at a shorter construction schedule they can scale back the environmental documentations as they would limit themselves to not doing anything major with the structure, including replacements, so they can do a much more simple environmental process.

Leigh asked, in this maintenance schedule, would it include painting the bridge. Bakkegard responded that is one of the items that they are recommending, and he believes that it is likely that there would be a painting done if they are going to do some work on the structure, that would be one of the elements that would be done. Leigh commented that he sees that lighting doesn't seem to be a big issue, but in talking about the Kennedy Bridge aesthetics, he feels that the Sorlie Bridge is really more visible in terms of the entertainment districts, he would like to see additional lighting features be a part of the project, and wondered if it could be included as part of the funding as well, or would it be local funding. Bakkegard responded that it could be,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

he added that they certainly talked a little bit about aesthetics and the extensiveness of the project, and he believes there will still be a discussion on levels of aesthetics. He said that the only criteria they are working on now is that they are going to leave the project at more of a maintenance, or base level, and not get into any major controversies or impacts to agencies, and the biggest one he heard on the lighting is just working with the historic groups to make sure that what they do with lighting doesn't detract from the view of the bridge in other ways, so he won't say that it will be included, but they aren't eliminating it from further discussions, it will be part of the discussion as they move forward.

Leigh asked, if the bridge is painted, who chooses the color, will it be silver again. Bakkegard responded that that typically, in his experience, falls back to again a discussion with the historic preservation offices, they are sometimes fairly particular about the paint colors matching what they've been, historically, so there is a likelihood that if silver has always been its color, that might be their emphasis, but it doesn't mean it has to be, but that is typically what he has seen, and there will be ongoing discussion on this. Leigh asked, have they ever been painted any other color. Bakkegard responded that he has done some where they haven't been as particular, mostly because there maybe hasn't been a prominent color that has been on the bridge, or there hasn't been anything documented, and they have done a couple of rehabs where the owner of the bridge has chosen a color and the preservation offices have accepted it, but he has also seen some where they have held pretty firm on what they feel is the historic color of the bridge, so, while he can't say for certain, he feels there is a pretty good likelihood that because this bridge has always been silver, that is what they will want it to remain silver.

Leigh asked, then, with this process of going forward with just repairing the bridge, at what point do we as a group need to get together and say, we would like the bridge to be brown, and we would like to have these kinds of lights placed on it, as a presentation to the Historical Society, or as a group to have a consensus on a possible color change, or jazzing it up at the taxpayer's expense, just to have a conversation. Bakkegard explained that what will happen moving forward is; we are here today gathering input as much as anything, and although they also wanted to give an update on what they are finding, they are really here gathering input. He said that the project will still move forward, there will still be another input meeting once they redefine the project and look at alternatives again, and they will have public informational meetings and input meetings regarding what the DOTs are thinking in terms of options and alternatives, so today is a good day to let them know what you would like included in the matrix of options so they can take it back to the project team for consideration and inclusion. He added that once the team has determined what will or won't work, they will bring the information back to this body, probably sometime early next year for more discussion.

Leigh commented that one thing he would like to see done is to take a look at lighting the bridge so we have proper lighting on both the pedestrian and the vehicle sides, because the current lighting, half of it doesn't work, so he would imagine that you will upgrade the lighting. Noehre responded that they will look at upgrading the lighting for the roadway and the pedestrian walkways, but anything beyond that would be an enhancement, which they can still look at, but it would not be part of the project funding.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Noehre stated that, to add to what Mr. Bakkegard said, they can look at these things, but there is going to be a box around the things that they can look at, they are going to be doing a dedicated CATEX, so that means that there is a universe of options available, but because some options would change the historic character of the bridge and would require mitigation even it would be allowed, it would be outside the documented CATEX and they would not consider them at all, but there is potential for some things.

Powers asked how long a paint job lasts. Noehre responded that it should last twenty to thirty years. Bakkegard added that he thinks the Sorlie was last painted in the early to mid-80s, although there was probably some touchup work done, but it has been thirty to forty years since it was last done.

Powers commented that, although he knows this is hypothetical, to say the least, but when this is all said and done, how long will this rehab last before it needs to be done again. Bakkegard responded that with something that has aged to the point that the Sorlie Bridge has, there is never an absolute certainty, but based on their experience, and what they are seeing with the structure itself, if it is well maintained, and this bridge has been well maintained, if that continues into the future they don't see any reason it wouldn't be another twenty to forty years before you would have to do anything like this again, and then at that point the same evaluation would be done to see if anything has happened that would cause the need to take the bridge off the ability to continue to maintain it. He said that these old steel trusses, if you keep them maintained, last very well, although there are some areas that you need to watch.

Bakkegard summarized by saying that this is really the bulk of what they had to present today, so if anyone has any other ideas, concerns, or thoughts they would like to see moved forward down this path he would certainly like to take those back as well. He said that what he described today is the direction the DOTs would both like to have with the project, so they are just gathering input from both City Councils, and this body as well.

Malm asked what the timeline is for the project. Bakkegard responded that the project is still scheduled to be constructed in 2018. Malm asked when the Kennedy is scheduled to be done. Haugen responded that it is scheduled for 2016. Malm asked if they are looking at doing anything about the pedestrian flow. Bakkegard responded that they are looking at this issue, but he will say that their options for modifying the bridge may be reduced as they reduce the project back to more of a maintenance mode versus a full-blown reconstruct type mode, but they are still looking at options for pedestrians and bicycles. Noehre pointed out that there are three lanes across the bridge and they are only using two, so a bike lane could be an option to consider.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Next MPO Executive Policy Board Meeting

Haugen reported that the next MPO Executive Policy Board meeting would normally be on Wednesday, October 15<sup>th</sup>, but because of some delays with the North Dakota Side T.I.P. it is hoped that it will be held on Wednesday, October 22<sup>nd</sup> instead.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE MOVING THE NEXT MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD MEETING FROM WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 15<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, TO WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 22<sup>ND</sup>, 2014.***

***Voting Aye: Powers, Leigh, Vetter, Adams, and Mock.***

***Voting Nay: Malm.***

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY MALM, TO ADJOURN THE OCTOBER 8<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:25 P.M.***

***Voting Aye: Powers, Malm, Leigh, Vetter, Adams, and Mock.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE  
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2014 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Steve Adams, Chairman, called the October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2014 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: Mike Powers, Gary Malm, Clarence Vetter, Warren Strandell, Greg Leigh, Steve Adams, Ken Vein, and Jeannie Mock.

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

Guest(s): Jane Williams, GF City Engineering Department and Mike Yavarow, GF City Engineering Department.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Powers declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 17<sup>TH</sup>, AND OCTOBER 8<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 17<sup>TH</sup>, AND OCTOBER 8<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Vein, Mock, Adams, Powers, Malm, Strandell, Vetter and Leigh.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

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

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that, as indicated in the staff report, a special meeting was held on October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014, and they were informed that the project would be scaled back considerably, and would now be more of a maintenance type project.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2014**

Haugen commented that, as part of the EIS (Environmental Impact Statement) process they started, they had to set up a committee of all the different federal, state, and local review agencies that would be participating in the EIS process. He said that a conference call was held with that group a week or so after the special meeting, and during that conversation one of the things that was mentioned was the possibility of moving the project up now.

Haugen explained that because the project is now basically a maintenance project, that would entail painting as well as some minor repairs; there may be a strong possibility that it could be moved in 2015 instead of 2018; however, that decision has not been made at this time as they still have not received a cost estimate from KLJ as to the cost of this maintenance project will be.

Haugen stated that some of the processes they will have to go through if they decide to move the project up to 2015 is to see whether or not there is funding available, not just from North Dakota and Minnesota, but from the City of Grand Forks as well as they have to participate in 10% of the North Dakota portion of the project cost.

Haugen said that some other processes they still have to go through, and there has been a lot of discussion on signature features on the Sorlie, are to determine whether or not the maintenance project would be scoped to allow these signature features. He added that if it is scoped to allow for some than we would have to go through a process to determine what it is that would be done.

Haugen commented that the final step would be to bring the finalized project scope to the MPO for approval of a T.I.P. amendment to move the project from 2018 to 2015.

Haugen stated that he just wanted to alert this body to the fact that there may be a push to move this project into the 2015 construction year. He added that if they miss 2015 they more than likely won't try to do it in 2016 because the Kennedy Bridge is still programmed to occur at that time, so they would most likely move it to 2017.

Haugen reported that another thing that happened was that they have separated the Sorlie Bridge project from the DeMers Avenue project on the Grand Forks side. He explained that they were both under the same EIS umbrella; but now, because they have determined that they may want to move one up into 2015, they have separated them from that documentation process.

Haugen commented that the DeMers Avenue project will likely be a normal type of transportation reconstruction project that North Dakota does year in and year out with their standard processes of project development. He said that they don't anticipate that having to have an EIS component at all, but it does need to be scoped out a bit further to determine what type of impacts it may have that would require they go further into the environmental process.

Leigh asked if they would only be closing one half of the bridge at a time. Haugen responded that that is what they mentioned at the meeting, that they felt that they could keep traffic flowing, and that is also why they feel that they can move it up into 2015 because they don't have to develop massive traffic detour plans and other traffic strategies.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2014**

Mock asked if still has an impact or does it drop down to a categorical exclusion. Haugen responded that their focus is to get that categorical exclusion, and maintain everything that is now within the confinement of categorical exclusion; so when we talk about signature features, anything that might go out beyond that envelope of what is there now, they are trying to stay away from because that opens up the question of whether it is adverse impact, and does it have to be mitigated, and does that kick us from a CAT EX process into an EA (Environmental Assessment). He said that they are trying to minimize the options so that they aren't exploring things that would delay the possible 2015 improvement. Mock, said, then, that we don't know how that impacts pedestrian and bicycles yet. Haugen responded that that would be correct. He added that in all likelihood if you are talking about expanding the sidewalks, that would kick it out of the CAT EX possibility because you would be going outside the existing structures, adding to it.

Haugen commented that the two things that were kind of still left in play are whether or not the bike/ped accommodations can be enhanced or bettered, and also improving the lighting on the structure. He added that during the conference call there was talk, a little, about the paint color, but not much.

Vein asked if the estimates that would be coming forward would give two different costs, one with and one without enhanced lighting. Haugen responded that he would venture to say that the first cost estimate we will see will be just the base project, and then we might get something like we did on the Kennedy, where the NDDOT gave a budget and stated that it was what they would participate toward enhancements, they might give us a number that they would contribute towards enhancements.

Haugen reported that later on on the agenda you are going to approve the North Dakota side T.I.P., and even though we now know all this information on the Sorlie, the T.I.P. document will still show it as a 2018 project, and at about \$30,000,000 cost. Powers asked if an amendment to that T.I.P. would move up as well. Haugen responded that if they decide to do the project in 2015 it will need to be amended; adding, however, that by that time they will also have identified all of the costs involved with the project and whether or not all involved will have the necessary funding needed.

Information only.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that a public open house on signature features was held on September 29<sup>th</sup>. He said that they did present some ideas on what could be done, which he highlighted in the staff report.

Haugen commented that MnDOT, as lead agency, is reviewing the suggestions we received at the meeting on the 29<sup>th</sup> to see if there is some elements that they want to push forward. He stated that the committee that was formed to look at signature features has not met since its initial meeting, primarily because MnDOT is processing some of those ideas and concepts, but he believes they hope to meet soon to get it done.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2014**

Haugen stated that in regard to the low area on the East Grand Forks side, he does have some information that he received on Monday regarding what the actual proposed level is to raise that area. He referred to a slide that illustrates the current and proposed levels for that area, and went over the information briefly, summarizing that the proposed raise is just shy of one-foot. Leigh asked what it equates to, 52-feet, 53-feet, or what. He asked if this would bring it level with the bridge. Haugen responded that it would be pretty close, adding that the bridge closes at 831 or 52-feet.

Discussion on flood levels ensued.

Malm asked who would make the decision on these enhanced features. Haugen responded that it is still going through the public process, but the committee that was formed would have some input, the public would have some input, and we know there will be some cost constraints, particularly on the North Dakota side that they said that they would be willing to participate in, and everything above that would have to be funded by the City most likely, so the City would have to decide if they want to fund those extra things. He added that this body will also have a say in the event they have to put in a request for a T.I.P. amendment to change the project costs that have been programmed in the T.I.P., so there are several people that have different decision points along the way.

Vetter stated, though, that ultimately what we do here today will need to be approved by the City Council. Leigh added that the City Council has to come up with some funding for any extras over and above what the State is going to pay. Haugen commented that before that T.I.P. Amendment would ever reach this board, each council will have acted on it so we know what they are going to do.

Malm asked where they are going to put the flowers. He said it doesn't even make sense to put flowers on the bridge. Haugen responded that that was one of the suggestions at the special enhancement meeting. Powers commented that they suggested putting flower pots on the railing of the bridge. He said it really decked it out nice. Malm stated that he thinks it is a silly suggestion, adding that there isn't anywhere to put flowers, and who will see them unless you put them up on the railing. Powers said that that is what the picture he saw showed, they were hanging on the rail. Leigh commented that this is just one of those added on features like if you go through Fosston or all these small towns, and even now East Grand Forks, doing beautification type of things, it is nice to look at but he doesn't know that it is all that necessary. Haugen reported that the picture of the bridge with flowers is in the City of Minot, and goes over the railroad. He added that you also need to remember that on the Kennedy Bridge there will be a 10-foot space for bikes and pedestrians, so we will have a whole different environment. Malm pointed out that there are pots on the corners in Grand Forks, and nobody wants to maintain them. Haugen stated that it is pointed out in the staff report that this was part of the presentation, and when you do these things you are adding some costs, so this will be part, hopefully, of the documents that are put underneath your nose when your council member hats are on so you know what you are approving and the full cost, both short and over the long term.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2014**

Haugen reported that right now, basically they are filling in just shy of 320 square feet, so they are asking the Corps of Engineers if it will impact the flood protection system or not. He added that there are three decision points: 1) the Corps can say that no they don't feel it is a significant impact, but either City can raise concern that it is an impact and it can't be mitigated; or 2) everyone can agree that it isn't a significant impact; or 3) everyone can agree it is a significant impact. He said, however, that he would assume that if the Corps of Engineers says it is a significant impact it would be hard for either City to ignore their determination. Vein commented that that would be of this design though. Haugen responded it would. Vein stated that there could be other designs that could have less impact. Haugen responded that there could, but this is the design MnDOT is proposing.

Leigh asked how leveling that roadway off have an impact on the flood protection. Vein responded that that roadway is designed for water overflow; at a certain elevation water will overflow so the higher we raise it the more it will force water to go under the bridge, and of course that will raise the elevation upstream somewhat so the only way to do it is if you do raise that, you would need to offset the amount of water that is flowing over that is being held back by putting a culvert or something underneath it so you still have the same amount of water to flow through and not have an impact, that would be the only way.

Vein commented that ideally, he doesn't know if they will ever be able to get there. He added that, ideally it would be nice that during every major flood event to be able to figure out a way to keep this route open, he just doesn't know how to do that.

Leigh stated that what he is getting at is that if you raise it up, you will still bank the sides of it and block the flow to keep it open, so how could this possibly, it has never gotten wet yet, have that effect on it. Vein responded that what you're looking at is, reality versus basically the design, the design shows it would go over but even in other floods we have extended sandbags on the side to keep it open so it does exactly what you're talking about.

Haugen reported that MnDOT has said that if the Corps of Engineers, and everyone else agrees that this raise is not a significant impact to the flood protection system, it will be done as part of the Kennedy project, so it is already rolled into the project, the only thing that would prevent it from happening would be the decision that there is too much of an impact and it can't be mitigated.

Haugen commented that if you want to have people develop and propose different designs, that is a different avenue, but this is the one that has been submitted to the Corps of Engineers for their analysis.

Vein asked when they expect to hear back from the Corps of Engineers. Haugen responded that it was submitted Monday, so they should hear back in 30-days.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2014**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF MPO SELF-CERTIFICATION**

Haugen reported that, annually, right before we do the T.I.P. document we have to certify to our State and Federal partners that we are fulfilling the requirements of all of these federal codes and regulations. He stated that we put together a write up that explains how we believe we are doing those things, and the MPO staff and the Technical Advisory Committee are recommending that this body approve the MPO Self-Certification document as submitted.

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE FY2014 SELF-CERTIFICATION DOCUMENT, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Vein, Mock, Adams, Powers, Malm, Strandell, Vetter and Leigh.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF 2015-2018 NORTH DAKOTA SIDE T.I.P.**

Haugen referred to a slide presentation, and reported that the actual T.I.P. document is 67 pages long, however he won't go through all of them, but he would like to highlight that two tables show the total dollar amount that will be spent if all of the projects are constructed as estimated. He stated that we will have close to \$100,000,000 invested over the next four years. He added that, with the exception of the two bridge projects, which total, roughly now in this document half of that \$98,000,000, that leaves roughly \$50,000,000 invested in the Grand Forks Side of our MPO area. He pointed out that some of those costs, the dollar values are transit operations, but the bulk of them are roadway improvements.

Haugen commented that if you are more interested in knowing more about the projects and how they changed from our current T.I.P.; on the transit side Grand Forks is anticipating that they will put in a request for three additional fixed-route bus replacements. He said that that request will be before this body next month for approval. He added that, not next month, but another funding source, they are looking for two demand response vehicles replacements and to continue funding the Mobility Manager position.

Haugen stated that the City of Grand Forks did submit TAP projects for consideration, none were awarded funds however. He said that two Safety projects were submitted, one was additional modifications to the left turn lanes on the 34<sup>th</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> Street intersections with 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue; and the City-wide implementation of upgrading their school signs for the new MUTCD and the School Safety Study we did with A.T.A.C., so both of those projects were funded, one in 2017 and one in 2018.

Vein said that he knows there has been some discussion about having something that reads traffic speeds that go by schools, is that what this is. Williams responded that she doesn't believe that that is part of this, this is strictly just for signing. Vein stated that he just didn't know if there was any potential to have something like that incorporated. Haugen pointed out that speed minders have been requested under the TAP funding. Williams added that they have

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2014**

been requesting speed minders for years. Powers asked if they are very effective. Haugen responded that it is his understanding that Polk County used some of their own local dollars to put them in. Strandell said that they used local dollars, adding that it was split between the Cities and the County. Haugen commented that they are actually eligible under both TAP and HSIP for funding.

Haugen reported that they had some projects that initially, in our Draft T.I.P., were described as being slid a year. He said, however, that since the Draft T.I.P. was done to now, as we are in the final, these two projects are back in their original years, but he believes that you were told to expect that they will actually slip to the years we had them originally, but they have to go through the internal process in Bismarck for that to happen.

Haugen pointed out that the project on I-29, the year did slip to next year, but the cost estimate has not yet been agreed on as it has doubled.

Haugen commented that on our Urban Roads Program, Columbia Road was originally going to happen in 2014 but was moved to 2016. He said, however, that the federal portion was not adjusted to reflect the inflation caused by that move, but they have now done that, so this portion of Columbia Road, which is basically from 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue to 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Haugen reported that they also pushed back, from 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue to 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue, from 2017 to 2018, but again they didn't adjust the federal dollar amount to reflect inflation, so another change will be needed.

Haugen stated that the new projects include the 42<sup>nd</sup> Street Project, from Gateway to University Avenue is funded in the T.I.P., and was a request from the City; and also a minor preventive maintenance type project on Highway 81 north of Gateway Drive is also funded in the T.I.P.

Haugen commented that beyond 2018, in 2019 the NDDOT thought that with the bridge projects, particularly the Sorlie Bridge, it being done in 2018, they would focus on just a minor treatment of U.S. Business 2 from Gateway Drive to DeMers because they thought that it would see more traffic and would need some work; and now with what is going on with the Sorlie this project might stick, but they also might think of some other more regionally significant projects such as the Washington Underpass Reconstruction.

Haugen reported that we did advertise that a public hearing would take place at today's meeting.

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

***Voting Aye: Vein, Mock, Adams, Powers, Malm, Strandell, Vetter and Leigh.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

There was no one present for discussion.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2014**

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

***Voting Aye: Vein, Mock, Adams, Powers, Malm, Strandell, Vetter and Leigh.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

Haugen stated that in the advertisement we did state that people could provide written comments up until 11:00 a.m. this morning, however none were received. He added that this T.I.P. document could be characterized as something that we have to adopt today, but we are already being informed that it will be modified in the future to address some of the things that still haven't gone through the Bismarck Headquarters' processes, so knowing that both the MPO Staff and the Technical Advisory Committee are recommending that this body approve the 2015-2018 North Dakota Side T.I.P.

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY VEIN, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT FINAL FY2015-2018 NORTH DAKOTA SIDE T.I.P., AS SUBMITTED.***

Vein asked, regarding the issues with the potential 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Overpass, or the 42<sup>nd</sup> Street Underpass, is that a part of this process. Haugen responded that it isn't. He pointed out that you will notice that in the T.I.P. document there are things that are called "Illustrative Projects", and right now the only Illustrative Project that we are showing, and are continuing to show, is the 42<sup>nd</sup> Street Underpass. He explained that they put this project in as an Illustrative Project two years or so ago because at that time our information was that because the City was doing the environmental documentation it needed to show up in the T.I.P. document in order for the feds to sign the environmental document, so we placed it here in the Illustrative Projects list. He added that just now that environmental document is ready for the federal signatures, but we have now been told that it can't be an Illustrative Project, it has to be a programmed project. He explained that the difference between the two is that illustrative means it has no funding behind it, it is a hoped for project; but a programmed project means that these are the funds we are committing to do this project in this year, and since this project doesn't have committed funds, it is not in the programmed part of the T.I.P. and the feds won't sign the environmental document, but until there is funding committed it can't be a programmed project. And the 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Overpass has the same problem, it can't be shown in the document until we have committed funding for it, but it could be shown as an Illustrative Project. Vein said that that is what he was wondering, because it has been a priority and the council has been back and forth between it and the 42<sup>nd</sup> Street Underpass project, maybe both could be shown as illustrative projects.

Haugen commented that part of our discussion, he was asking whether the 42<sup>nd</sup> Street Underpass project should be shown as an Illustrative Project anymore, because it isn't achieving the reason it was put in in the first place, but the response was that it is there, why not keep it there. He said his response was, well there is a whole list of projects that people want done, that need funding, so which other projects should be in there, or should everything be in there, and that is the kind of discussion we need to have, if we add to our Illustrative Project list, what projects should be included, how many, one or two, or all.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2014**

Vein stated that the only reason he is thinking of those two projects is because he knows they will actually go to the State Government, to the Legislature, potentially and having them identify these projects for state funding, so that is the purpose he is looking for, so that we might keep them listed here in this category. Haugen said that the question we would ask is whether it is a significant change to the document, if it is a significant change to add it then we would have to go through a public process to add it, if it isn't then we wouldn't have to go through that public process. Malm asked who determines that. Haugen responded that this body would have a determining vote on it, but ultimately the federal government would determine whether it is a significant change or not, but he doesn't think they would really go against our decision, but they may.

Vein said, then, that the issue now is whether to leave the 42<sup>nd</sup> Street project in the Illustrative Project list or not, as there isn't any funding available right now for it. Haugen responded that the only action we can take, and he is thinking this because the S.T.I.P. is based off of what our T.I.P. states, so we might affect your public process to have another project added to the Illustrative Project list, so we can leave it in an approve it as it is knowing that in a month or two they are going to come back at us with all those other changes and decide if we want to roll it in or not. He added that we could also ask both cities if we are going to start listing Illustrative Projects, what other projects would you like to see included.

Haugen summarized that that would be the thought he has today, to approve the document as submitted, and then have us go back and seek from both cities what projects, if we are going to open up the Illustrative List, they would like to see included. Vetter commented that the benefit of including project in the Illustrative Project list is that it puts those projects in front of everyone's eyes so if funding does become available it is right there. Haugen said, however, that we would have to maintain a pretty tight list otherwise we are going completely away from the purpose. Vein said that he doesn't envision any other additional projects that they would include, it is just that the project he mentioned are just such large projects that they know they need to get help with them from somewhere.

*Voting Aye: Vein, Mock, Adams, Powers, Malm, Strandell, Vetter and Leigh.*

*Voting Nay: None.*

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF MINNESOTA FUNCTIONAL RECLASSIFICATION**

Haugen reported that this is the result of working with the City of East Grand Forks, MnDOT, and Polk County Engineering on our reaction to the proposed MnDOT Reclassification of highways and roadway in the East Grand Forks area.

Haugen referred to a map illustrating the current Functional Classification, and explained that MnDOT proposed a lot of changes to what is currently in place. He added that in working through the processes, there are several proposed changes that we feel are agreeable, make sense, and others that we don't agree with. He went over the proposed changes briefly.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2014**

Haugen stated that both staff and the Technical Advisory Committee recommend approval. He added that this is a preliminary approval, and he will submit it to MnDOT, they will do their review of it, we will discuss their decision, and if an agreement cannot be reached with them it will go to an arbitrator type system made up of representatives from the MPOs, the RDC, the Counties, the Cities, etc., and what is decided there will be accepted by both sides, then it will come back to this body for final approval sometime this spring.

Strandell asked if these reduced classifications would have an impact or effect on funding. Haugen responded that they currently would not have an impact, but reading between the lines there is a reason why the feds wanted the urban properties to demark major collectors verses minor collectors. He added that on the rural system, if you're not a major collector or above you're not eligible for federal funding, so minor collectors on the rural system are not eligible for federal aid. He said that somewhere down the road people are suggesting, or extrapolating that on the urban side minor collectors won't be eligible, but that is just talk, it may or may not happen, but for now we have to come up with some kind of minor collector system, we would have a hard time saying there aren't any.

Vein asked for clarification between minor verses major collectors, is that something that both Minnesota and North Dakota use now. Haugen responded that it is the federal guideline, each State can adopt it wholeheartedly and use it, or each State can pick and choose what they want to use. He said that MnDOT is adopting it and using it wholeheartedly, and North Dakota is not seeing a need to rush into it yet.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE MINNESOTA  
FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION REVISIONS, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Vein, Mock, Adams, Powers, Malm, Strandell, Vetter and Leigh.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF ADOPTION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE  
MANUAL**

Kouba reported that, just a brief go-over of everything, back when we were doing our Long Range Transportation Plan, the feds had a caveat to approval of the document that we needed to review our environmental justice areas. She said that we went through the process and made sure that we understood what the federal guidelines were by going through training, and we did some methodology changes to ensure that when we looked at minorities and low income areas that we were looking at the same geographic areas. She added that they went from a combination of census blocks to census block groups, which is in the current document, and now we are strictly looking at block groups.

Kouba commented that we are looking at each category individually, so we are looking at high minority areas for projects, and then we will also look at where the low income areas are. She stated that this is a bit of a change due to the methodology changes, but the areas that we were always looking at are still included, just with some additional areas being

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2014**

included as well, especially along Washington Street and in the near South-side area, otherwise it is still primarily the UND area, just expanded a little beyond to encompass more of the UND area.

Kouba stated that they will also be looking at the Long Range Transportation projects and comparing them to the new environmental justice areas. She explained that some of the projects are touching the edges of the minority or low income areas, but most are staying within the right-of-way so they aren't adding capacity much, especially in those particular areas, so they don't foresee any environmental justice issues. She referred to a map and explained that this this new map they over-layed both focus areas for environmental justice, and you can see there is some overlap, the blue-hatched areas are minorities, and the red-hatched is low income areas.

Kouba said that they are looking for approval of the document itself, and will end up going back to the Long Range Transportation Projects.

Vein asked if there is a potential, then, to either change, modify, or stop a project from happening because of one of these. Kouba responded that there is a possibility, but it just depends on what the project is, and that is what they are looking at. She explained that when you start adding capacities, and things of that nature, on road projects that is when there is a possibility of say, noise impacts, in neighborhoods that are low income or minority. Haugen added that this is pretty similar to the bridge discussion, where we can't really go outside the historic structure and add to it or degrade from it; in environmental justice it is a little softer, and the chances of having an adverse negative impact to a population is likely to be able to be mitigated easier than a historic structure is, so there is a possibility it could stop the project, but it is pretty rare in our part of the woods.

Vetter asked if East Grand Forks doesn't have any minority populations, or low income populations. Kouba responded that they don't using the thresholds we have to use. She explained that, basically, for minorities they went three times the area, so there weren't any significant areas in East Grand Forks, and the low income they did 50% of it, there was 50% of that census block group area, then it was considered low income. Powers said, then, what you're saying is that East Grand Forks does have it, just not densely populated areas.

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MANUAL UPDATE, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Vein, Mock, Adams, Powers, Malm, Strandell, Vetter and Leigh.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2015-2016 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM**

Haugen pointed out that the full document is included in the packet. He stated that in that document it lists all of the activities we will be doing, and describes them fully. He said, however, that he is just going to focus on the funding streams and how each line item, or budget for specific activities have been done.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2014**

Haugen reported that there is a difference in the funding between the FY2015 and FY2016. He referred to the FY2015 table and pointed out that our basic funding we get is shown in the first line item, and can be summarized as our annual appropriation of federal funds. He explained that with our federal funds there is always a local match required, so this would be our total, which represents in this 2015 program 50% of the total budget.

Haugen commented that, as you will notice with the footnotes, the \$513,000 contains roughly \$465,000 from the North Dakota portion of the federal funds as they flow through, and \$47,000 from the Minnesota portion. He explained that those federal funds are actually further broken down between Federal Highway and Federal Transit, roughly  $\frac{3}{4}$  Highway and  $\frac{1}{4}$  Transit dollars, but they are all combined together under consolidated planning.

Haugen pointed out that we have some projects that we are carrying over from this year that we have to show that we were financially able to maintain, the big one is the U.S. #2 Access Study, so carrying forward those costs associated with it, with the dollar amounts, is shown as well.

Haugen reported that, as previously discussed, Fargo/Moorhead released \$300,000 to the Grand Forks/East Grand Forks MPO specifically, which is shown. He stated that we do have, in 2015, a continuation of our State funding that we received for the last 20+ years, roughly this same dollar amount of \$11,000. He said that for the first time we are seeking North Dakota DOT funding, and, again, if you recall, they said they would entertain providing a 10% match for a project that is specific to a State Highway, and we identified a project where \$19,000 would be 10% of the project, so this budget is reflecting that.

Haugen commented that the State and Local dollars, we use the State dollars, the \$30,000 if we get all this funding, we use it to lessen the local dollar match that would be required, so, assuming we budget 100% of all the revenue that is available to us, it is a \$1.269 million dollar work program for next year.

Haugen stated that the funding allocation is further refined down here; 80% is basically the federal funds, and 17.6% is made up by the two cities.

Haugen pointed out that in 2016, without the carry-over of projects, and without the additional one-time FM/COG funding, you can see our total budget is about half the amount of the 2015 budget, at \$644,000. He said that we aren't showing an increase in federal funds, and we were told to maintain status quo even though there is a likelihood that there will be an increase. He added that this would be more representative of our annual budgets in the past.

Haugen reported that they did go to each city and county and asked if there were any projects they wanted us to do. He pointed out that they are shown in the individual line items under the Corridor Planning, Land Use, and Special Studies headings. He went over the projects listed, and gave a brief overview of each.

Vetter said, going back to 2015; local match to Minnesota State is \$2,750, other local match is \$223,250; and in 2016 local match to Minnesota State is \$2,750 again, and other local match is

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2014**

\$108,750, so his question is how do we break that up between Polk County, Grand Forks County, Grand Forks City, and East Grand Forks City. Haugen responded that the two counties do not participate in the financial obligation of the MPO, so the local monies are split 50/50 between the two cities. Vetter stated that we need to have a discussion on the fairness of this split. Vein asked if this has been done historically. Haugen responded that it is been done this way since 1999. He explained that prior to 1999 it was done differently, it was done so that each individual FTA pot of money from the state was matched by that City and that State; and federal highway funding dollars were matched by that City and State, so because the bulk of our dollars come from North Dakota, Grand Forks was financing close to 90% of the local match required for the MPO, and while he doesn't know the exact numbers, they were quite high because the dollar values were still pretty high back then, ratio-wise between North Dakota and Minnesota. He added that we are one of three MPOs in North Dakota, and one of six in Minnesota. So the brass-tacks reason it changed in 1999 is because after the flood we were trying to take that opportunity and ultimately did accomplish identifying two additional locations for river crossings. But through that process it was pointed out that if one side had 50% of the vote, they should participate in 50% of the local costs, that was the agreement that was reached and it has been that way ever since. He commented that beside the brass tacks, when you look at the metropolitan area, one community with a river running through it, you look at our peak hour traffic crossing the three bridges, it is roughly 50/50 in the direction of flow, and if you look at employment crossing between both rivers, again the percent of employment that crosses over from Minnesota to North Dakota is about 50% of the EGF workforce, and even though it is a small percent of the total employers that employ people in Grand Forks it is increasing, those going to work from North Dakota has doubled in the last ten years that commute over to the Minnesota side. So there are other benefits to the 50/50 split than just the brass tacks of votes.

Leigh stated that it just seems to him that there are far more studies, and far more activities that the MPO deals with on the North Dakota side than the Minnesota side, so it doesn't really seem fair to him that East Grand Forks is paying 50% when probably 60% or even 70% of the MPOs time is spent on North Dakota issues.

Vetter suggested that when we look at the annual work program, the Bygland Road Study, the Land Use Plan, any particular program that we can specify goes to East Grand Forks or goes to Grand Forks, he thinks that that City should be picking up the cost of the local share, then all the other areas like administration, finances, etc., the stuff that is considered overhead, he would propose be split on the percentage of population. Haugen responded that most of the MPOs funding formulas use the decennial census data, so if they use 2010, and that ratio is carried through each year, or do you want to suggest an estimated population so it would change slightly every year.

Vein asked how it would work out based on population. Haugen responded that roughly Grand Forks would be at 55,000 and East Grand Forks would be at 9,000, using round numbers. Vetter added that based on those figures, the split would be 86/14.

Haugen commented that, if he understands correctly, he couldn't just go off of roughly \$115,000 and split that between each City. He explained that the traffic count program is going to be

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2014**

expanding over into East Grand Forks next year, so part of that cost is on both sides of the river; corridor preservation is on both sides of the river so then we would just be using, and this example, he believes, the 10% cost of the Bygland Road Study would be borne By East Grand Forks, and this \$6,000 would be borne by Grand Forks. He added that the T.I.P. element, again, is that both sides of the river have to do that as part of a base project, so that would assume 50/50 Land Use Plan, and we always viewed that as part of our requirement to have a Long Range Transportation Plan, so next year we are reacting to updated Land Use Plans, so we always shared in that cost 50/50. He said that he doesn't know if you want to make those outside the MPO, or since each City is doing it the same year that each City shares 100% of their costs. Vetter responded that under his proposal those that cross borders then it would be split 14% for the East Grand Forks side and 86% for the Grand Forks side. He added that it could be split using the street mileage, or some other way; but 50/50 just isn't fair.

Haugen commented that because of the additional \$300,000 from FM/COG, it skewed our budget, but if you look at 2015 there are really just two studies that are above and beyond our core mission, those are the Washington/Gateway Drive Study, and again that is trying to capture NDDOT funds in part; and then the Point Bridge Study.

Haugen stated, then, that if he understands what Mr. Vetter is proposing is that half of the \$17,000 local share for the Washington/Gateway Drive Study would be covered by Grand Forks only, and the \$14,000 local share for the Point Bridge Study would be covered by East Grand Forks only, and then all the rest of the costs are our core mission, and would be shared 50/50. Vetter responded that he is correct on the individual respective project local share but he thinks the core mission costs should be split by population, miles of roads, or something like that. Vein commented that he can understand what Mr. Vetter is saying, and when you get into the individual projects and having each City pay their share that makes sense to him, but then when it comes to funding the MPO there are some things that are generic for both sides, and then there are some that are maybe more City specific, so he thinks the purely population is probably not exactly accurate, but there may be something, you know just to have an MPO there is some overhead that is specific to that and then there would be some percentage that would might be specific to each City. He asked what other ways besides population, how many miles, planning, does the MPO staff operate under. Haugen referred to the budget sheet and explained that these are the categories that MPO staff charges their time off to, so we have to do these administrative type things, and there isn't really a difference between whether it is North Dakota or Minnesota, we have to please both equally. He said that that then gets into the planning and implementation, and again, when we do the Long Range Transportation Plan, that is joint; and then it gets down to the individual studies. He added that in the past, particularly for East Grand Forks, we have never gone to an outside consultant to do the Land Use Plan, so those costs have always been done by staff only, but in this budget it is increased because the City of East Grand Forks has decided to go with a consultant's services. He commented that, obviously we have to do all these things as an MPO.

Mock asked how the other MPOs bill their local share. Haugen responded that the three he is most familiar with have a core mission based off population, this is what FM/COG does; and then the individual studies would be charged just to the side of the river that it is specific to.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2014**

Leigh asked for clarification on the Land Use Plan, and the fact that the City of East Grand Forks is going to have an outside consultant do their update. Haugen responded that that is correct. Leigh asked who authorized that. Haugen responded that it came through your Community Development staff. Leigh said that it hasn't come through their City Council for approval. Haugen responded that it did go to their City Council as updating your Land Use Plan, but he doesn't know if it included language that said you would be seeking an outside consultant or not, but that is the discussion they had with the Community Development Director.

Vetter said, then, that he heard that FM/COG uses a population split. Haugen responded that that is correct. He explained that they have four main cities; West Fargo, Fargo, Moorhead, and Dilworth. He said that they have their funding arranged so that it does population, but it also has a stipulation so that Fargo doesn't have over 50% of the cost charged to them. He added that they also have their board membership so that Fargo doesn't have over 50% of the votes as well. He stated that Bismarck/Mandan includes Burleigh/Morton counties, Lincoln, Bismarck, and Mandan. He said that they are housed in the City of Bismarck, and most of their costs are borne by the City of Bismarck, so when they go to do these outside studies, then they look for those areas outside the City of Bismarck to provide the match. He stated that their policy board consists of five members, one person from each of those five entities, but they do have a weighted voting system so the City of Bismarck has the majority of the votes.

Haugen commented that if this body would like MPO Staff to explore and present more options to you, the action is sort of preliminary, based on the fact that we haven't determined yet if North Dakota will come up with their share, so besides this issue there are some other revenue streams that we aren't 100% sure of yet, so we will have to visit this likely in the near future.

After further discussion it was suggested by Vein that other options, outside what we currently have, be explored and brought back for discussion.

Leigh commented that in terms of voting, he doesn't see why East Grand Forks members need the opportunity to vote on something that only Grand Forks members need to decide on, and vice-versa. Vein added, though, that something like the land use plan, or the Long Range Transportation Plan, something that affects both sides, would need to be voted on by both sides. Haugen stated that he would venture to say that if you are starting to set up the votes where one side is not voting on a study that is happening on the other side, we will be cited for not fulfilling its obligation as an MPO, looking at the metropolitan area as a whole, and not acting as a board overseeing the needs and transportation opportunities in the metropolitan area, so that is a caution he would through across.

Adams asked how crucial it is to approve this item today. Haugen responded that the due date for approving it is today.

Haugen reported that the dollars shown are dollars that we budget, we don't bill out these dollar amounts. He cited the example that our last completed year, 2013, he believes that we budgeted, if we went with the 50/50 fully, somewhere around \$75,000 from each City, but we only billed about \$50,000 from each City, which has actually been a fairly constant dollar amount that we have billed each City.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2014**

***MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE 2015-2016 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM SUBJECT TO PARTNER AGENCY REVIEW, POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVE VOTING STRUCTURE OPTIONS, AND THE AVAILABILITY OF LOCAL FINANCING.***

Leigh asked when the discussion on possible alternative funding and voting structure options would occur. Haugen responded that he will be out of town most of next week in St. Paul meeting with other Minnesota MPO staff, and will find out how they split up their budgets, and will reaffirm what he knows about the FM/COG and Bismarck/Mandan budget splits, so he will have information on the North Dakota, Minnesota and Wisconsin MPOs to share with you at our next meeting in November.

***Voting Aye: Vein, Mock, Adams, Powers, Malm, Strandell, Vetter and Leigh.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF UPCOMING AMENDMENTS TO THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

Haugen reported that originally when they put this into play they were telling this body that we were going to try to process some amendments to our planning documents at the end of the year. He stated that the Environmental Justice update is a required amendment that we have to do, and essentially involves swapping out the current map in our Street and Highway element and putting in the two new maps, as well as looking at all of the projects to see if there is an environmental impact on them or not, so that is a pretty straight forward amendment.

Haugen said that we also gave you an update a while back about integrating the safety into our Long Range Transportation Plan. He explained that the hiccup we have on that right now is that the NDDOT is trying to determine if they want to somewhat follow the Minnesota model of reserving some of those safety dollars for things from the proactive list. He said that Minnesota says that 70% of their funds go towards that, and 30% goes to high crash location type things, so before we can start allocating money to projects or reserve it North Dakota has to make a decision, and that hasn't happened yet, so we won't have anything for November to process on this item.

Haugen commented that on the transit side there have been some significant changes to the financial plan, so we are still trying to figure out all of the dollars and cents, and where they belong in the transit tables, so he doesn't see us acting on this item in November either.

Haugen stated that we are going to ask North Dakota, as the lead agency, if, on the Environmental Justice, even if we have the documentation, we just don't process that amendment now, as we would be starting another amendment process on those other items next month, if we could still batch them in one amendment. He said that if we are able to accomplish this, if you are on the Planning Commission, you will know shortly because they will be the first entity we will need to ask for further consideration to preliminarily approve an amendment.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2014**

**OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO ADJOURN THE OCTOBER 22<sup>ND</sup>,  
2014, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:26 P.M.***

***Voting Aye: Vein, Mock, Adams, Powers, Malm, Strandell, Vetter and Leigh.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE  
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mike Powers, Secretary, called the November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014 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: Mike Powers, Gary Malm, Clarence Vetter, Warren Strandell, Greg Leigh, and Ken Vein.

Absent were: Steve Adams and Jeannie Mock.

Staff: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

Guest(s): Jane Williams, GF City Engineering.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Powers declared a quorum was present.

**SUSPEND AGENDA**

Powers stated that we are going to deviate from the agenda for a moment to go over some discussion items.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**Bronze Award For Bicycle Friendly Communities**

Haugen reported that, as you will notice, neither Teri Kouba nor Stephanie Erickson are available today, so he will be taking on their agenda items when we get to them, but, as Mr. Powers just stated there was an announcement made on an award we received that they were both an integral part of, and that is the Bronze Award for the Bicycle Friendly Community; Grand Forks/East Grand Forks, or as it is labeled, Greater Grand Forks.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen explained that we did receive the Bronze Award this latest go around; but, for those who aren't too familiar with the Bicycle Friendly Application, it is something that recognizes communities for the five "E's" – Engineering, Education, Encouragement, Enforcement, and Evaluation and Planning. He said that these five categories show that a community is making strides to make their communities more bike friendly.

Haugen stated that our two communities have been working on this for almost ten years, and have submitted two prior applications, both of which received honorable mention; but this time we received the Bronze Award. He added, however, that, as you would expect, there are additional levels we can strive for in the future; Silver, Gold, and Platinum.

Haugen commented that, unfortunately neither Teri nor Stephanie could be here today to hear this, but we will probably make a similar "kudos" to them next month when they are present. He added that this information was just released yesterday, although we were aware of it last week, but were asked to not say anything until a formal announcement was made.

Vein asked if this would be acknowledged at both City Councils as well. Haugen responded that he is sure that the Mayor's office is working on a presentation for both City Councils, as there are a lot of City Staff involved as well, both cities as it was a joint effort between the two communities in putting the application together.

Strandell asked if this was announced by our Congressional members. Haugen responded that it wasn't, adding that this award is given out by an organization called the League Of American Bicyclists.

Haugen commented that he wishes we could say that we are the first, and only North Dakota community to receive this award, but Fargo-Moorhead also received the Bronze Award this year. Powers asked if any community around here received a higher award. Haugen responded that he believes Minneapolis/St. Paul received the Gold Award.

Information only.

Federal/State Financial Review Of Our Payment Reimbursement Process

Haugen reported that this past month, Peggy and he have been busy responding to our Federal and State Agencies from North Dakota, who announced that they wanted to do a financial review of how we invoice the State and Feds for payment reimbursement.

Haugen commented that both himself and Peggy have been with the MPO for twenty-plus years and this is the first time that they have done a review on how we do things here. He explained that the first week of November they sent us a questionnaire with fifteen questions, however each of the questions had several questions within them, and asked that we send them a written response to those questions within four working days, so we had to supply that by November 10th, which we did; then they requested additional information be supplied on Monday, and then were here in our offices most of yesterday going over the information we provided.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen stated that the great news is, he believes, there wasn't a whole lot that they were able to point out to us that we were doing incorrectly, so we are expecting, just as we see every year with our audit process, confirmation that we have a pretty good process for invoicing and billing out, and keeping on top of the rules and regulations of what is eligible and what isn't. He said, again, that we should receive a written report on their findings, and he will make sure this body gets a copy of it.

Information only.

Chairman/Secretary Changes

Haugen said that he just wants to remind this body that at the end of December, Mr. Adams' term as Chairman is up and Mr. Powers will become the Chairman for the next two years. With this change the North Dakota side needs to determine who they want to put in place as the Secretary so that when Mr. Powers' term is up in two years they can assume the Chairman position.

Haugen stated that the different Boards, through the years, have treated this election differently; sometimes they wait until a new member is seated, and unfortunately we will have a new member appointed in January; but other times they have held it in December. He said that, perhaps this time, since the only change in membership is on the East Grand Forks side, and the position you are electing, via our by-laws, cannot be from the East Grand Forks side, you may want to hold it in December rather than waiting until January.

Consensus was that the election be held at the December meeting.

Information only.

**RESUME AGENDA**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 22<sup>ND</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 22<sup>ND</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Vein, Powers, Malm, Strandell, Vetter and Leigh.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

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

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that there has not been much movement on this project since the last MPO meeting. He stated that it is a preventive maintenance project.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen commented that on Monday, when attending the Kennedy Bridge meeting, Les Noehre, with the NDDOT-Grand Forks District, announced that they did just receive a new cost estimate for the preventative maintenance work, but they are still working on it internally, and will share it with Minnesota so it is still a little bit up in the air as to whether or not they are going to push to get the project done in 2015 instead of 2018.

Malm stated that he crossed the Sorlie the other night, and you can hardly see the bridge when you walk over it at night, and it is worse on the Grand Forks side than the East Grand Forks side. Strandell added that there are also big dips in the roadway on both ends of the bridge as well. Haugen responded that he doesn't believe they have determined whether or not they are stopping right at the bridge itself or if they are going further. He said that there was some discussion about going up to the flood protection system on either side. Vein asked who would make that determination. Haugen responded that initially both State DOTs will, but they will then have to approach both Cities to get your concurrence, plus the MPO will have to program the project in the T.I.P. Powers said, then, that the project stops at the bridge. Vein commented that a bridge includes the approaches to it, it isn't just the structure itself.

Haugen said that he doesn't know how much work they have done beyond the bridge structure itself, to-date, so he will follow up on that, and maybe in December, when there is more information, we can ask them that question, because the way they had it set up, if you recall, was that DeMers Avenue on the North Dakota side was also part of the project development process that they were using, so from 6<sup>th</sup> Street all the way up to the bridge was part of the project that they were working on, however their main focus was the structure itself and whether it required a major rehab or even replaced, so they spent most of their time working on the structure itself to determine its health, and then they discovered that some standards had changed that allowed what is there to be classified as good, and remain, thus going with the preventive maintenance project instead, so they are now going back to look at those other items. He said that they have separated out DeMers Avenue from the bridge, so they are no longer combined in the EIS document, so they will have to determine, particularly if they move the bridge project from 2018 to 2015, if the DeMers Avenue project on the North Dakota side will stay in 2018, so when they develop the new project termini descriptions both City Councils will have to agree with them, and the MPO will have to program them.

Information only.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen referred to a slide illustrating data concerning the low area on the Minnesota side, and explained that it shows what, East Grand Forks in particular, based on MnDOT work, submitted to the Corps of Engineers. He said that the Corps of Engineers recently responded that they did receive it, and said that normally they would expect the local agency to re-run the hydrogeological model, however, the Corps is updating that model so they have agreed to run this scenario in their model, and expect to have those results released December 5<sup>th</sup>, so, on this issue of the Kennedy Bridge we sort of now have a date of when we will know what the impacts of this proposed road raise will be, and if they aren't significant, it will be part of the project.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen commented that a meeting was held Monday morning, and a bridge person from MnDOT/St. Paul, attended and presented a lot of different concepts and discussed whether or not they are capable of being done.

Haugen distributed handouts of the presentation given and went over the information briefly.

Haugen explained that the budget that will be available for the signature features is: \$300,000 from MnDOT and \$200,000 from NDDOT, for a total budget of \$500,000. He added that there still might be some things that are above and beyond that, so if they were interested in cost sharing, the local entities would have that option. Vein asked if Mr. Haugen was saying that the two States were putting these monies in as the non-federal share of the project. Haugen responded that some of it includes federal funds. He explained that these monies will be part of the normal project cost, just like the concrete for the road deck is part of the cost, up to \$500,000 will be part of the bridge cost, and that \$500,000 is geared towards signature items. He added that they also made sure that local maintenance, or the maintenance and operation of these things will be 100% locally funded, which is pretty normal for both the North Dakota and Minnesota DOT contracts.

Haugen commented that they are still working on the railings. He stated that the existing railing has to be replaced because it is integral to the deck, but they are still working on what kind of railing will replace it, but they are insisting that it will be a safety rated railing that meets current standards.

Haugen said that on the lighting side, they will be using LED lights that are dark sky compliant and will be placed above the flood level. He referred to lighting examples, and explained that the group's preference is the "Wash" type of lighting placed on both the interior and exterior of the truss system.

Vein asked who the group consisted of. Haugen responded that it consisted of David Murphy, Mayor Stauss, and Warren Strandell from East Grand Forks; Mark Walker, Mike Yavarow, and Hal Gershman from Grand Forks; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Roger Hille Bridge Engineer from MnDOT District #2; and two MnDOT-St. Paul representatives.

Vein stated though, that, ultimately the decision on signature items will be made by the City Council on both sides. Haugen responded that that is correct. He added that they were actually encouraged not to worry about budget at this meeting, to just give their preferences, so that they can give this information to the consultant they plan on hiring, directions from the community, so that they can take the information and advance this part of the project quickly.

Vein asked if most of the issues being discussed concerned aesthetics. Haugen responded that is correct, specifically what is allowable under aesthetics; and then more of the controlling issue was maintenance, how easy it will be to maintain. Vein stated, though, that it isn't for lighting the roadway, but one would be for the cars that are going to it, or for people on the exterior to look upon, and he is assuming that a lot of that is from people on the exterior to look at when

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

they are on the bikepaths, the greenway, or even from the downtown looking north, you want to be able to see this, right, so the idea was what do you do to enhance it. Haugen responded that that is correct.

Haugen commented that colored lighting is an option, however, it has to be one single color for the whole structure at one time. He explained that this means you can have pink to promote breast cancer awareness, then you can have purple to promote Alzheimer's, but only one of those colors at a time, and you have to determine exactly what colors you want available, and what days you want those colors used, so it all has to be determined prior to them turning the bridge over to the Cities for maintenance.

Haugen stated that a lot of the other discussion was on lighting placed under the bridge for the trails system, but the group that met didn't favor putting lighting under the bridge as there isn't any lighting leading up to the bridge on the greenway. Vein commented, however, that the reason you would put lighting under the bridge would be for safety purposes.

Haugen reported that they closely regulate what they allow in terms of welcome signs. He said that in the end the only change you will see is an update to the Minnesota welcome sign. Strandell commented that the MnDOT Historical Preservation representative gave some input as to what could and couldn't be done to the bridge so as to not impact the neighborhoods.

Haugen commented that there had been some discussion as to the possibility of doing a bulb-out or outlook on the structure, but that was not allowed. He added that they are going to allow a plaque be attached to the bridge, and a border crossing marker will be placed in the center of the roadway for both sides of the river, to include both City's name and State.

Haugen said that planters are an allowable enhancement, but the group did not want to discuss them.

Haugen reported that MnDOT will now take this information and list those things that were agreed to in order to give us an idea as to what the exterior/interior wash combination will look like; what the etchings will look like. The costs will be determined with the consultant.

Information only.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2015 MINNESOTA GRANT AGREEMENT**

Haugen reported that, as you will recall from our work program last month, we do receive roughly \$11,000 from Minnesota to assist us with our local match. He stated that this is our annual agreement that we need to have authorization from this body to allow the Chairman and the Executive Director sign.

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING THE  
CHAIRMAN AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR EXECUTE THE ANNUAL MNDOT STATE  
PLANNING AGREEMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

*Voting Aye: Vein, Powers, Malm, Strandell, Vetter and Leigh.*

*Voting Nay: None.*

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE ND SIDE FTA #5339 APPLICATIONS**

Haugen reported that we solicited for projects for the North Dakota FTA #5339 program, and received one application from the Grand Forks Cities Area Transit, which went through the Grand Forks Council process.

Haugen pointed out that their request is to replace all of their aged vehicles on the Fixed Route, there are five of them. He added that they did prioritize them in the order they would like to replace them, but there is only \$1.7 million in funding available statewide, and the total request that CAT has is \$1.3 million, so it was important to prioritize these, as we know we won't get all five of them, which were the most important.

Haugen commented that since the list went out; and we did not hear from Dale Bergman concerning this, but the 25-foot low-floor bus did have some structural problems and they were trying to find someone local who would agree to take on the repair job, but he was going to let us know if that occurred, otherwise if it wasn't we would need to change the priority list to move it up to number one, so for now this is the priority as we understand it.

Haugen stated that both staff and the Technical Advisory Committee are recommending you approve this application as being consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan, and that you concur with the priority order.

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY VEIN, TO APPROVE THE NORTH DAKOTA SIDE FTA #5339 APPLICATION AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH OUR LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND THAT WE CONCUR WITH THE PRIORITY ORDER, AS SUBMITTED.***

*Voting Aye: Vein, Powers, Malm, Strandell, Vetter and Leigh.*

*Voting Nay: None.*

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON SCHOOL SAFETY REVIEW REPORT**

Haugen distributed copies of a power point slide presentation of the School Safety Review Report and explained that originally, included in the packet, was a report that sort of was a matrix of all the things that were recommended for each school, and a status of what was done, what has not been done, and what is still a viable recommendation. He said that he asked Stephanie to put together a presentation that focused more on what is left to be done at each of the schools, but she wasn't able to fully complete it in time so he won't be able to give a full presentation today.

Haugen commented that back when we started doing the school safety plans back in 2004, with Century School, crossings guards were not the norm at the elementary schools, particularly on

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

the North Dakota side, but through our efforts, along with Safe Kids, the school districts, City Staff, and the receipt of some awards of Safe Routes to School funds, now all of the elementary schools on the North Dakota side have crossing guards in place, which has greatly increased the safety at the schools.

Haugen reported that they have also been able to get speed minder signs installed at school sites, but Stephanie is still working on identifying where all of them are located. Leigh asked if there were any in East Grand Forks. Haugen responded that there are two; Polk County helped install them, and with the last cycle of awards there will be four more installed as part of the 2016 projects.

Haugen commented that, as you can see, we spent a lot of time looking at the signage around the schools, so a lot of the maps you have include items that address signage. He said that, basically, for the East Grand Forks side, the Public Works Department has gone ahead and replaced these signs; but on the Grand Forks side they are looking at specific schools and updating signs, but also in 2018 they do have a Safety Grant available to make sign changes around the schools.

Haugen reported that some of these studies started before the 2009 update of the MUTCD, so some of the older studies have some signage that is no longer compliant. Vein said, however, that you have a plan to bring all the signage at all schools up to compliance. Haugen responded that they do, but with the caveat that the older ones, prior to 2009, the actual sign itself is probably no longer compliant. Vein asked if there is a certain amount of money that will have to be spent in 2018 to get that completed. Vein asked what they are doing now versus what they will be doing in 2018. Haugen responded that that is something Jane Williams can answer. Vein stated that the reason he asks this is because he received a call from Carma Hanson, and the only thing he can think she would be calling about is this. Haugen responded that he would agree it is about this, adding that every time they do a solicitation for TAP projects (formally Safe Routes to School) they really want to get speed minder signs at all the schools, and the City Staff has always had a different project as a priority, and he believes that two cycles ago they were able to work the system so that the City Council prioritized the speed minder signs, that was the number one project being submitted to the State for consideration, but it wasn't funded. He said that last year the speed minder signs were again a project, but it was the last priority, but none of the projects on the application were funded last year, so he is guessing that since our TAP applications are due January 6, that that might be one of the things Carma is trying to contact you about.

Vein asked, if you wait until 2018 will they be part of the larger project and funded through it. Williams responded that 2018 is for signs, not for the speed minder signs though. She added that she is currently in the process of preparing a staff report for a presentation to Service Safety, as far as the whole city, where they are needed. Vein asked when she would be presenting that. Williams responded that she promised Terry Bjerke that she would have it the first quarter of next year so they have it in time for the budget if anyone wanted to budget it for the following year. Vein asked if there was anything in the current budget for 2015. Williams responded that she isn't aware of anything.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen commented that a lot of things that haven't been completed are things that aren't eligible for the regular transportation programs, so most of the things that were eligible have been funded and implemented, or are in the process of being implemented, but at some of the schools there are still some things that the funding source is still lacking identification, but they still would improve the safety around the schools.

Haugen pointed out that the handout highlights what is considered viable recommendations that still need to be implemented. He added that Stephanie still plans on going to each of the schools with the PTAs. He stated that all of these have been reviewed by staff and by school staff, and the last step is to engage the neighborhoods or PTAs to see whether they still want these things or not.

Vein asked if Stephanie did all of the designs shown. Haugen responded that she did not, that ATAC did the designs. He added that in 2004, almost every other year we did two or three schools, and ATAC developed a full report with these recommendations, so what Stephanie was tasked to do was to review where we are at with the recommendations for each of the schools, and determine where we will go with those not done moving forward.

Information only.

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON U.S. #2 ACCESS MANAGEMENT STUDY**

Haugen reported that there are two things to discuss on this item:

- 1) NDDOT released their high crash locations based on the most recent crash data. On the City side, or the Urban side it is based on three years of crash data and is updated every year; on the Rural side it is based on five years of crash data, and so Airport Drive, County 5/U.S. #2 Intersection, is in the top ten of all of the rural intersections across the State of North Dakota as being identified as a high crash location. It is one of two in the Eastern half of the State that have been identified. This is just another piece of data that is telling us that there is something going on that that location that needs to be looked at to see what can be done.
- 2) With proposed Nitrogen Plant we were tasked to incorporate the potential traffic it would generate to the U.S. #2 corridor and how it would impact our study. KLJ has been working with the Northern Plans to come up with a traffic distribution formula. 85% of the traffic will be using U.S. #2 to get to the site and 15% will be using North Washington Street Interchange. They are still working on trying to determine whether 69<sup>th</sup> is the best route or if 55<sup>th</sup> is the best route to actually access, or to point most traffic to, to get to the plant itself.

Haugen commented that another reason for doing this study is, if you read the report, you will notice that the existing traffic is operating at an acceptable level of service, but our projections in 2040 is that there will be a lot of intersections that won't be operating at an acceptable level of

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

service. He said that the Nitrogen Plant itself isn't a tipping point, it is really just the normal that we are projecting for this corridor. He added that this growth does include a full build-out of the Airforce Base UAS development.

Haugen stated that they have asked for comments from the various review people, so by the end of the month they should have this wrapped up which will allow us to comfortably go in to the future scenarios as to how we should improve traffic on U.S. #2.

Information only.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO ADJOURN THE NOVEMBER 19<sup>TH</sup>,  
2014, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:55 P.M.***

***Voting Aye: Vein, Powers, Malm, Vetter and Leigh.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE  
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, December 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Steve Adams, Chairman, called the December 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014 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: Steve Adams, Mike Powers, Gary Malm, Clarence Vetter, Greg Leigh, Jeannie Mock, Ken Vein, and Warren Strandell.

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

Guest(s): Jane Williams, GF City Engineering; Mike Yavarow, GF City Engineering; and David Kuharenko, GF City Engineering.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Adams declared a quorum was present.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**Bronze Award For Bicycle Friendly Communities**

Haugen reported that copies of the staff report were included in the packet. He added that Kim Greendahl, Greenway Specialist, is also here today to show us a couple of things concerning this item.

Haugen reiterated that this is the award that was announced at last month's meeting, and Kim, Stephanie, and Teri, along with a whole list of others, worked hard during a several month process to prepare this application.

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that included, from the application itself, is a list of all those involved in this process, including Kim, Stephanie, Teri, and a couple of our board members as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Erickson asked that Greendahl show the plaque that states that the Cities of Grand Forks and East Grand Forks are Bike Friendly Cities. She added that there is also a road sign, however they did not bring it today.

Erickson explained that this was a very long process, and many people were involved. She referred to a slide illustrating the report card they received from the American Bicycle Association, who are the ones that gave us the award for the Bronze Level. She stated that it just highlights some things that tell what makes a bicycle friendly community, such as public education outreach, which they rated us as being excellent, and the score to the left of that shows what needs to be done to get to the Silver Level, so there is already some points we are working on to reach the next level.

Erickson continued going over the report card, pointing out that they are really happy to see that we have such an active Bicycle Advisory Committee, which is the Greenway Trail User's Group.

Erickson referred to an info graphic slide, and pointed out that it shows the different levels we can strive for, and how to achieve each.

Erickson reported that we also had an article on this achievement posted in the Grand Forks Herald. She added that this has been kind of a bike kind of year in that we got sharrows along University Avenue, and before they went down we took some counts to see where the bicycle traffic and vehicle traffic is, and within the last couple of years have seen an increase, and will do another count in the spring so we can compare spring/spring and fall/fall counts, but even looking through the last couple of years we are seeing it double and even triple at some of those intersections, so it is very encouraging.

Erickson commented that she found it interesting that even though the bicycle numbers are going up, traffic is staying in the same kind of ballpark, as is the speed of the vehicles, so everything around the bicycle traffic is staying the same, we are just seeing an increase of people commuting around the University.

Vein asked if these were average daily counts, are they just done over a period of time. Erickson responded that they are 12 hour counts done in one day. Vein asked if they were just one day in that month, and were they done manually. Erickson responded that they were done manually, staff just sat on a corner and counted.

Greendahl reported that this was the third time that we applied for this designation; receiving honorable mention in 2005 and 2006, which is pretty basic, so to get Bronze was really quite a feat for us. She added that the meeting process itself is so important because it brought together a very eclectic group of people and gave them the opportunity to see outside their boxes and share what other people are doing with bicycling. She said that she thought that she was very involved in the biking community, but she learned a lot through these meetings, and there is a lot of good things going on out there, which reaffirms what we have been doing, but also pushes us to the next level to see if we can achieve more.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Greendahl stated that she really appreciates the support that the MPO brings to bicycling in both communities. She added that we will be seeing some more biking celebrations coming up when the weather gets nicer.

Erickson reported that there are some upcoming things that were discussed at a meeting earlier today. She explained that they are working on a commercial announcing our status of being bicycle friendly, done in conjunction with the Cities Area Transit; Cities Area Transit has a new t-shirt available that has both a bus and a bike on it; they hope to have a bus wrap this spring that will be traveling around town announcing that we are a bicycle friendly community; and they talked to the Downtown Association about whether or not they would be interested in maybe getting a bicycle shaped rack, or a rack with a plaque to have downtown announcing this as well. Haugen asked if he was correct that there will actually be two street signs, announcing as you enter into each city. Erickson responded that that is correct.

Appreciation Of Greg Leigh

Adams reported that Greg Leigh has been on the MPO Executive Policy Board since 2008. He read a letter of appreciation, and presented Mr. Leigh with a plaque for his years of service to both communities.

Election Of Secretary – Grand Forks Candidate

Haugen explained that per the MPO By-Laws, Mike Powers will assume the chair position in January, however we do need to elect a Secretary from the Grand Forks side.

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO NOMINATE KEN VEIN AS SECRETARY OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD.***

***Voting Aye: Adams, Powers, Malm, Strandell, Vetter, Leigh, and Mock.  
Voting Nay: None.  
Abstain: Vein.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 19<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY VEIN, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 19<sup>TH</sup>, 2014, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Adams, Vein, Powers, Malm, Strandell, Vetter, Leigh, and Mock.  
Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF HOLIDAY BONUS HOURS**

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY VEIN, TO APPROVE HOLIDAY BONUS HOURS.***

***Voting Aye: Adams, Vein, Powers, Malm, Strandell, Vetter, Leigh, and Mock.  
Voting Nay: None.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF 2015-2016 NDDOT PLANNING AGREEMENT**

Haugen reported that this is something that we approve every other year. He explained that this is the agreement we sign with NDDOT in order to access our federal consolidated planning grants. He pointed out that essentially the agreement has not changed for several years, thus staff is requesting the board to grant approval to authorize the Chairman and Executive Director to execute the NDDOT State Planning Agreement.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY LEIGH, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING THE CHAIRMAN AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE THE NDDOT STATE PLANNING AGREEMENTS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2015-2016.***

***Voting Aye: Adams, Vein, Powers, Malm, Strandell, Vetter, Leigh, and Mock.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF 2015 RENTAL/SERVICE AGREEMENT WITH THE CITY OF EAST GRAND FORKS**

Haugen reported that the City of East Grand Forks has decided that they would like to convert all of those entities renting space in City Hall to their lease agreement. He stated that our current lease agreement with the City of East Grand Forks was based on a template from Grand Forks City Hall's lease agreement, so in the packet they did give us a termination notice and have provided us, and we have negotiated with staff, the new lease agreement.

Haugen referred to the agreement and pointed out that there isn't any change in the space we occupy, but it does update our service charges. He explained that when we were leasing here previously we were also performing City Staff functions for East Grand Forks so we weren't being charged for phones, network, etc., but now that we are here for up to at least two years, and are no longer performing those City Staff functions, we are taking what we were being charged in Grand Forks and now are paying East Grand Forks for those services.

Haugen stated that this is a two year lease agreement, with the rent for 2015 being essentially \$10.81 a square foot and the rent for 2016 will increase to \$12.25 a square foot. He explained that there is a slight decrease in cost for 2015 from our current 2014 cost due to our having furnished the office furniture for our additional office space, and the City of East Grand Forks purchasing it back from us.

Haugen reported that ultimately the City of East Grand Forks is doing this in order to have a common lease agreement with all those entities renting space from City Hall.

Malm asked if the MPO phone number changed. Haugen responded it did not. He stated that they rolled our Grand Forks numbers over into our East Grand Forks lines. He explained that we are trying to maintain that this is a temporary space arrangement, so we purposely had them roll over the phone lines so that people don't have to start to remember a new number only to have to relearn our old number or a new number when things shake out two years from now.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Powers referred to the staff report and pointed out that it states: “Annual rent will be \$10,529 for 2015 and \$11,931 for 2016. (FYI Grand Forks office space will be about \$2,850 for wo15 and \$2,950 for 2016)”, what is that for. Haugen responded that we still have a little cubicle in that space we used to share with Grand Forks Planning, but that we now share with Grand Forks Planning and Community Development, an area about 8 x 12, that is what we are paying rent on and we still have one phone that we will be paying for as well.

Malm asked what the purpose is of having two locations. Haugen responded that it keeps us in touch with the Grand Forks staff, and also has better access to some of their internal directors/drives, which makes it easier for us to function. He added that it also keeps a presence in both City Halls.

Vein referred to the rental rates, and asked how the 2016 rate was negotiated. Haugen reiterated that the 2015 rate is slightly lower than our 2014 rate due to the fact that we furnished the additional office space, so in 2015 they lowered the rate to compensate for that furniture; and then in 2016 they use the Consumer Price Index to determine the increase, so in 2016 they are utilizing the current CPI based on what would have been our normal 2015 increase.

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE NEW EAST GRAND FORKS OFFICE SPACE RENTAL LEASE FOR 2015 AND 2016.***

***Voting Aye: Adams, Vein, Powers, Malm, Strandell, Vetter, Leigh, and Mock.***  
***Voting Nay: None.***

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

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that when the staff report was written it was hoped that the Corps of Engineers would have some analysis on the proposed road raise, whether or not it would have significant impact, as they initially thought they would have that information by December 5<sup>th</sup>. He said, however, that as the Corps started working with this they discovered that, when updating the hydraulic model, as they got into it that the work that MnDOT did in East Grand Forks in about 2000, where they did modify U.S. #2, that was not included in the model, and when MnDOT also had a planning study done last year, they had a sub-consultant, Houston Engineering out of Fargo run some modeling scenarios, whereby Houston discovered that U.S. #2 was actually a different profile than what was in the Corps model, so in short the Corps needs to have MnDOT release the work that Houston did to them so that they can have the proper profile in the model they are updating then they can run the proposed road profile raise that MnDOT has provided.

Vein asked how long this will take. Haugen responded that they are basically just waiting for MnDOT to release the model, and that actually should have happened yesterday or today. Malm asked how much this cost. Haugen responded that because the Corps of Engineering is updating the model, they are sort of using this as a test of the model, so as far as he knows it isn't costing

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

any of the local agencies any funds to have this tested. Powers commented that this was done in 2000 and the Corps of Engineers is just updating it now. Haugen responded that that would be correct. Mock stated, then, that we have to wait for Houston's information to be release, then we have to wait for the Corps to redo their model. Haugen responded that that is correct, but it is a fairly small road raise profile that MnDOT has proposed, and then, as discussed at a meeting yesterday on the Sorlie Bridge, at which MnDOT staff was present, we were all kind of commenting on the Corps of Engineers. He said that one other thing he will share is that it is interesting that they are so worried about a 100<sup>th</sup> of a foot raise in our flood profile, yet if the diversion project in Fargo gets built it will be a 1.1 foot raise in our flood profile, which is considerably more of an impact than our little 100<sup>th</sup> of a foot raise. Vein asked if this was documented, the 1.1 foot raise. Haugen responded that it must be because that was the figure everyone was citing. Vein asked if that is what they were saying. Haugen responded that the Corps wasn't saying that, but Brad Bail, WSN was saying that. Vein commented that that is a significant impact to us. Mock asked if this was part of the law-suit that is going on with the Corps. Haugen responded that the only law-suit he is aware of are for the south diversion, and then Mr. Strandell has been involved in the past with a group of counties, and the MPO Board, at one time signed a resolution back when the diversion was first looked at, and at that time they were considering a 1 and a ½ foot raise.

Vein commented that with the retention they have upstream there, he isn't sure, but he thinks, just for him personally, he was never against Fargo doing flood control, but he felt they needed to mitigate any negative effect it would have to any of our communities, so he would like to see if there are any mitigation efforts that are going to take place because that decreases the value of what we have invested. Haugen suggested that maybe Mr. Yavarow might know if the 1.1 foot figure is an assumption or not. Yavarow responded that he has never heard that figure given. Vein agreed that he has not heard it either, and that is why he is concerned. (Haugen follow-up and found that the 1.1 was an early impact that has since been mitigated down to basically no change)

Haugen said that ultimately, this is what is going on with the Kennedy. He added that it got a little overly complicated because not everyone had the most up-to-date information, and information was not being shared, but we now have a good understanding of what is needed for the Corps to be able to do their analysis of the proposed road raise. Vein commented that he thinks it is good that they are going through this process because he would like to hear the results of what the impact might be, and what was previously done, and what we might be doing here, and how to compare that to the Fargo project, so we can have at least that data, and have awareness of what we can do and address that.

Haugen stated that if anyone is interested he can share the report Houston Engineering did for MnDOT on the Kennedy Planning Study last summer. Vein said, however, that we will get accurate updated information now, so for himself personally, he would like to see the new information when it is ready, and then they can have a chance to address it.

Haugen said that as far as signature features, there isn't much new to report on that, he hasn't seen any follow-up from the MnDOT Headquarters staff person with more refinement of the concepts.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that there is a lot of new information to share on the Sorlie Bridge project, particularly from yesterday's meeting. He said that, basically, both States have agreed on a preventative maintenance project, and have priced it out since our last meeting; with the new estimate being just shy of \$5,000,000. He added that since it is a preventative maintenance, or a repaint project, they also are trying to move it up from 2018 into 2015, and they are also, if you recall, on the Kennedy Bridge, the environmental process and also making sure they don't get into more hefty reviews by outside agencies, the Sorlie Bridge process now is really trying to limit itself to just a categorical exclusion, NEPA process and are trying hard to make sure that there is no need to go to outside agencies to get additional review and permits with it, so essentially that means they are looking at just the bridge structure itself, and they aren't contemplating doing any approach work or any work outside the bridge structure now.

Leigh asked, when they do the work on the bridge are they going to sandblast it. Haugen responded that they most likely will. Leigh asked if they would be taking the lights down when they do that. Haugen responded they would. Leigh asked if they would be putting new lights back up. Haugen responded that that was part of the meeting yesterday. He said that he did share with the board the invitation to that meeting. He added that there was a signature features meeting on the Sorlie Bridge yesterday, the format of it was very similar to that of the Kennedy bridge, in-fact they mirrored that agenda.

Haugen commented that, because the Sorlie is just a preventative maintenance project, there are some things that would be done on the Kennedy that just wouldn't be done on the Sorlie. He explained that because they are doing a complete deck replacement, and are tearing out concrete and replacing it, there are some options available on that bridge; but since we are only painting the Sorlie they won't be doing any of those demolitions and reconstructions so lighting is something that is possible. Leigh stated that what he is thinking is that the lights on there now don't work half the time, so he is wondering if they take them down, will they put them back up or replace them. Haugen responded that the short answer is that they would replace them. He added that North Dakota did state that in addition to the \$5,000,000, per their policy they will provide \$100,000 for enhancements and signature features. He added that MnDOT has not given a firm answer as to what they might provide, however, yesterday they said they also have a similar policy and in all likelihood it will be a similar amount to what North Dakota is providing, so, again, there are lights that are necessary for the safety of the traveling public, etc., that will be part of, hopefully, the \$5,000,000; so the lights that are there that don't work will be removed and a new set put in their place.

Mock asked if they had looked at solar light options at all, and the cost differences, if they are out all the time maybe spending more on solar options would make sense. Haugen responded that he hasn't heard anything about solar options. Powers asked what is out there now. Haugen responded that there are two electrical feeds, one from each side of the river, each going about half way across the bridge, and the lights that are out there now were probably the best available ten years ago, but lights have progressed significantly, with LED and such, so neither

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

maintenance staffs have been at all thrilled with the lights installed ten years ago. Powers said that the reason he asks is because the City of East Grand Forks is in the process of going with LED lighting, and the ones they put up on Bygland Road have made a significant difference. He said that he went downtown and told Scott Graveseth that they are right on the ball. Haugen responded that what they are scoping out will be LED for both bridges. He added that that lighting discussion is very similar to what was presented for the Kennedy bridge.

Haugen went over those things that can and can't be done with enhancements on the Sorlie versus the Kennedy.

Malm asked how much they are going to be able to spend on this. Haugen responded that the budget is roughly \$200,000, although MnDOT has not given a firm amount but did say it would be in the same neighborhood as what North Dakota is providing.

Haugen said that, just like on the Kennedy North Dakota has said that for the aesthetics, for their \$200,000 will need a match just like they do with the Regional Secondary System, whereby Grand Forks has to provide 10% of the North Dakota cost share; so on the Sorlie that will be the same, Grand Forks will have to provide 10% of the North Dakota cost share. He added, however, that for East Grand Forks, for both bridges, there is no local cost requirement unless the things you want to do are outside the \$200,000 budget, or on the Kennedy the \$500,000 budget, then if both Cities agree they want to invest more on it you will have to agree on how you're going to cost share those increased costs, specifically if East Grand Forks will have financial stake in the improvements.

Haugen stated, then, that on the Sorlie we now have a cost estimate of roughly \$5,000,000.00, Grand Forks has to commit \$250,000 in local match, and they have to say that it is available in 2015; the enhancements or signature features, there is \$200,000 being looked at as the budget; KLJ is the consultant North Dakota hired on the Sorlie, and KLJ is taking the lead and looking at these alternatives, but essentially the decisions need to be made by the end of January so that North Dakota and Minnesota bid date of April 10<sup>th</sup> can be met and the project done in 2015; so he expects, possibly in January, a formal amendment to the T.I.P. document, or certainly in February.

Williams said that she would like to comment on the question about solar lighting. She stated that they have looked at solar a couple of different times, and although they have finally gotten past the angle of the sun and all that, what happens, or what we are still fighting with around here is the extreme cold. She explained that the batteries that actually store the energy get so cold that the chemical reaction can't occur, so then we are going out and changing batteries. She stated that they do have them in our traffic signals, but we have a warmer plate for them so we actually keep them warm during the winter time, so that is the problem they are still struggling with on solar lighting. She added that this coming year they will be doing LED lighting in the downtown.

Haugen reported that the basic reason the Sorlie Bridge is staying within the truss system is because if they do any work on the approach that gets the Corps of Engineers involved, and they

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

are fearful of delay. He added that they are also fearful that if they keep it in 2018, that there might be some spillback from the Kennedy project as it is scheduled for 2016 and there might be some delays that cause it to spill into 2017 and even 2018, and they don't want to have two bridges impacted back to back.

Powers asked, the foot of the Sorlie on the East Grand Forks Side, where the floodwall starts, is that... Haugen responded that it is back 100 or 150 feet from the end of the truss system. He stated that River Street is in-between the end of the bridge and the floodwall in East Grand Forks.

Vein commented that he thinks there are dips on both sides of the bridge. Strandell responded that there are dips on both sides. Vein said that that is why originally he was hoping to have that all inclusive of the project so we can do the whole thing, but with the changes that are happening they still need to be done but will, he is assuming, need to be done locally versus through the DOT. Powers said that he thought it was said that the Corps is involved. Haugen responded that if they do the approaches, the reason North Dakota and MnDOT aren't doing the approaches is because they are trying to get this project done in 2015, and they are trying to get it bid in April, and by January they need to have everything tied up so that they get approval to put the bids out in February, so if they do anything on the approach work they know that they will have to account for how it might change the floodway, the flood profile, but if they are just repainting the bridge they don't have to account for that. Vein said, though, that if they want to fix it it will have to be done at the local level. Haugen responded that if you want to do it quickly, yes, but if you want to fix the approaches, don't agree to the 2015 timeframe, and allow the additional time to work out the permits, if you feel the approaches are that important.

Vein reported that his thought is that the approaches were just a natural settlement, they didn't always dip that much, and all we are trying to do is to bring them back to their original condition, that was his perception; so then you would get a nice smooth ride as you come from the street, over the bridge, and back down, that is a normal design of any bridge. He stated that he understands why they don't want to do it now, because of the clearances they had to go through to use federal funds on a federal project, but his question is if they don't do it, because they are going to redo their portion of DeMers as you continue to go west, but at that time wouldn't we fix the profile of it so that it matches the bridge profile, and they would be doing that either at the local level, or there would be state and local funds, but it would be a separate project.

Haugen commented that when you work on the approaches he would assume you would have to get permission from the Corps of Engineers, and detail how it does or doesn't impact the flood profile, whether it is federal funds or local funds, so on the North Dakota side the DeMers Avenue project was also scheduled in 2018, as sort of a natural tie-in to a major bridge project in 2018, but now that the 2018 timeframe is no longer part of the Sorlie project, they aren't going to do the DeMers Avenue in 2018. Vein asked when it is scheduled then. Haugen responded that he believes it is scheduled for 2019 now, so the approaches on the North Dakota side could be fixed in 2019 as part of the overall DeMers Avenue project, but it wouldn't be in conjunction with the Minnesota side, although he would imagine that they could work out an agreement with

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

MnDOT that if they are doing DeMers Avenue on the North Dakota side the project limits could extend to the Minnesota side as well. Vein commented that that would only make sense because the road will be shut down to fix both sides at the same time.

Haugen stated that they will certainly start having conversations with North Dakota and MnDOT about accommodating their request to bring this up to 2015, that when we look at the 2019 project that MnDOT be involved in that short stretch to fix the approach. He said that they have \$29,000,000.00 between the two of them in 2018 monies to reserve some for 2019 for Minnesota to fix their side.

Haugen commented that he knows that on the North Dakota side they obviously need the City of Grand Forks to commit some local funds, and to say they are available in 2015; but on the Minnesota side it isn't as clear as to how they are approaching the City of East Grand Forks with a timeline for the changes. He added that they will be before the MPO Executive Policy Board to move the project from 2019 to 2015 in the T.I.P., and to approve the changes to the Scope-of-Work.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE REGIONAL ITS ARCHITECTURE UPDATE**

Erickson reported that staff is looking for approval of the Grand Forks/East Grand Forks ITS Regional Architecture Update. She explained that they have been working with A.T.A.C. to update the architecture, and added that we worked with them in 2005 and 2008 as well. She stated that they have been addressing any new technologies that have come to the area and updating them; and have been updating projects by making changes to existing projects as well as adding some new projects.

Erickson stated that both the Technical Advisory Committee and staff are recommending approval.

***MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE GRAND FORKS-EAST GRAND FORKS REGIONAL ITS ARCHITECTURE UPDATE.***

Leigh asked what the cost is to update this and where do the funds come from. Haugen responded that it is a requirement that the MPO have a Regional ITS Architecture Plan in place. He added that this is our third update, and it is funded through our normal Consolidated Planning Grant program, at a cost of about \$15,000.00 to have A.T.A.C. do it.

Haugen reported that this was in our 2014 Work Program to do, and now we are asking for approval. He added that this is a rather technical document, with a lot of spaghetti diagrams of how things operate, and we are just trying to keep it simple, but it is something that we have to do so we are seeking approval at this time.

***Voting Aye: Adams, Vein, Powers, Malm, Strandell, Vetter, Leigh, and Mock.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

**MATTER OF EAST GRAND FORKS FUNCTIONAL RECLASSIFICATION**

Haugen reported that a couple of months ago, he believes in October, East Grand Forks and this board approved a map illustrating some changes to what MnDOT originally proposed for the new classification in East Grand Forks. He stated that MnDOT did reply with comments, and counter-proposed so last night, East Grand Forks City Council approved a recommendation to counter-propose to their counter-proposal.

Haugen commented that there are a couple of things that are in disagreement, which makes a counter-proposal necessary. He referred to a map illustrating the areas of contention and went over the information briefly.

Haugen reported that 220 North and Bygland Road have both been Principal Arterials for a long time, but initially MnDOT proposed that they be downgraded to Minor Arterials. He said, however, that in working with the District Staff, East Grand Forks City Council, and the Technical Advisory Committee, our first counter proposal back to MnDOT was to maintain them as Principal Arterials.

Haugen stated that MnDOT commented back that they are essentially trying to avoid what they term “Stub” Principal Arterials, which means that if their State highway or roadway is not a Principal Arterial beyond urban limits then they are trying to, via a statewide initiative, make sure there aren’t any of these “Stubs”.

Haugen reported that when this whole process started twelve months ago, this issue of Principal Arterials was discussed at a joint meeting with the MPOs and MnDOT staff; and at that time the agreement was that they wouldn’t touch Principal Arterials, that we would only focus on these new classifications, which basically for us are the Minor and Major Collectors. He stated that a second meeting was then held, at which Federal Highway really encouraged MnDOT to look at the whole Functional Classification System in totality instead of just tweaking a couple of areas, and that is when the Principal Arterials came back into play.

Haugen stated that when we proposed our Stub Principal Arterials it was, again, with their blessing, and with strong encouragement from the District Office to include them. He said, however, that as MnDOT was getting the responses back, statewide, they discovered there was inconsistency amongst the State and the District of how they were treating these Stub Principal Arterials, so at a meeting with just MnDOT staff they made the decision that they would not allow “Stubs”. He added that this has had an impact on other MPOs, not just us; Mankato, Rochester, etc., have had similar things done to them, where Functional Classified State Highways are now being downgraded to Minor Arterials.

Haugen commented that he thinks all of us would agree that, certainly on 220 North, it changes a function when it enters East Grand Forks; it goes from a rural two-lane design into essentially a four-lane, controlled access, curb and gutter environment; however MnDOT is trying to maintain that it doesn’t change, and for consistent state-wide sake they want it to be a Minor Arterial. He

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

added that there is a lesser of an argument on Bygland Road, it doesn't change too much in appearance from when it gets past the schools, but in any event we are trying to maintain them as Principal Arterials.

Haugen reported that there are two other areas that we disagreed on; Rhinehart Drive in East Grand Forks is one. He referred to the staff report and pointed out that it states that MnDOT referenced some very low daily traffic volumes, and we aren't sure where they got those volumes, because when we look at their maps Rhinehart Drive is above the criteria necessary to be classified as a Major Collector, so we are trying to hold our stance that it is a Minor Collector.

Haugen stated that the other disagreement was on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.W., particularly north of U.S. #2. He explained that MnDOT was saying that it doesn't meet the criteria for a Minor Collector; they want it to be local, but last night East Grand Forks City Council approved a resolution that suggested it maintain at least a Minor Collector status, adding that at some time a full intersection there may happen, and with most funding programs if you aren't functionally classified you're simply not eligible for the funds, so it makes it a lot harder to get funding if you're not functionally classified.

Haugen summarized that these are the three areas that we are basically counter-proposing to MnDOT to see if they will agree with us, otherwise we are in agreement elsewhere. He added that if MnDOT doesn't agree, they will give us one more chance to acquiesce to their desires, or we will go into an arbitrary committee process where there is a three person panel formed, MnDOT gives their argument, we give our argument, and that body will make a decision and both of us agree to that decision.

Haugen stated that staff is seeking approval from the Executive Policy Board to present this counter-proposal back to MnDOT.

***MOVED BY LEIGH, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE MINNESOTA FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION REVISIONS, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: Adams, Vein, Powers, Malm, Strandell, Vetter, Leigh, and Mock.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

**MATTER OF PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM PRESENTATION**

Haugen requested that this item be tabled at this time.

**MATTER OF MPO POLICY BOARD COMPOSITION**

Haugen reported that a couple of months ago this body requested staff report on the composition of the MPO Policy Board. He said that you also said that you were looking for information on how local funds are allocated around the area as well, however at this time staff is only prepared to talk about the composition of the board, but should have the additional allocation information next month.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Haugen stated that originally we talked, as staff, that we could easily get you Minnesota and North Dakota information, but because of the local match issue we decided, as staff, to also include South Dakota. He explained that the reason for that is because the State of Minnesota does provide a lot of State funding for local match, so including just Minnesota wouldn't give you a flavor on how other local MPOs are provided with local match, thus the reason we included the two in South Dakota.

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

Presentation ensued.

Haugen said that the first bit of data comes from a national perspective; from a study that was done on all the Bi-State MPOs. He added that the report was done prior to the results of the 2010 Census. He stated that since 2010 there hasn't been much change to the basic issues, but the majority of the Bi-States were created a long time ago. He said that we were created with the 1980 Census.

Haugen reported that they categorized these as three basic types: 1) the Senate version whereby everyone is equal, there is equal membership regardless of population; 2) Population; and 3) all jurisdictions in the area all have representation, whether it is population based or it is just equality based, but everyone has representation.

Haugen stated that another thing we will discuss when we talk about local match is whether they are a stand-alone; part of a COG; or if they are hosted inside a City or County.

Haugen reiterated that this is all from a National perspective, but, again we looked at our Regional ones as well; and for Grand Forks/East Grand Forks it is an equal membership, four from each side of the river.

Haugen gave a brief history on how the make-up of the GF/EGF MPO came about. He explained that the very first Metropolitan-wide Transportation Plan was completed by North Dakota and Minnesota DOTs in 1969. He stated that in 1969 they were anticipating that we would grow into this Metropolitan Planning Organization level, so they started to identify what type of membership, or creation would be done in that 1969 document. He said that the number eight, with equal representatives was identified then, the only difference from our current membership is that in 1969 they talked about it being two people from both County Boards, whereas we now have one person from both County Boards, and one from each Planning Commission; so in 1980 when we established the MPO, as it was being formed the initial By-Laws, drafted by the Grand Forks Planning Department, identified that it would be a seven member board, with two people from the Grand Forks City Council, one person from the East Grand Forks City Council, but the East Grand Forks Mayor protested and got equal representation for both sides.

Haugen commented that, as a basic summary, and he does have slides that detail each of the other MPOs composition; but the basic summary shows that of our three State areas, most share

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

the same type of composition we have, where there is equal representation, however the sizes of the boards are different. He briefly went over each of the MPOs' compositions.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

1. **Solicitation For Recreational Trails**

Haugen reported that this is for the North Dakota side only. He explained that Recreation Trails is a program that is similar to the Transportation Enhancement program. He said that, although it is geared for more recreation transportation, it is also eligible for motorized traffic, the ATVs, the four wheelers, etc., as well.

Haugen stated that North Dakota is currently soliciting those projects. He said that the actual regulatory requirement has always been that they be vetted through the MPOs. He added that Grand Forks has received some funds in the past from this program, and this is another one of the things the North Dakota and Federal Highways are cleaning up and catching up on, so in January, if there are any applications, and he believes there is, at least some work is being done on the North Dakota side to have an application, it will have to come before this body in January.

2. **Solicitation For Minnesota Side T.I.P. Programs**

Haugen reported that in February we have a deadline for the Minnesota federally funded projects. He said that, as you will recall, in East Grand Forks the main funding source is what the A.T.P. calls the City Sub-Target program, which is shared and rotated every four years, and East Grand Forks already has a project identified in 2018, so unless they are changing that project, he doesn't think there will be any projects solicited at this time.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO ADJOURN THE DECEMBER 17<sup>TH</sup>,  
2014, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:05 P.M.***

***Voting Aye: Adams, Vein, Powers, Malm, Strandell, Vetter, Leigh, and Mock.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager