

2015 MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD MINUTES

January 21, 2015

February 18, 2015

March 18, 2015

April 15, 2015

May 20, 2015

June 17, 2015

July 15, 2015

August 19, 2015

September 16, 2015

October 21, 2015

November 18, 2015

December 16, 2015

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, January 21st, 2015 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Mike Powers, Chairman, called the January 21st, 2015 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, Clarence Vetter, Marc DeMers, Jeannie Mock, and Warren Strandell.

Absent were: Ken Vein and Gary Malm.

Staff: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, 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

Powers declared a quorum was present.

WELCOME NEW MEMBER

Powers welcomed Marc DeMers, East Grand Forks City Council Representative, to the MPO Executive Policy Board.

DISCUSSION

Lunch Options

Powers reported that when he was doing his “Introduction to MPO Chairperson 101” one of the things mentioned was that we could change our lunch vendor if we so choose. He said that he asked Ms. McNelis to look into other options, so she went out and solicited some options, so he would ask that she share this information with us today.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 21st, 2015**

McNelis stated that she checked with a couple places just to see who would be willing to deliver to us, and of course Mike's Pizza, our current vendor delivers. She said that she also talked to the owner of Seasons, Norm Braaten, and he said that although they don't actually have this service set up yet, he would be willing to deliver to us. She went on to explain, however, that the one issue is that Seasons does not accept checks, and our paying with a credit card is not allowable, therefore we would have to pay cash and she doesn't think that would go over with our State Agencies very well, or our auditors. Strandell commented that he would think that Mr. Braaten would make an exception for us. McNelis responded that this was the answer she got when she asked, however, maybe if the Chairman or someone with a little more power talked to him he would agree to accept our checks.

McNelis distributed copies of Seasons menu for review, and stated that if we can get him to accept our checks it would certainly be a good option for us.

Information only.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 17TH, 2014, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 17TH, 2014, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Adams, DeMers, Powers, Strandell, Vetter, and Mock.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF STAFF VACANCY

Haugen reported that, as you will recall, last month you were informed that our past employee, Stephanie Erickson, had submitted her resignation and was taking a planner position with the City of Grand Forks. He said that we went through the hiring process, offered the position to someone, and they accepted. He explained that that person was qualified to meet our Senior Planner position qualifications, and we announced the hiring to you via e-mail, however, since that time that person reneged on their commitment and is remaining with their current employer. He stated that because of this we have now begun a new search and have reposted the position, however we are actually going to advertise a little more thoroughly than we did this past time, and hopefully can recruit more candidates.

Haugen commented that it was unfortunate that the person we did have hired for the position for that short period of time was very qualified and we were pretty excited to be getting them, but in speaking to how good that person was, it shouldn't be a surprise that their current employer enticed them to stay.

Haugen said that if anyone knows of someone that might be interested in this position, have them check out our website or call us. He added that the position is being posted until February 13th.

Information only

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 21st, 2015**

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reiterated that, as you are aware, we have been waiting for the U.S. Corps of Engineers to give us their determination as to whether or not the potential road raise on the East Grand Forks side would cause a problem with our flood protection system. He referred to the staff report, and pointed out that it highlights, in yellow, their response that it will not adversely impact the performance of the Flood Risk Management project.

Haugen commented that in the past we had been informed by MnDOT, and one of the reasons they extended the project limits was so that if the Corps came back with this determination, the roadway would be part of the Kenned Bridge Project. However, last week at our Technical Advisory Committee meeting they have kind of back-tracked from that stance. He explained that the reason for their back-tracking is because they still need to work with the Flood Plain Administration, on the firm maps, to make sure that what they are doing is consistent with that requirement. He said that because of that, MnDOT wanted to say that they are really happy that the Corps came with this determination, but they are still concerned about what the requirements would be for the flood plain, what permits will be needed because of the FEMA designation, so they back-tracked just a little bit to say that they aren't 100% sure that the project, even with the Corp's determination, will include the road raise as part of the Kennedy Bridge project, and because of their fear of what FEMA might require, they might pursue it as a separate project on a different timeline.

DeMers asked if MnDOT elaborated on what their fears of what FEMA might require could be, is it something bureaucratically or something structurally, or both. Haugen responded he doesn't know the answer to that, but his assumption is that it may be more bureaucratically spurred. He stated that both this project and the Sorlie Bridge project, the driving force behind them is the red tape process, to get all the clearances by all the agencies, and so he would assume that they would be fearful that FEMA might add some length to their approval process, which is tight now, and they are really trying to stay away from have to have substantial reviews by agencies.

Mock asked if the firm maps were changed after the flood, or was there a LOMA done. Haugen responded that the firm maps have been updated because of the Corp project, etc. He added that he isn't sure why they are concerned with this, because with the Kennedy Bridge project itself they are going to need approval by the Flood Plain Administration anyway, but we know that the Corps and FEMA don't always agree 100% on everything.

Haugen commented, that in any event, although the minutes of several meetings will reflect that MnDOT stated that if the Corps did come up with this opinion it would be part of the Kennedy Bridge project, but they are now saying that this FEMA thing is new to us so we aren't exactly sure how it will impact the project, so we aren't committing 100% that it will done with the project now.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 21st, 2015**

Haugen reported that also included in the packet are the signature features summary for the Kennedy Bridge. He explained that these are the things that are now being given to the consultant to work with. He said that there will be two meetings held with the community to help narrow down what features we would like to see done, then we will get the cost of doing them, and if they are within the budget available include them in the project scope.

Haugen added that if there are features that we would like to see done that aren't included in the budget, this will give one or the other community, or both, to step forward and finance them locally if they so wish.

Haugen reported that as of last week, MnDOT, as the lead agency, has been negotiating a contract with a preferred consultant, so they have gone through the selection process and are now just finalizing the contract with the consultant to do the project development.

Information only.

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that have been a couple of little things that have happened on the Sorlie Bridge Project since our last meeting.

Haugen stated that the most significant thing was that the signature feature budget, while last month it was reported that each State would be contributing \$100,000; at our Technical Advisory Committee meeting NDDOT stated that it is really just \$150,000 split between the two States. He said that again, the question is if the costs come above this \$150,000, whether one or both cities will want to contribute local dollars to include those signature items they still want to see done, or if the \$150,000 is the budget they will be used.

Haugen said that NDDOT has also committed that they will replace the existing lighting, as it does have to be removed in order to paint the bridge, thus it makes sense to replace it at that time. He commented that this includes replacing both the safety and the decorative lighting currently there.

Haugen commented that minutes from the Historical Preservation Commission were e-mailed last Friday to this body. He reported that KLJ is the consultant for the project, and they did a presentation to the Historical Preservation Commission, and if you read the minutes you will see the reaction they received. He commented that it is basically too early in the game to a definite yes or no, but they were given some direction as to how to light up the bridge.

Haugen reported that at next month's meeting this body will be asked to amend the T.I.P. to move the Sorlie Bridge project from a 2018 project to a 2015 project, to reduce the cost from roughly \$30,000,000 to about \$5,000,000. He added that in order to be able to make an April bid letting, they need to have the signature features determined by the end of January, so we should have a determination as to what signature features will be done by the end of next week.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 21st, 2015**

DeMers asked, with the change in the scope-of-work for the Sorlie Bridge project, what is the anticipated down time for the bridge. Haugen responded that the answer he has heard to that question is that there will only be temporary closure to traffic, and they will try to maintain traffic flow as much as possible. Yavarow added that it will be closed minimally, but it will be closed during maybe half of the time.

Vetter asked who was saying yes or no on the signature features, who is running with that ball. Haugen responded that the NDDOT is the lead agency, they are the ones running with that ball. He said that from Minnesota's point of view, since it is just a maintenance project, even though there are some signature feature items, unless the City of East Grand Forks wants to add to that budget some local monies, MnDOT doesn't feel the East Grand Forks City Council has a yes or no say, but on the North Dakota side the Grand Forks City Council has to provide 10% of the cost of the project so they will be going to the council for confirmation of the project decisions. Haugen added that because this is a historical structure, both State's SHIPs will have a say, and also because Grand Forks has a local Historical Preservation Commission, they will also have a say as to what is and isn't allowed on the structure.

DeMers asked, then, it would be like a \$7,500 pay to play type of thing. He said that if it is a 75,000 cost share with State, and Grand Forks has to pay 10%, they have to pay \$7,500. Haugen responded that that is correct, but they also have to pay 10% of the \$5,000,000 as well.

Haugen commented that there was a committee formed back when the Kennedy Bridge was first talked about, what signature features would be done there, and the same basic group met back in December to talk about the Sorlie Bridge's signature features as well. He said that the Mayor of East Grand Forks, he believes was in attendance, and the City's Consulting Engineer had a representative there as well.

Haugen stated that, just as with the Kennedy, the environmental approval process is the driving force behind this, so in order to get a project done in 2015 they need to have a pretty clean review process and the signature feature item is, perhaps, the only real wild card that might cause the timeline to slip a bit.

Information only.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT #1 TO THE 2015-2016 UPWP

Haugen reported that, as you recall, back in October this body approved the 2015-2016 UPWP; but when Ms. McNelis entered the programmed dollars into her accounting system she discovered a calculation error of \$260,000. He stated that the good news is that this meant we had monies unaccounted for so we didn't have to take projects out of the work program.

Haugen commented that the error occurred in the spreadsheet, down under the land use plan. He explained that back then the total cost for the land use plan item was \$260,000, and he added the three cells under that item when he should only have added one cell.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 21st, 2015**

Haugen reported that the other thing that occurred, that is included in the staff report, is that since October our U.S. #2 Access Study consulting firm performed additional work, thus we received a bill for a much higher amount than we had anticipated when we first set the budget, so we deducted an additional \$50,000 in 2014, thus we carried \$50,000 less over into 2015.

Haugen stated that what we are asking to be amended into the work program, and highlighted on the spreadsheet, is, originally both cities were asked if they wanted to have their zoning ordinances updated in conjunction with their Land Use Plans; East Grand Forks felt they didn't need that, Grand Forks felt they did, but under the original budget error we didn't have the money available to help Grand Forks out, but now that we discovered this additional revenue, Grand Forks wants us to assist them with their Land Development Code as well, so we added an additional \$110,000 back into the Land Use item to take care of this.

Haugen reported that he spread the remaining funds throughout various administrative items and studies that we have going on. He pointed out that for each of the Land Use Plans they increased the consultant budget \$10,000 each; for the Bygland Road Study they added an additional \$5,000; and for some of the administrative activities they increased the budget line items to reflect what our most recent budget costs have been for each.

Haugen stated that the only other change is to the text. He explained that in the text of the work program you approved they did mention that they would be finishing the access study in 2015, however the table didn't reflect that line activity, so it is being brought in. He added that this does not impact the budget, but it does need to be included in the spreadsheet in addition to the document text.

Haugen reiterated that, in a nutshell, what is going on here is that our original error was double counting the Land Use Plan costs; we also had a bigger than anticipated bill in 2014 that took some carryover monies away that we had budgeted for; we have confirmed with Grand Forks that they do want their Land Development Code updated as part of their Land Use Plan update; we also increased some of the consultant costs for these already programmed activities; and increased a little some of these other type of admin costs to round out the project.

Haugen said that the recommended action, he believes, is to approve, but also to still know that the NDDOT and Federal Highway have not completed a full review of the work program changes, so there may be some subtle changes that they may require, although he isn't anticipating any, but we should still approve it subject to their review.

***MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED
AMENDMENT #1 TO THE 2015-2016 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM
SUBJECT TO PARTNER AGENCY REVIEW.***

Voting Aye: Adams, DeMers, Powers, Strandell, Vetter, and Mock.

Voting Nay: None.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 21st, 2015**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF EXTENSION OF PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT
CONTRACT WITH GOODPOINTE TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION**

Kouba reported that back in June this body approved a contract for getting a pavement condition analysis done for all of the roads in Grand Forks and East Grand Forks. She explained that there have been some delays along the way; there was an original delay of the right-of-way imagery we had done the previous summer, some of those images had gotten lost in transfers so they had to come back out and redo them; then we also updated some of the mapping information they had, and there was a glitch in trying to get the condition and the maps to come together, so they have been having some data tweaking issues, so it has pretty much delayed everything else along the line.

Kouba stated that as of right now they have gotten the condition analysis done for Grand Forks and East Grand Fork; but, unfortunately the East Grand Forks one hasn't been inputted into our data base, so that needs to be done, and the report has to be completed, thus the need to extend the contract to March 31st, 2015, although they do plan on having it done before that date.

DeMers asked if this is something that runs parallel with, or along with the stuff that the East Grand Forks' Consulting Engineer does as well, because he was under the impression that, a couple of years ago they were going to proceed with doing our own pavement analysis. Kouba responded that they are using the Goodpointe software and the information that we have inputted, or have had Goodpointe input into our data base. DeMers, said, then that it is the same. Kouba responded it was.

Haugen reported that this is just a time extension, it does not involve any increase in funding.

***MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE EXTENSION OF
THE PAVEMENT CONDITION ANALYSIS CONTRACT WITH GOODPOINTE
TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION TO MARCH 31ST, 2015.***

Voting Aye: Adams, DeMers, Powers, Strandell, Vetter, and Mock.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF 2016-2019 T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS

Minnesota Side

Haugen reported that on the Minnesota side, this month was the deadline for the Transportation Alternative Program submittal. He stated that there were two projects that were being worked on for submittal, however both of them were not forwarded for submittal, so for now we have no Minnesota candidate projects. He added that next month we will have the same basic programs we are now discussing, discussed on the North Dakota side.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 21st, 2015**

North Dakota Side

Haugen commented that on the North Dakota side, just to highlight what our responsibilities are as an MPO, we review these to make sure they are consistent with our Planning Documents, and we also prioritize the projects within its proposed funding program.

Haugen referred to a slide illustrating the MPO study area, and pointed out that the grey area is the Federal Aid Adjusted Urban Boundary. He stated that there are some programs that are only available to do projects in this area, and there are some programs that only allow projects within the brown and tan area, however anything in the wider boundary that needs or uses federal aid must come through the MPO process, so it isn't just for project within the City, it also covers our full study area.

Haugen reported that in the past it used to be sort of a six to nine month process, compressed, starting in the fall and ending in the spring, but it has now evolved into a twelve month, continuous process.

Haugen stated that there are still a lot of big unknowns, which have been conveyed to this body for the last several years, and unfortunately they are still unresolved. He said that MAP-21, our federal legislation that authorizes transportation programs expires at the end of May this year. He added that there is funding for all of 2015, but there isn't any money after May 31st if they don't authorize the program, so what we do today is subject to change, and he is expecting that it probably will change.

Haugen reported that we have, for the last couple of years, had to do the year of expenditure adjustment. He explained that in the old days we would scope out a project and price it at today's dollars, program four years from now, and then be surprised, perhaps, that the cost changed; now we are trying to inflate the costs up to what we think those costs will be in the future. He commented, however, that, as noted, and you will see in a later list of projects there is still an issue with the year of expenditure still occurring.

Haugen referred to the staff report, listing the projects, and to a power point presentation and went over the projects briefly (a copy of the list and presentation are included in the file and available upon request).

Haugen said, then, in summary, for the TAP Program there are three projects, prioritized as staff and the Technical Advisory Committee recommend; for HSIP we are showing the staff/Technical Advisory Committee recommended prioritization scenario, however we maintain their priority order within the two categories; for Regional Road, again there are some slight changes to the current T.I.P, and the new projects are DeMers Avenue and U.S. Business 2, or 5th Street, which are both within our long range plan and timeline; for Urban Roads, the new project is the Mill and Overlay of University Avenue, and the Illustrative Projects trying to account for the year of expenditure and the 80/20 split for the Columbia Road Project.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 21st, 2015**

Haugen stated that these are the candidate projects, in the priority order staff and the Technical Advisory Committee are recommending, and that they are consistent with the Long Range Transportation Plan, and should be given priority ranking as discussed.

MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE LIST OF CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE FY2016-2019 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Adams, DeMers, Powers, Strandell, Vetter, and Mock.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT RFP FOR EAST GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN UPDATE

Kouba reported that in our work program this is what Mr. Haugen was discussing earlier, the Land Use Plan Update for East Grand Forks. She stated that they are hoping to have it completed by the end of the 2015, with a draft available in October for review. She added that there will be some public input meetings held during the process.

Kouba said that staff is recommending approval of the RFP as submitted.

Vetter referred to Item #3 in the staff report, and asked why we are singling out the property north of 23rd Avenue N.W. and east of Valley Golf Course, and he was wondering why. Kouba responded that it was requested by the East Grand Forks City Planner due to some possible development in that area.

Vetter stated that the next item on our agenda today is the Bygland Road Study, and he was wondering if the Bygland Road Study wouldn't be an integral part of the Land Use Plan Study as well. Haugen responded that they are similar, the consultant(s) will be under contract at the same time, and will be aware of each other's work, but the Bygland Road Study is more of a transportation focus, so that is why it needs to be a separate RFP.

Haugen explained that, going back to that one area, the way it is worded is that through the process three areas will be identified, only to assist the consultant in understanding potentially what those areas, or what one area might be, that is that one area that is highlighted, but it doesn't state that that is in-fact one of the three areas.

MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE RFP FOR THE EAST GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Adams, DeMers, Powers, Strandell, Vetter, and Mock.

Voting Nay: None.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 21st, 2015**

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT RFP FOR BYGLAND ROAD

Haugen reported that this is the RFP for the Bygland Road Study that is included in the work program. He explained that it is basically going from the signals at 1st and 3rd to the Middle School, looking at all of the intersections along there, the turning movements, and looking at the potential for multi-modal connections that would include not only bike/ped, but also interplaying with the transit routes that utilize Bygland Road and cross Bygland Road.

Haugen stated that one unique thing about this study is that East Grand Forks has asked us to consider what different solutions might be if there were ever a bridge constructed at 32nd Avenue. He said that he discussed this at the Technical Advisory Committee last week, quite a bit, and the only reason they are looking at 32nd is because any other bridge location would be Merrifield, as currently identified, and in all the past studies Merrifield has had little impact on Bygland Road, so it made sense to look at just the one bridge at 32nd.

Haugen commented that there will be two scenarios run; one based off what our current 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan is, and that is with no additional bridges; and a second based on a bridge at 32nd.

Haugen said that the timeline for this study is a little quicker than that for the Land Use Plan.

MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE RFP FOR THE BYGLAND ROAD STUDY, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Adams, DeMers, Powers, Strandell, Vetter, and Mock.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL FO DRAFT RFP FOR AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY

Kouba reported that this is a project that we generally done about every three years, updating it and refreshing our imagery so that we can see where the city is growing, where there are new roads, what new infrastructure is out there, and it has been requested by both cities.

Kouba stated that there is a budget of \$50,000 for the project, and it shouldn't take very long. She said that they generally do the imaging in April or May, before the trees leaf out and there isn't any snow left on the ground.

Mock asked if there was any partnering with UND on this kind of thing. Kouba responded that they haven't done anything with UND on this in the past. Haugen asked if Ms. Mock was asking whether or not we are making sure we cover areas that the university is interested in; or is it more a question as to whether or not the university is capable of doing the project. Mock responded that she is wondering if maybe the university has grad students that are already getting some of this product. Kouba responded that not a lot of them are, the only one that she knows of that would be doing any kind of imagery would be the Upper Mid-West Aerospace, and they do mostly farm land, and generally focus on certain areas, so they aren't really prepared to do something of this scope.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 21st, 2015**

DeMers asked if, once we get this project completed, is it marketable, can we sell it to anybody, is anybody interested in it. Haugen responded that it is copyrighted by us, but it is still a government product so we are regulated on what we can do with it, although we obviously allow our local agencies, and our State and Federal Partners to have access to it. DeMers is just thinking of Google Earth, knowing that they like to buy this kind of information up. Haugen responded that we have never been approached by them to purchase any of our imagery. DeMers stated that this is something that we maybe should look into.

Strandell said that he sees there is a \$50,000 cost for this, who is paying for it. Haugen responded that it is part of the work program, so it is 80% federal funds and 20% local match.

MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE RFP FOR THE AERIAL IMAGERY PROJECT, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Adams, DeMers, Powers, Strandell, Vetter, and Mock.

Voting Nay: None.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. EGF Functional Classification Update

Haugen reported that, as you are aware, we have been going back and forth with MnDOT on the Functional Classification for East Grand Forks. He said that where they are at right now is that they have reached an agreement on everything except for those Principal Arterial Stubs; 220 North and Bygland Road, so they are going to the Arbitration Committee next.

Haugen commented that MnDOT asked him earlier this week to prepare a package of information for the five member committee. He stated that the committee is made up of representatives from the City, County, Federal Highway, RDC's and one other entity that he can't recall at this time.

Haugen reported that after he submits our arguments as to why we think 220 North and Bygland Road should remain Principal Arterials, MnDOT will produce their arguments as to why they feel they should be dropped down to Minor Arterials, the committee will review the information, and may decide without our having to appear before them or we may have to appear before them, so right now he is preparing that information, and will submit it to MnDOT in the next ten days.

Haugen stated that other than these two roadways, the rest of the reclassification has been agreed to by City Council and were presented to this body last month.

2. Legislative Session

Haugen reported that for both North Dakota and Minnesota legislative sessions are on-going, and both have significant proposals for increased funding potential for transportation. He said that at

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 21st, 2015**

this early stage it is difficult to know what might come out of it, but if anyone is interested he can certainly share what he has seen in terms of the different proposals for each side of the river, but it does appear that there is a big movement for additional transportation funding.

Discussion ensued.

3. Merrifield Road Interchange

Vetter asked if there has been anything new on the Merrifield Road Interchange. Haugen responded that Merrifield Road is probably on everybody's back burner, but not on the forefront for funding.

Vetter asked if there is any other area being discussed. Haugen responded that the City of Grand Forks' official list only mentions two structures, 42nd Street Grade Separation and a 47th Avenue Interchange, otherwise he isn't aware of anything else. He added that he doesn't think that Grand Forks County has submitted any kind of priority list of any sort.

Haugen reported that eventually, if you look back in the work program, you will see an I-29 Traffic Operation Study that is scheduled to begin this year; and Merrifield and 47th and the existing 32nd, DeMers and Washington and U.S. #2 interchanges will all be looked at. He said that in the future, the existing ones, will all have some capacity problems so we will look at doing a real good study and determine what projects should be in what sequence to alleviate those capacity issue.

4. Additional Discussion On Lunch Vendor Options

Powers asked if anyone had any thoughts on this issue. Consensus was that whatever option works best is fine. Powers said that he would suggest that Peggy, Earl and himself go over there and discuss the issue of accepting our checks with the owner of Seasons. He added that if he still isn't willing to accept our checks, then we will look at other options.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY STRANDELL, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO ADJOURN THE JANUARY 21ST, 2015, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:06 P.M.

Voting Aye: Adams, DeMers, Powers, Strandell, 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, February 18th, 2015 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Mike Powers, Chairman, called the February 18th, 2015 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, Clarence Vetter, Marc DeMers, Jeannie Mock, and Warren Strandell.

Absent were: Ken Vein and Gary Malm.

Staff: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Teri Kouba, 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

Powers declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 21ST, 2015, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 21ST, 2015, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: Adams, DeMers, Powers, Strandell, Vetter, and Mock.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen referred to the staff report, and reported that MNDOT is still in negotiations with its preferred consultant to do the design study on the Kennedy Bridge.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, February 18th, 2015**

Haugen commented that there is some information that may impact the Kennedy Bridge. He explained that Governor Dayton's \$6 Billion Dollar Transportation proposal includes a list of projects, one of which is the reconstruction of the bridge on 4th Street. He stated that, as you will recall, one of the issues we have been discussing with MnDOT is the low area, and one of the controlling aspects has been the height of this bridge, so if in fact it is included as part of a package, and there is ultimately a new bridge at 4th Street, it would offer an opportunity to make more advancement on the road raise issue on the East Grand Forks side. He added, however, that reconstruction of the bridge at 4th Street still has a lot of hurdles that would need to be met, including the rehabilitation of the Kennedy itself, so, again, we are waiting for MnDOT to get a consultant on board to start design work, and go through the other processes to get it out for bidding. He said that they are still talking about the project being done in 2016.

Information only.

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen referred to the staff report, and stated that one issue is the "dips" in the approaches on both ends of the bridge. He explained that they are continuing to try to have discussions with both the NDDOT and MnDOT, and the Cities of Grand Forks and East Grand Forks about whether it is part of the bridge project, or if it will be done at all this year. He said that at the Technical Advisory Committee last week, the District Engineer from North Dakota did not have too much information on the possibility, and MnDOT staff, who normally would attend our Technical Advisory Committee meetings, did not have any information either so the short answer is that there is still hope that it can be accomplished with a temporary fill this construction season, and then a more permanent fix might be available when the NDDOT does work on DeMers Avenue in 2019, at which time we will try to engage MnDOT to do the same on the East Grand Forks side of the bridge.

Haugen reported that on the signature features it has come down to a lighting concept. He explained that KLJ met with the Grand Forks Historic Preservation Commission a week ago, and also met with a group of people this morning, and submitted their proposed lighting plan. He referred to slides illustrating the existing lighting, and the proposed lighting plan and went over the proposed plan briefly.

Haugen referred to a slide illustrating early lighting on the bridge and explained that the Historic Preservation Commission felt that it was probably an orphan set of lights from a different structure that were attached to the bridge at some time. He pointed out that it also hung lower than the lowest steel beam, so for this design they felt that it probably wasn't the right way to go to try to replicate what was there back then. DeMers said, then, that it is not really history, its selective history. Haugen responded that they either go back to trying to replicate the original, or they go the opposite approach by not trying to make it a fake historic issue, so they did look at what was there historically, but for many reasons they decided not to try to replicate history and are now going with more modern LED lighting.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, February 18th, 2015**

Haugen commented that the motion that passed at the Historic Preservation Commission meeting basically said that they go along with the proposed lighting plan, that it has no adverse effect, but that there has to be a policy developed that will spell out how that lighting will be illuminated, particularly the different color options, and when it will be used, etc. Mock asked who would make that policy. Haugen responded that ultimately there will be a group of people, those listed in the motion, that will draft a policy and submit it to all the groups involved in this process for approval.

Mock asked if when they use colored lighting it will still provide enough light for pedestrians to still be able to see adequately. Haugen responded that KLJ is still finalizing that aspect of the lighting, but technology is such that one set of lights will remain white while another set can be colored, so there should be adequate lighting .

Haugen reported that the budget, so far, for the lights has stayed within the \$150,000 allocated to it.

Haugen said that the expectation is that the next step will be to give presentations to both City Councils to get their concurrence with this proposal. He said that on the North Dakota side there is a 10% match of North Dakota's 50% cost share of the total project; and on the Minnesota side there is a 0% match for East Grand Forks.

Haugen reported that one thing they will not do is illuminate any of the trails underneath the bridge, that will not be part of this project.

Yavarow stated that the bid date is April 10th for this project.

Further discussion on lighting options/issues ensued.

Haugen commented that he would expect that at either one of your March City Council meetings you will have your staff report and a request to concur with the project and the lighting plan. He added that he would imagine you will also be asked to nominate people to start working on the policy.

Information only.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FY2015 ANNUAL ELEMENT T.I.P. AMENDMENTS

Haugen reported that last week they did advertise for public comment on the proposed T.I.P. amendments, and also provided for people to provide written comments as well. He said that no one showed up at the public hearing and no written comments were received.

Haugen stated that the bulk of these T.I.P. amendments are administrative things that we need to do. He said that the real big one affects the Sorlie Bridge, however, just to comment on some of the other amendments, for the Grand Forks Cities Area Transit there are three things that we

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, February 18th, 2015**

need to amend. He reported that first, back when we developed the T.I.P., we identified some requests for funding, and those awards have since been announced. Haugen stated that we originally asked for five fixed route coach replacements, but only one was funded so we have to show the actual amount awarded; and they also requested two demand response vehicle replacements, but only one was funded, so again we have to show the actual amount awarded for that replacement vehicle. He added that finally the continuation of the Mobility Manager position was funded as well.

Haugen stated that, again, the big item was the Sorlie Bridge, and that it is being moved from 2018 into 2015, and the project estimate is \$5.1 million dollars and does include the signature feature, or the lighting aspect of it. He said that on the North Dakota side they are using federal funds and on the Minnesota side they are using State Bridge Bond monies. He added that on the North Dakota side there is a required local match from the City of Grand Forks, but there is no local match required for the City of East Grand Forks.

Haugen commented that there are a couple of things on the Minnesota side that we need to amend into the T.I.P. beside the Sorlie:

- 1) The Good Samaritan Home applied for, and was awarded \$60,000 in federal funds to replace a van that they purchased 12 to 15 years ago, also with federal funds. This needs to be included in the T.I.P. in order for them to actually access the federal award.
- 2) A district wide reflective curve delineation signs. As part of MnDOT's use of safety funds they determined that it is appropriate to put in chevron signs at critical curves throughout their system, and they plan on putting them on U.S. 2 out be the shop and at the intersection with Business 2 at two places. These also have to be included in our T.I.P.

MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE FY2015 ANNUAL ELEMENT T.I.P. AMENDMENTS AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH OUR LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN.

Voting Aye: Adams, DeMers, Powers, Strandell, Vetter, and Mock.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ACTIVITY TO CONDUCT THE NORTH GRAND FORKS AT-GRADE RAILROAD CROSSING MITIGATION STRATEGY STUDY

Haugen referred to a map of the areas being discussed and went over the proposed study briefly.

Haugen reported that around the first of the year, the North Dakota State Mill approached the MPO staff and informed us that they are going to increase their capacity 30%. He said that they also indicated that they needed to find a way to get increased grain to their mill, and the Mill Spur has a severe limitation on its ability to handle unit trains.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, February 18th, 2015**

Haugen commented that, if you remember, we did a Freight Rail Access Study a year ago, and they worked independent of that and identified a site in the Glasston Subdivision where they could purchase enough land to be able to develop a loop system so that a unit train could be landed, and they would then shuttle the unit cars back over to the mill using a new railroad route that would be connected from the north of the Mill Spur to get in and out.

Haugen stated that their request to the MPO was primarily to work with the other users of the Mill Spur to see if they would welcome their idea of eliminating a portion of the mill spur, have it abandoned and removed, and have all of the train service coming into the area north of Gateway Drive use this new route that they would have to create for them to continue 30% more production of flour and other materials out of the mill.

Haugen said that the MPO worked with the NDDOT and got them to agree that, yes, we can work with the Mill and the properties that are currently served by the mill to see if they can reach an agreement on this northern route. He added that we also need to work on getting people engaged with what is happening at the three crossings on the Glasston Subdivision; University Avenue, 6th Avenue, and Gateway Drive. He commented that the Technical Advisory Committee, at their meeting last week, added in 27th Avenue, and we were always going to look at a new railroad crossing at North Washington, so the study before you is to look at these five crossings, four existing and one new one, to see what mitigations we can do because of the increased conflict that will occur between trains, particularly unit trains, and traffic, and also work with the Mill Spur properties to try to get abandonment of the Mill Spur area.

Haugen reiterated that they have worked with the NDDOT and Federal Highway on the language of the scope, and also with the modifications from the Technical Advisory Committee, and are asking this body to authorize the MPO staff to release an RFP to engage a consultant to do this study.

Haugen said that the Mill itself has their consultant finalizing, our Freight Rail Access Study identified a potential for a unit train to land in this area, and their work identified an area essentially a mile north, so their consultants, in working with the, again, the local DOT, City, County, Township officials, will finalize which of these two will be their new route the way the new landing spur will match up with the Mill Spur, at their cost, and we will just engage on the new crossing of Washington. He added that as part of their discussions with BNSF, BNSF told them that it would be nice if they could get the west wide and rebuilt at 42nd and DeMers, because currently all of the unit trains that go on the Glasston Sub, all the trains have to come into the yard and then come back out, so from BNSF's perspective it would make their operation easier if all of the western portion could be rebuilt, so their consultant is looking at whether that is practicable given the development UND has on the western side of 42nd Street.

Haugen commented that part of our RFP identifies that we will engage a consultant, and they will inform us if we do any mitigation on University Avenue or 6th Avenue, what impact, if any, it will have on the proposed 42nd Street Grade Separation.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, February 18th, 2015**

Haugen reported that we are tagging along with the NPN, and the NPN will also introduce increased train traffic on the Glasston Sub. He explained that the NPN is the nitrogen plant, and it will introduce unit trains, obviously the mill will introduce unit trains, there already are unit trains for your main facilities and also for American Crystal's coal near Minto, so that is why we were encouraged to look at what mitigations with all the increased train traffic, with the critical routes that the Glasston Sub blocks when trains are using it, and see if we can't get a positive response on the proposed abandonment of the Mill Spur line through the Near North Neighborhood in Grand Forks.

Haugen commented that they think they have worked out all of the concerns, and have a scope of work that has been approved and recommended to this body by both the Technical Advisory Committee and staff, and our federal and state partners, so we are asking the Executive Policy Board to authorize staff to release an RFP to engage a consultant on this study.

DeMers pointed out that it looks like on the west side the rail is kind of, in some sense, retreating west and moving north, would there be an incentive or possibility of changing the route, if everything is going north on Glasston, would there be some incentive to try to bypass East Grand Forks and come back on the east side of East Grand Forks. Haugen responded that from BNSF's perspective, no. He explained that their focus and push is on the routes that are servicing the Bakken Oil movement, and millions of dollars are being invested on that, so from their perspective the main line is fine and serviceable for their future needs.

Haugen commented that further up there is a line that does cross, maybe north of Oslo. DeMers stated that they wouldn't want to eliminate service for businesses in East Grand Forks, but just knowing we have that central corridor plan trying to mitigate how you get north/south traffic to East Grand Forks, he would think that if you could eliminate at least the downtown area and rail, there is a lot of space there that could be used for ????. Haugen agreed, but added that perhaps the most controlling thing is the yard itself, it is just a natural flow. He added that there will be some increased north movement, but the predominant flow will still be ??? and south, and a little more coming into the yard and continuing through.

Haugen stated that they will explore with BNSF, and their engagement and involvement in the study that we are asking you to authorize, about giving us some future potential plans of coming from the north. DeMers commented that he thinks it is also, the buzz, whether it is at the State level or Federal, is on rail safety also, so there may be several opportunities to look at Federal or State funding to move it out of ???, so it is something that hasn't been formalized yet, obviously, but it is something that we should maybe prepare for.

***MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING MPO
STAFF TO RELEASE AN RFP FOR THE NORTH GRAND FORKS AT-GRADE
RAILROAD CROSSING MITIGATION STUDY.***

Voting Aye: Adams, DeMers, Powers, Strandell, Vetter, and Mock.

Voting Nay: None.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, February 18th, 2015**

MATTER OF UPDATE ON THE TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Kouba reported that there have been a few changes to our Transit Development Plan that required we do an update.

Kouba said that these changes were due to projects or partial projects being moved from the illustrative project list to FY2014, and to significant changes in the operating cost due to an increase in driver salaries. She added that the planned 30-minute headway has been taken out of the budget and the vehicles that were to be purchased have been taken out of the capital improvements list as the amount of expended FTA funding for capital replacement vehicles was reduced by half.

Kouba referred to the tables and proposed route changes, included in the packet, and went over the changes briefly.

Haugen commented that at some point they will be going through both cities' Planning Commissions and City Councils for adoption of these changes to the transit system and part of the Long Range Transportation Plan document.

DeMers asked if there would be any sense to changing the direction of Route 11. He said that this thought on this is that it looks like it would primarily service Northland, so if someone was transferring, instead of riding everywhere else and then going to Northland, it almost looks like it would be a direct shot to Northland. Kouba responded that the truth is is that Northland is pretty much served on the half hour in reality because Route 10 gets up there as well, so it is staggered enough that they have plenty of service, so they would like to continue focusing on the south end for Route 11.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON THE U.S. #2 ACCESS MANAGEMENT STUDY

Haugen reported that we will hold our second public open house next Tuesday, February 24th, at the Ramada Inn. He stated that the Steering Committee met a couple of weeks ago, and they helped them walk through some alternatives and narrow them down to present them to the public. Haugen referred to the packet and said that a more detailed documentation was included.

Haugen commented that they are looking at a couple of alternatives at Airport Drive. He added that there are two issues they are trying to solve; one is an identified safety issue, and the other is if we do nothing we will have a level of service in the future that isn't acceptable.

Haugen explained that they looked at the alternatives using a four step process:

- 1) Brainstorm Solutions
- 2) Discard Alternatives that don't reduce crash potential.
- 3) Discard Alternatives that don't meet LOS standards.
- 4) Environmental Impacts Scoring.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, February 18th, 2015**

Haugen went over the alternatives briefly:

- A) Do nothing.
- B) Dynamic Speed Display Signs (DSD) – Lowest priced alternative.
- C) Intersection Conflict Warning System (ICWS) - These are being used in Minnesota and have a fairly low cost.
- D) Reduced Crossing U-Turn Intersection (RCUT) – Haugen referred to a slide illustrating this alternative and explained that under this configuration the through movements and the left-outs would be eliminated; the through movements would occur by coming to the new median cuts and your left turns would initially go the opposite direction to make the final movement they wish to do. He added that there would be new lanes created to help with the weave taking place, to separate the slow moving vehicles from the faster moving vehicles.

Haugen reported that the cost is fairly inexpensive compared to the others still in play. He added that this RCUT is what is in the Local Road Safety Program that was presented to you last year as a solution they identified for the intersection. He said that it does do a fairly good job of safety, however you see that operation wise it isn't the best solution.

- E) Staggered T-Intersection Configuration (STIC) – Haugen referred to a slide illustrating this alternative and explained that, again the conflicts are left-outs primarily versus the speed, the unexpected signal with high speeds, so we are trying to separate those movements from each other. He added that currently they are right on top of each other, the left turns are conflicting with the left turns so the concept here is to realign Airport Drive to the east since most of the left turns are to head back to the east, so we want to remove them from the left turns that are heading to the west, and instead of one location we will separate a whole intersection into three legged T-intersections. He stated that the actual through movements, according to our traffic counts, was less than 5% of the traffic using Airport Drive and County 5 as a way to go through the intersection, so we are talking about very little traffic volume going through the intersection being hindered by this move, the rest of the traffic will basically do the operation they are doing now except for they don't have to wait for a green light.

DeMers asked how this would be hindered by growth to the west of Grand Forks. Haugen responded that all of these are based on 2040 traffic volumes, so they are all computer simulated as to what our 2040 traffic volumes will be and how they will operate. He commented that he does have the ability, if you are interested, in showing those simulation models.

- F) Diamond Interchange (INT) – Haugen stated that this is the desired interchange. He explained that the concept that they are presenting forward is an underpass concept instead of an overpass. He stated that this is due to flight restrictions and the height

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, February 18th, 2015**

restrictions at are connected with the Airport Operations. He said that this concept also includes building frontage roads to maintain service for airport operations and for future development of the area. He summarized that while this is ultimately the most desired, it is also the most costly of the alternatives.

Haugen reported that the ten member Steering Committee was asked to rank the alternatives. He said they ranked them as follows:

- 1) Staggered T-Intersection
- 2/3) Dynamic Speed Display Signs/Interchange - Tied
- 4) Intersection Conflict Warning System
- 5) RCUT
- 6) Do Nothing

Haugen stated that for the I-29 Interchange area there were several alternatives reviewed, the issues we have with this area is operations and the correlation between operations and crash potential, so they discarded things, interchanges that are in our area, but would be newer types introduced to here to Grand Forks and East Grand Forks.

Haugen said that there are two that we are bringing forward – they are:

- A) Northeast Loop (NEL) – Haugen stated that this is the simplest to implement as it involves just adding a north bound loop. He explained that currently all of the north bound off-traffic has to take the off-ramp, so if you separate those that want to go east from the west by creating the loop you do get considerable improvement in your operations. He said, however, the one thing it does though, almost all of the alternatives we looked at, it does modify how access is gained at 43rd Street; which would include the hotel, visitor center, McDonalds, gas station, etc. He stated that it does have a great operations impact, it does have a great safety impact, but again the cost estimate is not outrageous, it's relative.
- B) Modified Northeast Loop Concept – Haugen explained that this alternative takes the same Northeast Loop concept but tweaks it, and improves it slightly. He stated that what it does is it brings all of the conflicting turning movements at one intersection, so you are eliminating some of the traffic signals and other things through the intersection, but in order to make it work we do have a more major impact, particularly on the McDonald's area. He added that it does have a little bit of a funky operation taking place if you're coming southbound, take the off-ramp and go eastbound, there will be a barrier in place, but you are kind of on the wrong side of the median progressing through to go east. Haugen commented that it does have a higher cost because we would have to do modifications to the bridge structure.

Haugen reported that there clearly was a favorite alternative out of the committee, and the analysis would say there is a clear one as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, February 18th, 2015**

Haugen commented that the discussed the issue of where the next traffic signal, perhaps, should be installed; 55th Street, 51st Street, and 58th Street will all warrant signals at some time, but right now 55th Street also has a warrant for crashes occurring there. He stated that the committee is suggesting that the next signal be located at 55th Street.

Haugen stated that one of the main reasons for the whole study was to try to nail down future access points. He said that there are two strategies that we are carrying forward: the first is perhaps what is already experienced out there and that is extending the frontage road; the second is to just work at specific locations to carry frontage or backage road concepts and identify the type of access control at the intersections in-between and where we would have signal space.

Haugen reported that the cost, you have everything but frontage and backage, and includes the cost to build those frontage and backage roads, context specific, there would be a little less cost, but would still have more access.

Haugen said that the next item is just talking about the fertilizer plant and the traffic it will introduce. He explained that all of our previous forecasts did not include the nitrogen plant.

Haugen commented that there would be two options; Route 1 is using 55th Street, and if you will recall that is where we are recommending a traffic signal be placed, the other one is 69th Street. He said that the main decider for this option is, the Nitrogen plant needs to land a unit train, and according to their operations plan, and the siting of the railroad track, this is 55th Street, north/south, and then this is 54th Avenue, so you can see that the railroad track diagonally dissects the intersection there, and if you use 55th to get into the plant itself, one day a week a unit train is going to block the ability traffic north bound to west bound or east bound to south bound, so what the nitrogen plan has to do is to build a parallel roadway along their unit train track and then reconnect at 70th Avenue which gets us over to North Washington.

Haugen reported that in March they will be trying to finalize the recommendations from the steering committee, and start engaging it through the local approval process. He added that they may need to go before a township board or two depending on what is going on. He stated that there is a meeting with the townships and county people regarding the nitrogen plant next week.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON CONSOLITATED PLANNING GRANT AND LOCAL MATCH

Haugen reported that this is a continuation of when we approved our work program for the next two years, we had discussion about, particularly local match, and some other items. He stated that since then, there has been an issue of too much planning money, perhaps, laying on the table in North Dakota.

Haugen stated that staff met with the Finance Committee to try to lay out what is going on and to get some recommendations from them as to how to approach the issue. He explained that what has been transpiring is, because of the uncertainty of MAP-21, or the reauthorization, plus the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, February 18th, 2015**

uncertainty of whether or not Minot would be designated as an MPO, we were encourage to sort of bank dollars to build up a reserve in case MAP-21 didn't get done, and in case Minot did become and MPO so that we all wouldn't be at a loss for funds.

Haugen commented that what has happened is that MAP-21 did become authorized so the full money wasn't halted, and Minot did not become an MPO so the funds did not need to be divided up and now there is a pretty good healthy balance showing up in our federal highway accounts.

Haugen explained how the monies were divided, and pointed out that we receive the least amount of funds. He added, however, that there is a desire by the NDDOT for us to help identify, working with the MPOs, how we can get that balance down to a more reasonable amount, and maybe work with them on doing a joint state-wide type of effort.

Haugen stated that how this gets back to local match is, the reason why some of the balances have also gotten so large is because those other MPOs have not had the ability to spend down their balances, so back in about 2010 we received \$400,000 from Bismarck; and last year we received \$300,000 from Fargo/Moorhead.

Haugen commented that the NDDOT has identified that perhaps they could start using some of these planning dollars for statewide possibilities, but the Finance Committee was directing him to do with his communication with the other MPOs is to revisit the distribution formula to try to make sure we don't get these lump sums that we have to spend in a year, to try to get it so that the formula is based to allow we get a larger share so that all three of us are able to spend our monies down equally.

Haugen reported that we are also interested, if there is a problem for either of the other MPOs to spend their monies, to be awarded another one time amount coming to us.

Haugen said that the third thing would be to try to work with North Dakota to retain a consultant to work specifically on MAP-21 performance management process, to help identify what the measures are, and the targets, etc.

Haugen commented that the MPOs have begun an e-mail exchange, and he did share our Finance Committee's thoughts to the other two MPO directors, but have not received any type of reply from them on that.

Haugen stated that at one time the NDDOT was wondering if we would allow them to use the planning dollars for them to hire additional staff, but Federal Highway indicated that that is not a possibility, so the way we would have to deal with this would be for the three MPOs, and the NDDOT would have to agree to hire a consultant, or to put someone on retainer, not actually have a full-time employee.

Haugen referred to a slide illustrating the dollar amounts we have in our current 2015 work program, and, just to recap how we split the local match, currently, in the past we have divided

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, February 18th, 2015**

whatever this other local match item is, the amount, we have divided 50/50. He said, however, since our earlier discussion, we have done some additional changes to that basic policy. He explained that Grand Forks has agreed to pay for the added code work we added to their Land Use Plan Update, and the Mill has agreed to pay the local match for the study we just approved for them.

Haugen commented that there are some other options in play, and he has talked to one of the two counties, is that since they have an 1/8 of the voting decisions that take place, perhaps we can approach them to see if they will contribute an 1/8 of the local match. He said that, based on our 2015 dollars, that would be about \$25,000 for each county per year. He added that they are continuing to work on other options as well.

Powers asked Mr. Strandell if this was something that might be possible for Polk County down the road. Strandell responded that he doesn't see a whole lot of support for it, but he can certainly bring the idea up. He said that the question, though, that will be asked is how much of this study activity occurs on this side of the river, it is very little compared to the total budget.

Powers asked if Mr. Haugen had talked to Mr. Malm about Grand Forks County contributing as well. Haugen responded that he has not had a chance to visit with Mr. Malm on this yet.

Powers asked if this body needed to make any kind of recommendation. Haugen responded that you know what the Finance Committee has directed him to pursue, but if you would like to make an adjustment to that you can make a recommendation, however if you're satisfied with their direction then no action is necessary. He added that his intent is to continue working with the Finance Committee on the statewide balance issue, plus the local match issue as well.

Haugen added that, as he told the Finance Committee, he knows there are studies out there that were requested be done that we weren't able to finance because we didn't have enough federal funds, so he doesn't think there is a lack of project on either side of the river that want to be done, but now we might have the federal funds so we need to approach to see if there are more local dollars available, and then there is still a desire to maybe relax some of the pressure of the local match being evenly split 50/50.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. MPO Senior Planner Position

Haugen reported that last Friday was the closing date on our Senior Planner applications. He stated that we received eight applications, with a range of applicants, some with Phd's, some with Bachelor's degrees with lots of experience, so we have a wide pool of people from Canada, Minnesota, North Dakota, California, and Florida, so hopefully by our next meeting will have an announcement.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, February 18th, 2015**

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO ADJOURN THE FEBRUARY 18TH,
2015, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:14 P.M.***

Voting Aye: Adams, DeMers, Powers, Strandell, 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, March 18th, 2015 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Mike Powers, Chairman, called the March 18th, 2015 meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:00 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Mike Powers, Clarence Vetter, Marc DeMers, Jeannie Mock, Warren Strandell, Gary Malm, and Ken Vein (via conference call).

Absent was: Steve Adams.

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

Guest(s): Mike Yavarow, GF City Engineering; and Jairo Viafara, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Powers declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 18TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY STRANDELL, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 18TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: DeMers, Powers, Strandell, Vetter, Mock, Malm, and Vein.

Voting Nay: None.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW SENIOR PLANNER

Haugen introduced Jairo Viafara, the MPO's new Senior Planner, and explained that he comes from Winnipeg, and has an extensive background with the type of work we will be doing the next couple of years. He added that Mr. Viafara won't physically begin his duties until April 1st, but was in town today so he agreed to attend today's meeting in order to be introduced to the board.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 18th, 2015**

Mr. Viafara thanked the MPO for this opportunity, and explained that he is a member of the AICP, American Institute of Certified Planners, and has experience at the MPO level, particularly in Florida, and is very familiar with the things that are happening around North Dakota and Minnesota. He added that he wants to extend his appreciation for giving him this opportunity to contribute to the MPO's success.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE FY2014 MPO AUDIT REPORT

Haugen reported that Janelle Mulroy, Brady Martz, is present for a brief presentation on the FY2014 MPO Audit, a copy of which was included in the packet (and is available upon request).

Mulroy referred to the 2014 Audit Report and explained that she would like to go over some of the highlights of the report.

Presentation ensued.

Mulroy commented that, as shown on Page 2 of the audit report, they are offering their unmodified/clean opinion of the audit of the financial statements. She added that they did conduct the audit in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and government auditing standards, however one thing that is a little different this year is that the organization did not spend \$500,000 or more in federal monies, therefore there wasn't a requirement to do a single audit over the federal programs for the 2014 calendar year.

Mulroy referred to the financial statements, and went over them briefly.

Mulroy pointed out that they did find one significant deficiency, and that is the fact that they did help prepare a draft of the financial statements and proposed some audit journal entries. She said that they are required to disclose this per the auditing standards.

Information only.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE FY2014 MPO
AUDIT REPORT, AS SUBMITTED.***

Voting Aye: DeMers, Powers, Strandell, Vetter, Mock, Malm, and Vein.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that both City Councils have concurred with the signature lighting concept that was presented to this body last month. He reminded the board that a T.I.P. amendment was adopted last month as well. He added that Minnesota has changed their S.T.I.P. to reflect the 2015 construction year, but North Dakota is still in the process of ensuring that their S.T.I.P. has been changed to reflect what the MPO's T.I.P. states.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 18th, 2015**

Haugen said that there has been a shift in the bid date, originally it was pegged for an April bid letting, but that has now shifted to May. He added that the project is still intended to be done this construction season and there shouldn't be a problem with that as long as the bids come in within the boundaries set, however, because this is a State project, should the bids come in higher, they have the ability to adjust their budgets to ensure the project occurs in 2015.

Haugen commented that at a future date the Historic Preservation Commission, the two State DOTs, and all the other entities involved will have to convene their committee on the agreement as to when and how to utilize the colored lighting capabilities on the bridge, so that is still an agreement that will need to be worked out. Powers asked who was on that committee. Haugen responded that he doesn't think it has been formed yet.

Information only.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that currently the Kennedy Bridge project is waiting for MnDOT to hire their design consultant. He explained that they have been negotiating for several weeks now, but still do not have anyone in place, so given that we are now in March of 2015, and the project is intended to be done in 2016, he would anticipate that we will start seeing the project slip to 2017, as it is an extensive project as they are going to be replacing the entire deck, and since they haven't begun the design work yet because the consultant isn't on board, it would make sense that the project will not be able to be done according to the schedule in place, although this is just his guess at this point.

DeMers asked, if they don't have the designer in place, does that hold up all the other progress on the other things that are being done with the project as well. Haugen responded that it is all on hold until they do get the consultant on board.

Haugen reminded the board that he did announce last month that if the Governor's proposed transportation funding is approved, they have identified the bridge over River Road/4th Street as a project that would be done and that bridge would be replaced. He added that, if you recall in our discussion on the low area, it is all really controlled by that bridge structure, so that would be a tremendous help by giving us more height than what we can do with the Kennedy project alone. Vetter asked if this project has been on the horizon for a while. Haugen responded that that project has probably been more identified as a "wish" project, to be done if funding were to become available, it would be a project that they would like to be done.

Information only.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF BYGLAND ROAD STUDY CONTRACT

Haugen reported that in our work program we included a study of Bygland Road in East Grand Forks. He said that an RFP was sent out and they did have two firms provide proposals, and they had a Selection Committee of East Grand Forks staff, and one MPO Board Member and City

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 18th, 2015**

Alderman, help them with the selection and ranking. He stated that Alliant Engineering is their selected firm that they are recommending to the board. He added that there are a couple of points, at least from his perspective, that he would like to highlight as to why Alliant was chosen, are: 1) one of the issues they are hoping to solve with Bygland Road, is what to do with bike accommodations on the street, and Alliant Engineering are just finishing a bike lane feasibility on 33 corridors, or 56 miles in Minneapolis, so as part of their presentation to the Selection Committee they showed a breadth of knowledge of the different corridors are unique and how different treatments are preferable for those corridors versus a different corridor, so they were able to show that they have looked at unique corridor characteristics and came up with a solution or alternative unique to that corridor rather than using just a cookie cutter approach to how on-street facilities could be provided; 2) they also gave us a little bit more of their analysis and high level concepts of what could be done on Bygland Road so they showed us that they had done a little pre-work and are familiar with the roadway characteristics and issues and factors of that roadway.

Haugen referred to information in the packet, and pointed out that it shows that Alliant Engineering did look at some of the concepts, and whether or not on-road bike facilities could be done and how it could be done, and what the pros and cons would be.

Haugen commented that a third factor that was identified by the Selection Committee is the public involvement process. He stated that the project manager for the other firm not chosen, was not able to obtain and maintain great eye contact with the Selection Committee, whereas Alliant's project manager was very good at working with the Selection Committee, and we also have had experience working with that person in past MPO studies, and he has proven to be very effective in the public participation process.

Haugen reiterated that staff is recommending Alliant Engineering, their bid proposal fulfilled the scope of work we developed, and did come in under the \$45,000 budget we set, therefore we are recommending the board authorize the Chairman to execute the contract with Alliant Engineering to perform the Bygland Road Study.

Vein asked if this was a qualification based selection. Haugen responded that it was. He added that virtually all of our RFPs are selected on that basis. Vein asked if a price was negotiated after the selection was made. Haugen responded that they did not. Powers added, though, that Mr. Haugen did state that the bid came in under the budgeted amount for the study. Haugen commented that there was one slight negotiation that took place involving public meetings.

DeMers commented that he appreciates that Alliant did some background work, and identified a couple of intersections that they thought needed additional study, but if they decide that they want to look at 5th and Bygland as well, will there be additional costs or would they have to eliminate one of the others. Haugen responded that we had identified in the RFP those two specific intersections, but the whole corridor is being analyzed, so if we find out in our data that 5th is something that needs a little special treatment, it is in the scope of work for them to look at it.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 18th, 2015**

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING THE CHAIRMAN EXECUTE A CONTRACT AGREEMENT WITH ALLIANT ENGINEERING TO PERFORM THE BYGLAND ROAD STUDY AT A COST NOT TO EXCEED \$45,000.00.

Voting Aye: DeMers, Powers, Strandell, Vetter, Mock, Malm, and Vein.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY CONTRACT

Kouba reported that the MPO, over the last several years, has been on schedule to do an update to their aerial photos every three years, so we put it in our 2015 Work Program. She stated that an RFP was sent out in January, and they received six proposals, which the Selection Committee, who was made up of MPO Staff, Grand Forks and East Grand Forks Engineering, and the Grand Forks GIS Coordinator, reviewed.

Kouba commented that the Selection Committee is recommending we hire Quantum Spatial to do this project. She pointed out that Quantum Spatial is a new name, however, for those of you that are familiar with our previous aerial photography projects, they really aren't as new as their name indicates. She explained that the project manager was on our last three aerial photography projects, so they are familiar with our area, specifically the MPO Study area.

Kouba reported that when they opened the bids they were well under our \$50,000 budget, therefore staff is recommending we enter into contract with Quantum Spatial.

Powers commented that it is his understanding that the photos are scheduled to be taken between April 13th and May 18th, however he feels that this may need to be moved up due to the weather. Kouba responded that if it is warranted, they will work that out with Quantum Spatial.

Mock asked if both cities, and the University of North Dakota, have access to this information. Kouba responded that anyone can ask for the information, and she generally also lets the State of North Dakota GIS know, so it ends up on their web as well.

MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING THE CHAIRMAN EXECUTE A CONTRACT AGREEMENT WITH QUANTUM SPATIAL TO PERFORM THE AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY PROJECT AT A COST NOT TO EXCEED \$50,000.00.

Voting Aye: DeMers, Powers, Strandell, Vetter, Mock, Malm, and Vein.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF NORTH DAKOTA FTA #5310 PROJECT APPLICATION

Kouba reported that back in January, North Dakota DOT announced that they were putting out a solicitation for 5310 (FTA) funds for transit, specifically for the elderly and disabled. She said that the MPO then also solicits, in our area specifically, for these funds as well, and they received one application from Cities Area Transit.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 18th, 2015**

Kouba commented that Cities Area Transit submitted four prioritized requests:

- 1) Mobility Manager – they provide bus training for senior citizens and persons with disabilities, is CAT contact for local human service providers, and serves as regional transit coordinator. This is a previously funded request.
- 2) Four (4) Replacement ADA Minivans – They will replace 4 ADA Minivans that have reached useful life and will start to cost more to maintain.
- 3) Enhanced Route 12 Service – This would split the current Route 12/13 so that Route 12 would serve the growing south end of Grand Forks by expanding to serve the new Discovery School and multi-family housing units that are being built or have been built. By doing this both routes would be able to increase frequency.
- 4) Addition of one 25-foot Low Floor Bus – This bus would be needed only if the Enhanced Route 12 was funded. The added bus is needed for the new separate route.

Kouba reported that in looking through this request the first two priorities have been in the Transit Development Plan since it was first adopted in 2012, and staff feels they should be forwarded on. She said, however, that the other two requests; the enhanced Route 12 Service and the addition of a 25-foot bus for that route, and even though they are in our plan as being wanted and needed and requested, Route 12 is a service that we simply don't have the funding to maintain.

Kouba summarized that staff feels that it just can't fully support the Enhanced Route 12 Service at this time, there just wouldn't be any federal support after this year's solicitation, if we were to receive it. She added that Cities Area Transit doesn't feel that they would actually get to their third and fourth priorities, which is probably correct as there is only a total of \$357,000 available, but in keeping with our plan and being fiscally constrained we just cannot support the third and fourth priorities so the MPO is recommending this board approve priorities one and two be moved forward, although the State will still see the third and fourth priorities as the application will continue forward as written, but from the MPO the State will hear that the priorities are one and two and not three and four.

Haugen commented that staff did discuss this with Cities Area Transit staff, and they understand our position. He added that it was also discussed at the Technical Advisory Committee last week and they are in concurrence that we approve the first and second priorities. He stated that the real crux is that Cities Area Transit is more or less operating off of carry-over, and in 2017 in our financial forecasts there really won't be any carry-over left to operate the service as it currently is, and if we were to add this enhanced Route 12 service that would make the problem even worse, and may cause the deficiency to occur in 2016, so for those reasons we are suggesting it not be done. He added that staff does recognize that it is a good concept as that area of town is growing, it does have coverage issues, but this perhaps isn't the appropriate funding source to seek to get it done.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 18th, 2015**

Vein asked if these four requests were approved by the City Council. Haugen responded they were. Vein asked if this has been discussed with Cities Area Transit staff, and are they agreeable. Haugen responded that they did discuss it with them, and they also sit in on the Technical Advisory Committee as well, and the Technical Advisory Committee recommended the same action that we are recommending today.

Mock said then, that our recommendation would be to emphasis priorities one and two, not necessarily to be opposed to priorities three and four. Kouba responded that that would be correct.

MOVED BY MOCK, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE PRIORITIES ONE AND TWO OF THE GRAND FORKS CITIES AREA TRANSIT #5310 GRANT APPLICATION.

Voting Aye: DeMers, Powers, Strandell, Vetter, Mock, Malm, and Vein.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF DRAFT GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN UPDATE RFP

Haugen reported that this is the Grand Forks Land Use Plan, and it also involves some Land Development Code revisions into the Scope-of-Work we are requesting. He explained that staff has been working with a subcommittee of the Grand Forks Planning Commission on this RFP language, and have also been bouncing it back to our State and Federal Partners to ensure that we are meeting their requirements for the use of the planning funds.

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that included is a presentation that was provided to the Planning Commission of Grand Forks at their last meeting. He said that there are some continuing concepts that were suggesting this Land Use Plan update can do. He explained that Grand Forks has a long history of growth management via a tier system, and included in the packet is a little of that history.

Haugen commented that we do already incorporate some of the federal philosophies and emphasis areas, and they have worked with the City on some design concepts of pilot areas. He stated that last time those were focused on the green field area, or the vacant farm fields that are then converted to housing developments.

Haugen reported that in this RFP the City is focusing more on pilot areas that are in underutilized developed areas of town right now. He added that, also, there is, in conjunction with the federal transit, emphasis on ladders of opportunity for having transportation choices. He said that the City is doing things where they are emphasizing transit as a transportation choice so in the RFP you will notice that, when they talk about pilot areas, a lot of those areas that have been identified are trying to identify areas where new development could have a transit focus into the development as well. He commented that two of the sites that were preliminarily pointed out were the Grand Cities Mall area, which is also in our renaissance zone so it does have some advantages there; and the other area was the downtown fringe in Grand Forks, particularly the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 18th, 2015**

existing water treatment site; and the third site is a kind of floating site to allow the City and the Consultant team to become more familiar with other areas of town and then select a third site to do a pilot area.

Haugen stated that for the Land Development Code city staff will do some work on their own to update the code. He pointed out that in the RFP they are asking the consultant to look at four areas:

- 1) Re-examine the Corridor Overlay District that exists in Grand Forks. He explained that this is primarily a design type of corridor overlay that looks at how buildings appear once they are on the corridors.
- 2) Look at Pilot areas and how the City can address a more mixed density of land uses. He said that it seems like there is a preverbal battle royal that takes place if someone is proposing a higher density near or adjacent to a more single family type of development, so City staff is asking for the consultant's help on language that will allow that mixture to occur more easily.
- 3) Look at landscaping section of the code. He said that staff has told him it needs to be updated.
- 4) Look at Transit friendly design. He stated that as part of every site plan review that the planning staff does they want to have some language in the zoning ordinance that assists them in understanding how transit could be better served or provided within that development.

Haugen reported that the generic timetable for the RFP, assuming it is approved today, indicates that submittals will be due at the end of April; and then in May staff will request the Chairman be authorized to execute the contract.

Haugen pointed out that the Scope-of-Work does carry over into 2016, with conclusion occurring primarily in October, with November being the wrap up month of having all final documents delivered to us.

Haugen stated that within the RFP, with all those specific programs we want the consultant to assist us with, our specific due dates for those individual identified things, so spread throughout 2015 and 2016 are the due dates for those items so it isn't being dumped on us for review all at one time, we will be getting them at appropriate times throughout the planning update process.

Haugen explained that the reason we are doing the Land Use Plan update is because, ultimately we have to do our Long Range Transportation Plan, and this is the normal cycle of how we address that update, the first thing we do is assist each City with their Land Use Plan. He added that the East Grand Forks RFP has been out, submittals are actually due next week, so in April we hope to be asking for approval authorizing the Chairman to execute a contract for their update as well.

Haugen stated that, with this, the Technical Advisory Committee and MPO Staff are recommending approval to release the RFP for the Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update and Land Development Code Revisions.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 18th, 2015**

Vein asked how much effort is going to be put towards looking at the City Code and trying to update it. Haugen responded that, going back to the presentation he gave the Planning Commission, he would refer to the areas that the consultant will focus on:

- 1) The corridor overlay district - he believes that what Mr. Gengler has in mind is right now the corridor overlay district applies to all corridors exactly the same regardless of the uniqueness of the corridor, and so they will be seeking assistance in individualizing that overlay corridor district so that perhaps Gateway Drive doesn't have to have the exact same design as 32nd Avenue would.
- 2) Mixed use zoning - will be paired up with the pilot areas to see what it would take for a zoning district to be modified, or the creation of a new district to allow a more mixed-use type development to occur.
- 3) Landscaping - should be fairly straight forward with landscape architects and with the park district staff in particular since most of the boulevard trees, etc., are maintained by them.
- 4) Transit friendly design - is something that is very new and unique to North Dakota, however it is common in our neighbor state of Minnesota and elsewhere across the nation, so that will be working with Cities Area Transit, Planning and Engineering staff to come up with what we feel will be appropriate minimum transit friendly design concepts to put into the code.

Haugen said that the consultant will prepare drafts of these documents and then City staff will marshal them through the approval process, as they still need to have preliminary approval from the Planning Commission and City Council, then final approval from them as well, so they will get a two month process for each one of those issues individually at the appropriate time.

Vein said, then, that this will not be a total comprehensive review of all planning ordinances, just these four specific areas. Haugen responded that those are the ones the consultant will be working, however, Mr. Gengler has identified some things that his staff would like to tackle and make revisions on as well.

Vein stated that his other question would be, he understands the last part of this is how you incorporate transit, but if we put together some good options for that is it realistic to expect we will have funding to be able to supply that transit, and would it be part of this recommendation. Haugen responded that there are two components to that; fixed route certainly has limitations and would likely would be located on an existing fixed route or a future fixed route, however our demand response services do cover everywhere and there is probably the financial where-with-all within that service to provide service to every development in town, so not everything will be geared toward fixed route accommodations, but more to make the ease of demand response service within the development occur.

Malm asked what the MPO's role will be in this. He stated that he has seen this before, and we end up saying some things and then everybody changes what occurs. He said that in Grand

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 18th, 2015**

Forks it doesn't go where we have ever always told them where we think it should go. Haugen responded that this is their Land Use Plan, and these are the concepts they have agreed to have discussed and considered in the adoption of the Land Use Plan. He stated that, ultimately it is their Land Use Plan, that they will approve, implement, and enforce through their City staff and City ordinances, so we are providing them with the opportunity to have consultants help them engage the community in incorporating these concepts.

Powers asked who else is on the Selection Committee for this besides himself. Haugen responded that Mr. Powers is on the East Grand Forks Land Use Plan Selection Committee, but we are discussing the Grand Forks Land Use Plan, and right now the way this RFP is set up, City staff will be working through a subcommittee of their Planning and Zoning Commission. He said that their Planning and Zoning Commission has formulated a Land Use Subcommittee, those members are identified and MPO staff has been working with them on this RFP. He added that that subcommittee will be making recommendations to the full Planning and Zoning Commission, and then the Planning and Zoning Commission will be making recommendations, and forwarding their decisions as to what the future of land uses in Grand Forks will be to their City Council, and ultimately to the MPO.

Malm commented that, very simply, we are just providing them with a list of consultants and then they will decide what to do. Haugen responded that we are actually going to be the ones contracting with the consultants, and within the scope of services we could play that fine dance of if these concepts aren't embraced, or are totally ignored, we could start suggesting that our financial support should be paid back to us, as this is the agreement we made going into the study, that they will consider these concepts and work towards getting them implemented. He added that this is the same discussion we would have with East Grand Forks as well. He stated that the MPO does not create a Land Use Plan for either community.

MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN UPDATE AND LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE REVISIONS RFP, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: DeMers, Powers, Strandell, Vetter, Mock, and Vein.

Voting Nay: Malm.

MATTER OF PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM REPORT

Haugen reported that instead of going over the details of the report included in the packets, he asked Ms. Kouba to show you the ICON Software System and its capabilities so that as you guys, as council members, go back and work with your staff on prioritizing pavement treatments and such, you have a better understanding of the management system being offered to you to work from.

Kouba's presentation on the ICON Software System ensued.

DeMers stated that he thinks, this only talks about Principal Arterials, but he is pretty sure we are doing the local roadways as well, so are those surveys done at the same time. Kouba responded

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 18th, 2015**

that they are. DeMers asked if they were sampling that stuff out for these reports. Kouba responded that she believes that in that report, the report itself has all the local roadways included, but the map itself doesn't.

DeMers asked for a definition on what backlog means, is it everything over a certain level, or is that all other maintenance, down to even something in good condition if it has some work. Kouba responded that, basically the backlog is all the things that, basically you have the whole list of things that need to get done in, say one year; and then there are the ones that are more minor, and then everything after that. DeMers asked to what level; is there any way you can change the threshold so that the backlog is just projects under 60, and those over 60 we wouldn't consider in our backlog because we think it is alright for now, or is it any project, like he said if it is a 98, there would probably be a dollar amount affixed to that project. Kouba responded that she isn't sure exactly, they have, basically it's in here, they're set up as to, from one CI to another what you do so when you do a seal coat or an overlay, once it's in the condition rating range then it is considered, if it's not in that range then it's not considered and it's probably under the routine maintenance or basic maintenance and you have that money set aside in that project.

DeMers asked if you can run a scenario that is targeted as certain average CI, and is that what that maintain current PCI is about, but you could change that to, say you want to run at 75 or whatever, you could run that scenario. Kouba responded that it is, and you can change it to a higher or lower number as well. Haugen added that you can change it by surface type; concrete PCI versus an asphalt PCI.

DeMers said that he thinks that as a budgeting tool, if we want to keep our roads at 75 or, that's fairly good, then you know what that number basically is, there's probably some discussion or whatever as to how that's feasible. Haugen commented that, if you recall from the slide Ms. Kouba showed that has the ranges of index, at 85 and above there really was no treatment suggested, but from 85 down to a certain point a sealcoat is suggested, and if you start skipping those sealcoats, then all you're doing is taking the cheap option out of the picture and making it a more expensive option down the road because the surface is going to deteriorate more quickly.

Haugen commented that this is a nice tool, but we have not used this tool very well in the past, however we believe we have commitments from both City staffs that this will now be a tool that will be used more often and more robustly for us in identifying pavement treatments, and also to help you identify how to best budget to meet your pavement goals.

Haugen explained that the reason they went with this program is because we all know that MAP-21, and from a federal perspective, there are pavement conditions they want us to maintain, and this is the system that we used to identify the pavement levels we have, particularly on the federal aid routes. He added that we are going to try to target a PCI of 83 or so, and we will program projects that we can play with using this program, so that we can determine whether or not if we do that project is it going to help us maintain that target, achieve that target, or is it harming us, does it actually get us into a lower PCI for the federal aid routes, and the city will do that for the city streets, but that is the big picture as to why we are investing in this pavement

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 18th, 2015**

management system, because MAP-21 and the federal funds are being tied to pavement condition, particularly on the National Highway System, and if you fail to maintain the National Highway System there are financial penalties, where they take money away from more discretionary programs and force it into the National Highway System so that their pavements are brought up to the level they want.

Malm referred to the map included in the packet, and pointed out that using the code at the bottom, he doesn't see any roads marked poor, and he has lived in Grand Forks too long to believe that that is true. Haugen reminded everyone that they are only showing the functionally classified roadways so not every roadway is being shown. Malm responded that he is talking about 42nd, and if he reads that it is satisfactory, but you can just about disappear out there, and we have discussed, how long, connecting over to East Grand Forks via the Point Bridge, and we have a hunk of roadway in there that is non-existent. Haugen pointed out that there is that one block that has not been treated with a mill and overlay that is shown in red. He added that in terms of 42nd, you are talking about the ride ability of the roadway, but this is analyzing the condition of the pavement, not the ride ability, however the feds are just now proposing what their pavement management system measures are going to be, and ride ability is going to be one of them so in the future when we do this we will have to include ride ability in our scope of work. DeMers asked if this software is capable of doing. Haugen responded it is.

Information only.

MATTER OF TRAFFIC COUNTING PROGRAM

Haugen reported that we have engaged our Advanced Traffic Analysis Center out of NDSU to help us come up with a way, a system to count traffic on a perpetual basis rather than us hiring temporary staff to go out and sit at intersections and count traffic for a day and then use that single days data as our data for analyzing all traffic conditions going on in Grand Forks.

Haugen commented that the system, in the past, has been focused on Grand Forks simply because they have a camera system that communicates back to a central location. He stated that in our work program for next year and this year we are going to look at expanding this service into the loop system so that we have the capability of communicating back to a location so East Grand Forks will be looked at this year.

Haugen stated that there are 31 intersections that we have the ability, now, to pull up counts. He put the actual tool being used on the screen, and explained that it has a Google Map with all 31 intersections identified on it, and, again, the intersections are those that have traffic signals that have video detection on them.

Haugen reported that they can do all sorts of reports off of any of these intersections. He said that he does want to point out that there are intersections that have differing history of data attached to them. He explained that this was due to scheduled projects being done, and also to some traffic signals being updated and those signals were delayed in getting here, so there are fewer months of data on South Washington than we do on 32nd Avenue, etc.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 18th, 2015**

Haugen reiterated that we are able to go into each of these counts and pull up different types of summary reports, and in the end we can also export the raw data into a spreadsheet format, and then we can manipulate information even further.

Haugen gave a brief overview on how this program and data can be used.

DeMers asked who owns the cameras. Haugen responded that in Grand Forks NDDOT owns some, but the City of Grand Forks owns the majority of them; and in East Grand Forks MnDOT owns them so it will be MnDOT's system that we will be capturing data from. He added that the MPO does not purchase the cameras themselves. DeMers asked who has access to the data. Haugen responded that right now the data is limited to just those that have a password protect, but we are going to segregate the data out, and it is our hope to allow the public to be able to access some of the basic volume data, but for the technical staff we will allow them the capability to go in and export out the nitty gritty data and work from that. He added that our consultants will be given access to it during their studies as well.

Haugen referred to the staff report and pointed out that it also discusses utilizing the video detection to capture the frequency and duration of train pre-emption as well. He added that this will also give us the ability to count the number of trains going through a corridor and the duration of closure at intersections. He stated that we do have an RFP out for the 42nd Street Railroad Crossing Study, and now these traffic signals will be able to tell us how often trains go through and pre-empt those signals, how long those trains are, whether we are seeing an increase in train traffic, or a decrease in train traffic, on a little more up-to-date basis than having to rely on the federal railroad sites.

In summary, A.T.A.C. has concluded their portion of the work we engaged them on, and we do have a web-access site, although it is still a work in-progress, but ultimately we hope to have a public site to allow the public to look up the information on their own.

Information only

MATTER OF AUTHORIZING CHAIRMAN TO SIGN AMENDED NDDOT CONTRACT

Haugen reported that our current contract has a date of January 5th, and this amendment has a date of January 1st, so our 1st through 4th work activities can be reimbursed.

MOVED BY STRANDELL, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN THE AMENDED NDDOT CONTRACT.

Voting Aye: DeMers, Powers, Strandell, Vetter, Mock, Malm, and Vein.

Voting Nay: None.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 18th, 2015**

OTHER BUSINESS

1. East Grand Forks Functional Classification Result

Haugen referred to a map and explained that it displays the results we have reached with MnDOT. He explained that, as you recall, we went through an arbitration process with MnDOT for Central Avenue, which we had hoped to maintain as a Principal Arterial, but the arbitration group agreed with MnDOT to drop it down to a Minor Arterial. He said that they were also hoping to keep a segment of Bygland Road/Business #2 corridor as a Principal Arterial as well, but it too was dropped down to a Minor Arterial, so at your April meeting you can expect to be giving formal approval of this new Functional Classification Map for East Grand Forks.

Strandell asked what happens if we don't approve it. Haugen responded that MnDOT will cooperatively agree with us to have us ultimately adopt this map. Strandell asked what that means. Haugen responded that MnDOT has the ability, with some creative withholding options, to force us to adopt this map.

Haugen commented that North Dakota has said that, even though this is the new federal guidance on functional classification, they are not anticipating going through this same process, so right now we aren't anticipating any changes whatsoever on functional classification on the North Dakota side unless there is a request by one of the entities to upgrade or downgrade a roadway

Information only.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO ADJOURN THE MARCH 18TH, 2015, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:27 P.M.

Voting Aye: DeMers, Powers, Strandell, Vetter, Mock, Malm, and Vein.

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, April 15th, 2015 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Mike Powers, Chairman, called the April 15th, 2015 meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:00 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Mike Powers, Clarence Vetter, Marc DeMers, Jeannie Mock, Warren Strandell, Ken Vein, and Steve Adams.

Absent was: Gary Malm.

Staff: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Jairo Viafara, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; and Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner.

Guest(s): Mike Yavarow and David Kuharenko, GF City Engineering.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Powers declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 18TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE MARCH 18TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: DeMers, Adams, Powers, Strandell, Vetter, Mock, and Vein.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen referred to the staff report, included in the packet, and pointed out that it states that per discussion with the Technical Advisory Committee regarding the advancement, or the progress of the “Dip Fix”, on the North Dakota side there will be a strong effort to try to get the temporary fix done this season, between the City of Grand Forks and NDDOT; and on the Minnesota side

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 15th, 2015**

there will be an effort to try to get it done this year, but they are really looking towards a more permanent type fix than doing a temporary one this year and then having to come back a few years later to do a permanent fix, so while we are trying to coordinate this so that we aren't having one State do it one year and the other State doing it the next year, there is still a chance that that might occur just because of the resources and the manpower necessary to get it done, from each State's perspective.

Haugen reiterated, then, that it is pretty fair to state that on the North Dakota side there will be something done this season; and on the Minnesota side there is a chance something will be done as well.

Vein stated, then, that the idea on the North Dakota side is that we are going to do the reconstruction of DeMers Avenue at a later time, so we are just going to do something temporary now and then more permanent later along with the reconstruction, is that right. Haugen responded that that is correct. Yavarow added that it will be strictly reviewed by the State, it cannot be handled as part of the project, and it cannot happen during the project, so it has to be either before or after the bridge project, and if it is done it will be done internally.

Haugen reported that the only other news he has on the Sorlie is that the bid letting date has slipped another month, and will now take place in June. He stated that it was originally programmed to occur in April, then moved to May, and finally it has been moved to June. Yavarow commented that it has now slipped backwards to May 22nd, as of yesterday.

Information only.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that, included in the packet is the full scope of work they have with SRF Consulting Group to do the project development on the Kennedy Bridge. He referred to the staff report, and pointed out that he did highlight three things that have been of key interest to this body: 1) Bike/Ped Facility – it is scoped so that they do put in the multi-use or shared bike/ped facility inside the truss, preferably on the north side of the roadway; 2) Visual quality signature features item – included in this scope you will notice that they do have meetings included in that scope with the locals to finalize what the lighting and other visual quality items will be on the Kennedy Bridge; and 3) Approach grade changes so that the dip on the Minnesota side, between the Kennedy bridge approach and the River Road/4th Street Bridge, is addressed. He added that you will also notice that they also include language that states that if it causes the main project to slip they will pull out of doing the dip with this project.

Haugen commented that there was also discussion at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting that right now we have this project programmed for 2016, and there was some discussion that because of, primarily Minnesota, fiscal year beginning July 1st, that in our next T.I.P. document you will see that the Minnesota funding is shifting to 2017, but it is likely that the project will be done during the 2016-2017 construction seasons.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 15th, 2015**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO FY2015 ANNUAL
ELEMENT OF THE T.I.P.**

Haugen reported that this is a project that is being added to the T.I.P. on the Minnesota side, in East Grand Forks. He explained that they are using transit dollars to correct some ADA issues that resulted from when East Grand Forks installed a sidewalk using TAP funds, or enhancement dollars, over on 5th Avenue N.E. He said that as they went through the driveways they did not make that transition ADA compliant, and MNDOT is requiring they correct the problem.

Haugen said that, if you recall, we have used these transit dollars in East Grand Forks to put sidewalks along Central Avenue, or 220 North, on the east side. He added that the monies here are left over from that project so all of the agencies have reviewed and bought in to using these transit dollars to put towards this ADA fix on the sidewalks on 5th Avenue N.E.

Haugen commented that a public meeting was held at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting last week, and no comments were received, therefore both the Technical Advisory Committee and MPO Staff re recommending the board approve this amendment.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE FY2015 ANNUAL
ELEMENT T.I.P. AMENDMENT, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Aye: DeMers, Adams, Powers, Strandell, Vetter, Mock, and Vein.
Voting Nay: None.***

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Kouba reminded the board that copies of the Draft Pavement Management Report were distributed at their last meeting. She stated that comments were received from the Technical Advisory Committee, and were included in this final document. She added that they presented the new inclusions to the Technical Advisory Committee, and at their meeting last week they approved a motion to accept the Final Pavement Management Report with North Dakota wanting some additional text. She said, however, that the staff recommendation is still to approve the document with some additional text that the NDDOT had requested, as well. She explained that the main difference between the two is we are looking, NDDOT is looking, is definitely looking for an approval of the document so we are using it, and with the acceptance she believes it is just more of a, the Technical Advisory Committee is looking at it as more of just an additional tool that they are going to be using for what their departments use in choosing different projects.

Vein commented that as he was looking at this he actually looked at it a little bit differently than do you approve or accept, he was thinking of receive and file, only because he is a registered engineer, and he doesn't feel comfortable approving something that comes from somebody else without my stamp of registration or whatever being on it so he much prefers the idea of either accepting it, or the receive and file.

Haugen reported that in discussions with the NDDOT staff, it is their view that doing anything other than approving it, or adopting it, jeopardizes the use of CPG dollars, or federal planning

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 15th, 2015**

dollars. Vein asked if he was saying that adopting it is an alternative. Haugen responded that it is. Vein said that he can go with adopting it, he just doesn't like the word "approve". Haugen continued that it is NDDOT's concern that we somehow need to better endorse the document.

Haugen commented that NDDOT required us to show how we use the report. He referred to a slide illustrating how it has been used in the past, and explained that we do have a performance measure on pavement condition, and we do report this as shown on the slide. He pointed out that in our programming, all of our programs have a questionnaire, and one of the scoring questions we ask is: "Did you utilize the Pavement Management" so we are able to satisfy the NDDOT's requirement on how we use it. He added, however that their concern is that by not using the words "approve" or "adopt" it jeopardizes the use of federal funds to pay for this work, and in the future, and perhaps we didn't report this to you before, but this might be the last time we can use consolidated planning grant funds to do this work. He explained that the Bismarck MPO was trying to do similar work in their area this spring, and at the last minute Federal Highway told them that it wasn't a consolidated planning grant eligible item. He said that the work we are doing with Federal Highway is transferring some of our MPO Planning Funds and receiving State Planning Funds, as the State Planning Funds can do it if the MPO Planning Funds can't, so it is a touchy issue as to the eligibility and the use of the term "adopt" or "approve" is soft.

MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE ADOPTING THE FINAL PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT REPORT, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: DeMers, Adams, Powers, Strandell, Vetter, Mock, and Vein.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF MINNESOTA SIDE DRAFT FY2016-2019 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that this is our annual draft approval of the next T.I.P. document. He added that we had hoped that we would be doing a T.I.P. document that covered both sides of the river, but this one is only available for the Minnesota side as North Dakota is still unsure of the federal funds available or what the Legislature might do as far as transportation funding, so they aren't comfortable proceeding with their T.I.P. at this time.

Haugen stated that staff is recommending approval of the Minnesota Side Draft FY2016-2019 T.I.P.

Haugen referred to the document, and went over it briefly. He pointed out that something new, that wasn't included in our current T.I.P., regarding the Kennedy Bridge project is that in 2018 the State is using federal funds to pay back the State funds they are using in 2016, so that is a new item as previously it was 100% State funded, now it is 100% State funded for advance construction, and then a payback in 2018. He added that 2018 is East Grand Forks' typical year for City Sub-Target funds, and they have tentatively identified paving 10th Street just east of 5th Avenue where it is currently graveled, making it a concrete section, otherwise the rest of the T.I.P. is the standard transit operations and transit capital projects going on.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 15th, 2015**

Haugen commented that the Technical Advisory Committee did hold a public hearing at their meeting last week, and no comments were received, therefore both the Technical Advisory Committee and MPO Staff are recommending the board adopt this draft document.

MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT FY2016-2019 MINNESOTA SIDE T.I.P., AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: DeMers, Adams, Powers, Strandell, Vetter, Mock, and Vein.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT RFP FOR I-29 TRAFFIC OPERATIONS STUDY

Haugen reported that in our work program we have identified that we would be doing a Traffic Operations Study on I-29. He said that the project boundaries are, to the north the North Washington Interchange, and to the south the Merrifield Overpass. He stated that the Scope-of-Work is to look at the three existing interchanges to see what issues can be resolved there, and there alone, or if we need to have a combination of additional overpasses or interchanges to work with the existing ones that are in place.

Haugen commented that, sort of new in this Scope-of-Work, and it is a strengthened product of the MAP-21 legislation, and the Federal Highway's Every Day Counts Initiative, and that is approaching this from a Linking the Planning and Environmental together, or PEL. He stated that they are trying to create a more seamless transition and eliminate the need for duplicating this effort and to expedite the process for the development of future transportation facilities.

Haugen explained that PEL, or Planning and Environmental Linkage, and for us this is our first RFP that is taking this approach, although it has been used by the other two MPOs in North Dakota. He stated that on the plus side they are trying to get this done seamlessly, and further strengthening the initiatives that are being carried forward at the end of the study into project development, but on the downside a lot more eyes will be reviewing the work, and so we have been forewarned that our typical process of having just a few set of eyes look and comment on the development process will change and we will now have a lot more involvement by different divisions, different agencies in the front end of the project.

Vein asked if this will slow the process up, with more eyes looking at it. Haugen responded that that was the warning that we were given, that it may be slowed down. He added that our original work program had this product being done at the end of the year, but this RFP scope of service puts the final project out to June of next year, so we have extended the timeline to accommodate this change.

Haugen reported that both the Technical Advisory Committee, and the MPO Staff are recommending approval of the Scope-of-Work.

Vetter commented that when he was reading through this, he did see some highlights to a possible bridge on Merrifield Road. He said, though, that he didn't see any talk about a possible bridge at 32nd Avenue, and he is wondering if he missed it in there. Haugen responded that he

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 15th, 2015**

thinks you actually only saw a reference to an interchange at Merrifield road, perhaps. He added that there was no intent to have either bridge involved in the I-29 Traffic Operation Study. Vetter asked if either one or both of those bridges wouldn't impact the study, and future traffic patterns. Haugen responded that they would, but the question is whether we should use both scenarios as part of the study analysis, and they didn't feel it would be appropriate, but you can include it if you wish. He explained that you could have three additional scenarios; in his mind you would have each bridge individually looked at as one and two, and then the third would be combining both bridges. He added that to do this we might have to expand the Scope-of-Work and budget to do this, up to 20% increase in cost could occur. Vetter asked what the current budget is. Haugen responded that it is \$175,000 for the consultant, \$190,000 with staff hours. Vein asked if there was funding available if the cost would increase up to 20%. Haugen responded that in 2016, towards the end of the project we would have funds available to cover the additional cost.

Haugen suggested that as an alternative, we could put the RFP out, and then work with our State, because we are partnering with North Dakota on this, and they are agreeing to pay 10% of the total project cost, so we can work with them to see if they will also increase their funding source, and then when we do select a consultant we can do an amendment to the contract to add to the scope.

Discussion on doing this now or waiting ensued.

Haugen commented that the next agenda item is to sign a contract with the NDDOT for them to pay up to \$19,000, based on our current estimate. He said that he would have to go back and negotiate with them if you want to maintain them at 10% of the cost, or we can just say that we will absorb the difference above \$19,000.

Vein asked if it would delay things if we were to table this for now and enter into negotiations and bring it back to our next meeting, then we would have more accurate numbers. Haugen responded that he doesn't know if this a rush that we have to approve the RFP today. He said that we would in essence just shift everything back a month on the schedule. He added that he knows there are some consultants that are reserving a bit of their time and energy this year towards this project, that would be the only concern he would express, but that isn't something we need to put much consideration into, so, perhaps the best thing might be to table this and let us decide whether we will include the bridges, as well as to find out if we can get additional match from NDDOT.

MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE TABLING THE APPROVAL OF THE RFP FOR THE I-29 TRAFFIC OPERATIONS STUDY TO THE MAY 20TH MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD MEETING.

Voting Aye: DeMers, Adams, Powers, Strandell, Vetter, Mock, and Vein.

Voting Nay: None.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 15th, 2015**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL TO EXECUTE THE NDDOT CONTRACT FOR THE I-29
STUDY**

***MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE TABLING THE APPROVAL
TO EXECUTE THE NDDOT CONTRACT FOR THE I-29 STUDY TO THE MAY 20TH MPO
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD MEETING.***

Voting Aye: DeMers, Adams, Powers, Strandell, Vetter, Mock, and Vein.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF U.S. #2 ACCESS MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE

Haugen referred to the staff report, and pointed out that it identifies that next Tuesday evening, April 21st, at the Howard Johnson we will be hosting our third public input meeting beginning at 6:30 p.m.

Haugen commented that also included in the staff report was the executive summary from the draft report. He pointed out that he did highlight where you can access the full report on the MPO website as well.

Haugen stated that he would like to spend a little time today talking about individual intersections, which we have done before, but we really haven't given much effort to the access management philosophy that is being presented, and that is the main purpose of this study.

Haugen commented that currently we have a lot of primary access, secondary and tertiary access along the corridor. He said that we know that there is evolving pressure along the corridor as well, some that are moving towards and some that are still kind of pies in the sky.

Haugen referred to slides illustrating access alternatives and stated that they have looked at, and he has presented some of these alternatives before; different and innovative types of alternatives along the corridor, but this is what is being recommended.

Presentation on access alternatives ensued.

Haugen summarized that for the first stretch we have the interchange area in a separate project, and for the area up to 55th the access points are already defined, but from that point along the rest of the corridor is what we are developing a concept where we have spacing for full movements every half mile along the corridor so as it develops the plan is that the only place where there will be full turning movement access is every half mile or at the section lines and then the half section line.

Haugen commented that they are also identifying that, as warranted, traffic signals could be spaced every half mile, and there will be no quarter line access until development pressures cause it, and at that point, or in addition to that then most of the access to properties would be then off of either frontage roads or backage roads, depending on the development that is being proposed and how they desire to work that out. He added that there are some areas where it has

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 15th, 2015**

already been established that there will be frontage roads, while others have the option of either frontage or backage roads.

Vein asked if we can promote backage versus frontage roads because it seems to him to make the most sense as you grow in the future and not have the frontage roads. He added, though, that he likes signals every half mile, or do you see a potential for signals every quarter mile along the stretch. Haugen responded that they don't see that, and they are actually suggesting that at the quarter line it's three-quarter only access.

Vein said that if the developers know this when we do the platting, they can plat around this type of requirement. Haugen responded that that is the whole intent of developing this access plan, so that everybody, the city, the county, the State, are all in agreement and developers and property owners know that this is how they are supposed to proceed when proposing developments along this corridor.

Haugen referred to the area between 55th and 69th, where right now there is a lot of development occurring and where there is development being proposed to occur, and said that it is part of the City of Grand Forks' Strategic Growth area as well. He said that, again, every half mile, when warranted, traffic signals will be put in, but at the quarter line we want the three-quarter access.

Haugen stated that a new concept, which is illustrated by this graphic of the functional area of the three-quarter access, shows that we are also trying to eliminate or prohibit driveways, right-ins and right-outs, and so depending on the speed you want to maintain as it urbanizes, you have different areas that have been identified as being the functional areas of the intersection that we are creating, so, again, we are suggesting that if you don't have any additional accesses, but we know and we see on other corridors that right-ins and right-outs get put in for reasons, we really wanted to highlight the protection of the functional area of the intersections that we are planning on having and relying on, whether they are signalized or just three-quarter. He said that this is the one thing that we haven't spent a lot of time on before, that he did want to highlight today.

Haugen reported that he presented this to the Grand Forks Service Safety Committee last light, and one of the key concerns he took out of it was responsibility of implementation. He said that the Steering Committee they are working with will be meeting next Tuesday as well, and that is one of the agenda items they will be working on, to help resolve this issue and to help identify the implementation responsibilities.

Mock asked, when you talk about implementation, is there a point at which the Planning and Zoning Commission get involved as well so that they are aware of possible changes to the Land Development Code. Haugen responded that they have had some discussion with Mr. Gengler on this. He stated that, currently in the Land Development Code the City has their access management based on levels, but within each of the levels they do talk about following the code, or if a study is done they rely on the study, and so we are trying to figure out the mechanics of how that study is incorporated so that it is followed, whether that as an amendment to the code type of document, or if it is more of an approval or adoption of the study, and this will be part of the discussion next Tuesday.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 15th, 2015**

**MATTER OF EAST GRAND FORKS' LAND USE PLAN UPDATE CONSULTANT
SELECTION**

Kouba reported that back in February we approved the RFP to do the East Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update. She said that the RFP was put it out and we received three proposals.

Kouba stated that interviews were conducted, and the Selection Committee felt that SRF Consulting Group put forth the best proposal. She said that they then opened their cost proposal and it was under the \$95,000 budgeted for the project, therefore, staff is recommending the board approve the contract with SRF.

MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE WE ACCEPT THE PROPOSAL FROM SRF CONSULTING GROUP OF \$94,988.00, AND EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH THEM TO DO THE EAST GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN UPDATE.

Voting Aye: DeMers, Adams, Powers, Strandell, Vetter, and Mock.

Voting Nay: None.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. **TIGER GRANT APPLICATION**

Haugen reported that the feds are accepting the next rounds of TIGER Grants. He explained that these are national competitive grants to do either transit or highway, or a combination multi-modal investments.

Haugen stated that for our area the total project cost needs to be \$12,500,000 or more, and the minimum the feds want to invest is \$10,000,000 out of the TIGER Funds. He said that he knows that on the Grand Forks side there are a couple of projects they are considering submitting, but he isn't aware of any on the East Grand Forks yet, nor if either County has any they would like to submit.

Haugen commented that one thing all applications need to have is a letter from the MPO indicating that if awarded funds, the project will be amended into the Long Range Transportation Plan and the T.I.P. document.

Haugen said that the timeline is very tight; pre-applications need to be in the first week of May, the MPO needs to identify, during the month of May, it's letters of support, and the final application is due the end of May or first of June.

DeMers asked when the work needs to be completed. Haugen responded that the physical work has until 2019 to expend the funds, funds have to be obligated by 2017, so there is time to work the project, but only 5% of what is submitted are awarded monies, and most of those rewards are not for the amount requested, usually less.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 15th, 2015**

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO ADJOURN THE APRIL 15TH, 2015,
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:45 P.M.***

Voting Aye: DeMers, Adams, Powers, Strandell, Vetter, Mock, and Vein.

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, May 20th, 2015 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Mike Powers, Chairman, called the May 20th, 2015 meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:00 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Mike Powers, Clarence Vetter, Marc DeMers, Jeannie Mock, Warren Strandell, Ken Vein (via conference phone), Steve Adams, and Gary Malm.

Staff: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Jairo Viafara, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; David Wiosna, GF/EGF MPO Intern; Jay Sandeen, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

Guest(s): Mike Yavarow, GF City Engineering.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Powers declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 15TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE APRIL 15TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen reported that the MPO Interns, David Wiosna and Jay Sandeen, have been working for the MPO for a while now, and are now on their summer schedule so were finally available to attend an MPO Executive Policy Board meeting. He asked that they each introduce themselves and give a little background on where they are in school, where they are from, and what they are working on.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, May 20th, 2015**

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Haugen reported that since the last MPO Executive Policy Board meeting there hasn't been a whole lot of new information forthcoming on either bridge to report.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen stated that the consultant is on board, and they are working towards project development, getting the design done. He added that, as discussed last month, there are several things that they are doing that this board helped direct, such as aesthetics or signature features. He said that they are going to hold at least two public meetings here in the community to assist in finalizing what those features will be, however those dates are still to be determined

Information only.

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen commented that, as reported last month, it is more likely than not that on the North Dakota side a temporary fix may be done to the approach to the bridge; but on the Minnesota side they are still reviewing solutions, what resources they have available, and if there is funding available so it isn't likely that anything will be done on that side of the bridge this year.

Haugen explained that the reason he calls it a temporary fix on the North Dakota side is because they want to do something that just bridges us to their 2019 DeMers Avenue project, at which time they will do a more permanent fix. He stated that on the Minnesota side they are looking at doing this once, and doing it permanently, so while they may or may not wait until 2019, but it is unlikely they will do anything this year.

Powers asked if on the Minnesota side of the bridge, the area you are talking about goes from the foot of the bridge to the flood wall. Haugen responded that that would be correct.

Vein asked if he heard correctly that North Dakota will try to do something this year. Haugen responded that a temporary fix will be attempted this year.

Yavarow reported that the bid opening for the Sorlie is scheduled for tomorrow morning, and there is always a possibility that none of the bids will be accepted.

Information only.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE I-29 TRAFFIC OPERATIONS RFP

Haugen reported that at last month's MPO Executive Policy Board meeting, this item was tabled to today's meeting in order to allow staff to work with our Federal and State Agencies, as well as local staff, to try to incorporate somehow the potential impact additional river crossings might have on the study results.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, May 20th, 2015**

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that he included a copy of the new section that was added to the RFP. He stated that, essentially, what they are suggesting, and this was approved by the Technical Advisory Committee last week, is instead of doing an in-depth analysis of each and every alternative with any potential bridge combination, we will be asking the consultant to do what we have termed “sensitivity testing” on the alternatives. He then gave an in-depth explanation for making this change/request.

Haugen summarized that what this is trying to do is to incorporate the what ifs should additional river crossings be constructed without adding any cost to the proposed budget. He added that our travel demand modeler has already done the forecasts of these three river crossing scenarios, so we already have an idea of what the results will be, and have given that information to the consultant, so this will be just one more step to their alternative analyses, so shouldn't add any significant amount to the cost.

Haugen commented that this is our recommendation to address the request this board made last month, otherwise the RFP is the same as what was submitted last month, and it has been vetted and approved by the Technical Advisory Committee, so both the Technical Advisory Committee and staff are seeking authorization TO release the RFP, get bids, and get the project started.

MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE I-29 TRAFFIC OPERATIONS RFP, AS SUBMITTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL TO AUTHORIZE THE EXECUTION OF THE CONTRACT FOR THE GRAND FORKS LAND USE 2045 PLAN UPDATE

Haugen reported that we received a total of four proposals submitted to us. He stated that the Selection Committee, as identified in the RFP, was comprised of three members of the City Planning Commission, three members of the City Planning Staff, and himself. He said that they met and identified the top three choices, held interviews, and unanimously chose WSB.

Haugen referred to the packet and pointed out that a copy of the basic Scope-of-Work that WSB, and its subs, are providing us for the Grand Forks Land Use Plan was included. He explained that this will be the first time we have had WSB under contract. He said that he did have some discussions with them about some modifications to our standard contract that they proposed, and in the end they dropped their suggestions, so we are seeking approval to authorize execution of the contract, which will be contingent upon our State and Federal agencies concurring with our selection process.

MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF THE CONTRACT FOR THE GRAND FORKS LAND USE 2045 PLAN UPDATE, WITH WSB AND ASSOCIATES, AS SUBMITTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, May 20th, 2015**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE GLASSTON RAILROAD CROSSING STUDY
CONSULTANT SELECTION**

Haugen reported that this RFP was due at the end of April. He stated that a couple of unusual things occurred with the selection process; the first thing was that we only received two proposals, therefore we did have to seek approval by our State and Federal agencies to proceed with reviewing and selecting based on just two proposals, and we did get that. He said that once we received approval we scheduled interviews with the two firms, and the Selection Committee did name KLJ as its top choice, but as noted in the staff report in their proposal there were some key things that they had labeled as “value added” and the committee knowingly named them their top choice but also knew that if we couldn’t reach negotiations on what those “value added” items were they were comfortable with Olsson and Associates proposal.

Haugen explained that they then entered into negotiations with KLJ, and tried to iron out the differences, but in the end, to satisfy what they felt was the proper scope of work, they were 150% over our budget. He said that the main sticking point was on the Glasston line itself, we were expecting that as part of a range of alternatives to address the conflicts between auto/bike/ped/bus/train traffic, that grade separations would be considered, but in their view that is the reason why it was 150% above budget, that if we incorporated grade separation concepts, that increased their budget considerably, so when we ceased negotiations with KLJ, our first question to Olsson and Associates was about that key point, and from their proposal they do identify that at all of those crossings along the Glasston line, as the process goes along they will incorporate those concepts as alternatives that will be reviewed.

Haugen commented that Olsson and Associates are anxious to get into our market so they are at our budget doing the scope of work in the RFP, as requested, therefore although we are sorry we couldn’t work things out with KLJ, we are excited about possibly working with Olsson and Associates.

Haugen stated that the Technical Advisory Committee, and staff are recommending approving authorization to execute the contract for the Glasston Railroad Crossing Study with Olsson and Associates, subject to concurrence by our State and Federal partners.

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING
EXECUTION OF THE CONTRACT FOR THE GLASSTON RAILROAD CROSSING
STUDY WITH OLSSON AND ASSOCIATES, AS SUBMITTED.***

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

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON THE BYGLAND ROAD STUDY

Kouba reported that this is pretty much an update on the beginning process of our Bygland Road Study. She stated that we have Alliant under contract to do this study, and have done turning movement counts along the corridor in order to get some updated traffic information, and Alliant has been able to do some analysis of that information, along with associating it with our model

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, May 20th, 2015**

data and we have been able to present this, actually, to the public as well as our Steering Committee.

Kouba commented that we were able to identify what was going on on the corridor, being that there are the various sidewalks, bus, and pedestrian traffic and things of that nature, identifying any kind of safety issues, which there happens to be very small amounts of accidents happening along Bygland Road, and they are mostly towards, the largest number are at the traffic light, of course, and then anywhere between that and Rhinehart Drive intersection.

Kouba stated that as we get into more analysis of the actual traffic that is going on, we see a lot of traffic, and we see that some of this traffic is actually getting up and beyond what we were actually predicting for the model for 2025 and 2040, so that was a little bit of a surprise.

DeMers asked, the area north and east of Bygland, where it says 2025 100 added houses, is that what was predicted in the 2025 plan. Kouba responded that that is what we had predicted happening by 2025. DeMers asked, though, if that was when the 2025 Land Use Plan was put together. Kouba responded that it wasn't, that it is in our 2040 Land Use Plan, that is what we had predicted by 2025. DeMers said that this seems a little bit high, as there is really only one development with lots remaining. Kouba commented that you also have to remember that the Land Use Plan was done five years ago. DeMers stated that this is what he is saying, is this based on what's current of from when in the past. Kouba responded that it is based on the 2040 Land Use Plan, which is based upon 2010 data. DeMers said that he is all for raising the amount of houses because he thinks it helps with some of our goals. Kouba added that the 2040 plan was done in 2010, and there are quite a few in the area that have been added, but you also have to remember that even though there are all those houses being predicted to be added in that area, the schools are city-wide schools, so at the elementary school you have third through fifth grades, and then you have the middle school which has all middle school kids going there.

Kouba said that once they presented that information, they looked at some of the issues that were coming up. She stated that the biggest issue, obviously, is the traffic. She said that Bygland has the unusual spike mostly because of the schools, we think, because you have the most traffic coming down in the 7:30 a.m. to 8:15 a.m. timeframe as parents are taking their kids to school then coming back, and people that live there are heading north on Bygland, so we are looking at various options for this. She added that this was discussed at the public meeting, and was the biggest concern for the residents in that area, and a lot of suggestions were submitted.

Kouba commented that they also presented some types of bicycle facilities, as well as some of the costs associated with them, and went over the pros and cons of each. She stated that this was done in order to inform the public about the various alternatives as we have been talking about the possibility of using some of them on Bygland Road, including on-road facilities such as a bike lane, or a sharrow.

Kouba stated that they have also been looking at pedestrian facilities. She said that there are sidewalks that go down Bygland Road on both sides, although there are a couple of gaps to the north, they want to try to make sure there are accesses, and that if there are any safety issues that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, May 20th, 2015**

need to be addressed, as well as letting people know about some of the accentuated safety protocols such as Hawk Signals, that are available.

Kouba reported that their main objective was to try to get information from the public on what their concerns are, and what they would like to see done. She said that they also informed them that we would be holding another public meeting in July in order to present alternatives for addressing some of the issues we already know about.

Powers commented that he felt that the public meeting was pretty well attended, and he was really proud of the City Council members stopping in after their work session. He added, however, that the feeling he got concerning bike lanes is that the residents aren't too wild about placing bike traffic on the roadway. He stated that the main reason cited was that we have the dedicated bike paths on either side of it so shouldn't need it on the roadway as well. DeMers said that that may be a perception, but we also have to remember that going forward every authority, whether it is Federal or State, requires you to accommodate for every mode of traffic, so how we do that, we can be creative, but we have to also be aware of the requirements. He added that if we want to go on our own and pay for all that stuff we can make all the decision we want, but we have to be cognizant of that as well.

Vetter said that one of the things that was brought up at the Steering Committee meeting was about future traffic patterns, and whether they recognize that growth on the north end would send traffic down there because of the schools, have you had a chance to check into those. Kouba responded that they did. She said that the model did account for that change in population.

Strandell commented that regarding the bicycle traffic area, he doesn't see any reason at all why we can't have a shared pedestrian/bicycle lane, it is on both sides of the road all the way out to 13th, so it is already there, it is just a matter of sharing it, and the amount of people walking and riding bikes, just doesn't justify any more than that.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON THE U.S. #2 ACCESS MANAGEMENT STUDY

Haugen reported that we are getting to the end of this study process. He stated that we are waiting for the Airport Authority to meet next Thursday. He explained that when we started this process they sent a letter citing their concern about the Local Road Safety Improvement Program's solution, which was the "R-Cut" alternative. He said that we hope that we've engaged them through the process where we presented alternatives other than the "R-Cut" and are seeking their feedback, from the Airport Authority's perspective, of what alternative we presented might be favorable to them.

Haugen stated that most of the comments we have received to date have focused on the Airport Drive area, and most are typically "why don't you just reduce the speed limit sign out there" and that would solve all your problems, and we are trying to educate them that the speed limit was lowered to 55 and yet we still have traffic going 70 miles an hour, so their suggested 40 to 45 mph won't slow most of the traffic, at least not to the degree they would expect. He said that they need to understand that you can't just put signs out there and expect traffic to slow down,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, May 20th, 2015**

that they would also need enhanced enforcement, and that is difficult to do, particularly with an artificial speed limit that isn't based on conditions that are out there.

Haugen referred to a slide, and explained that they have tried to give a little more background on what the research of empirical data, that has been analyzed would suggest that if you are trying to lower the speeds, it isn't by the signs you put out there, it is just by the design of the roadway, and U.S. #2 is meant to be a rural, high-speed roadway out here, and the intersection is sort of the anomaly, so unless we reduce something to make that intersection, or that stretch of roadway more of an urban setting, and with reasons for people not to want to go 70 mph, that is the only way you will be able to lower the speed, and there aren't any development plans, nor are there any future land use documents that would suggest any real development occurring out there than what is there now, so our response is that lowering the speed limits and enforcement isn't going to reduce the crashes that are occurring out there, nor the severity of those crashes.

Haugen reported that they did provide, just to hopefully educate and inform people as much as possible, what it is that we favor as the alternative for this intersection, and that is from the Steering Committee's perspective; and it is the "Staggered T", where we do shift Airport Drive to the east, separate all of those movements that are wanting to get to and from the airport and the city, away from County 5 intersection. He stated that by doing this we know that there is less than 5% of the total traffic going through that intersection that wants to go north and south directly, so we would be displacing them a bit. He added that a couple things they are doing to assist them with that maneuver, if you were to look at the details, the acceleration lane, or turn lane, is way longer than it would normally be designed if it were just a stand-alone left turn lane, so we are trying to allow traffic to get over to the left as early as possible, and stay out of the through traffic lanes. He said that the other benefit we are providing them is to allow them to take a right on a stop or yield condition.

Powers asked if they would still retain the traffic light at that intersection. Haugen responded that it would be removed. He said that the only alternative that would keep the traffic signal in place would be if we were to just lower the speed limit signs and hope for stricter enforcement, and hope for compliance that way.

Haugen stated that, for the left turn movements, they got a lot of comments and questions about traffic being pushed out into the high speed through movements. He said that one of the things they enjoy about the stop lights out there is the fact that traffic on U.S. #2 has a red light that they have to stop for so that when they do come out of the airport and turn left to get on U.S. #2 they aren't having all this traffic speeding behind them, so we proposed that they also have a dedicated acceleration lane allowing those left turn movements to have their own lane to get them up to speed before they have to merge with additional traffic.

Haugen commented that, just to ensure that you understand, all the details we are showing on the "Staggered T" intersection are mirrored on the west side with County 5 intersection, so we are treating both sides equally. He stated that, as you recall, the movements are heavy from the airport to the city and back, and on County 5 it is coming from the south to the west and the west to the south, so by separating them you remove a lot of conflict, but then we are also treating them equally because the volumes are fairly equal, and to provide more protection with the maneuvers.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, May 20th, 2015**

Haugen reported that a further added feature they are doing, and this is a feature that is in the Local Road Safety Improvement Program, and that will be implemented elsewhere on the County State Highway intersections, are the advance warning traffic approaching system that will be employed out here as part of this, so as vehicles are coming down Airport Drive, these flashing lights are tripped so that the traffic on U.S. #2 is given another visual clue that there is potential turning traffic entering into the roadway. He added that in doing this it reduces the occurrence of crashes by 30%, so overall we are addressing up to 67%, or two-thirds, of the crashes that are occurring there now, and preventing them from happening; and with the removal of the traffic light we will also see a 75% reduction on total traffic delay as well.

Vein asked if there are certain types of accidents occurring that are more damaging, or more threatening than others, that will be either affected positively or negatively. Haugen responded that, overall, when we installed the traffic signal roughly 20 years ago we predicted that there would be increased crashes, and recent data confirms that. He added that one thing that is being traded off by taking out the signal, and the reason for our giving the left turns the dedicated acceleration lane, and also the addition of the warning system, is because the angled crash potential does increase.

Discussion on alternative details ensued.

Haugen commented that this is where we are at with the study, and there isn't too much controversy with anything else we are recommending. He stated that going into the study they knew that Airport Drive was one of our hot topics, and we had an alternative that was already documented in a document that wasn't vetted through the public nor other agencies well, if at all, and we knew that it wasn't a very popular thing to put forward, but we are pretty confident in suggesting that the "Staggered T" is a much better improvement than the "R-Cut", and it is also a much better improvement than an interchange or an overpass or underpass of any sort.

Haugen stated that since the Airport did write the letter at the start of the study, they met with them at their last meeting and asked them to reconsider their stance, so they are waiting to get another letter to see what their decision is on this. He said that he has a kind of sense that they may not be quite as against the study as they were when they first wrote their earlier letter. Mock commented that she isn't aware of what their formal response will be.

Vetter said that he thinks there are a lot of students now that take DeMers out to County 5, and then go out to the airport, with the "Staggered T", do you think that will drive some of that traffic off of that and right on to Highway 2 in town. Haugen responded that there may be some, even at the Airport Authority some of the board members said that if this were implemented they could see themselves shifting their trips to the airport to get up to Gateway Drive. He added that the capacity, in the future, 2040, we are still looking at a level of service B so there is plenty of room on Gateway Drive or U.S. #2 for that added traffic, and, again, it was less than 5% of the traffic they counted out there coming from the south heading directly north to the airport, so if we displaced 5% of the traffic, U.S. #2 is able to handle it, and all of the facilities leading up to U.S. #2.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, May 20th, 2015**

Vetter commented that the NDDOT also, going back to the bridges across the river, specifically Merrifield Bridge, they wanted to study going all the way from County 5 to the Merrifield crossing, so would the “Staggered T” affect that at all. Haugen responded that it would make the same movements at the same intersections as they are now, they just wouldn’t have a signal, and that traffic will allow those going from the west to go south, and traffic going north to the west would have a left turn as they do now, but they won’t have a signal. Vetter stated that the NDDOT was looking at that as a business by-pass, so will they want some sort of a different intersection at U.S. #2 and County 5 if it becomes a business by-pass. Haugen responded that if the traffic gets to the point where it is more than what we are forecasting in 2040, then they may have to address a different type of traffic control up there, but what we are forecasting here it wouldn’t be necessary, and, again, with a level of service B we have a lot of room to add traffic before it really gets to be a concern.

Powers asked what happens next. Haugen responded that next month they will have the final draft report, we will see what the Airport Authority weighs in on, and will incorporate that into the document, and then we will seek approval of that document at our next meeting.

Powers asked if there is funding dedicated to this. Haugen responded that there is. He explained that the Local Road Safety Improvement Program is a sub-component of the whole new safety dollars that are available in North Dakota, so when this was presented to the City of Grand Forks’ Service Safety Committee, one of their questions was who will be responsible for these implementations in the major areas. He stated that the NDDOT has stepped forward and said that they would push and be the sponsor of the improvements that we are recommending along Gateway Drive, Airport Drive, the interchange, etc., so we now have a sponsoring agency identified that is going to go to the bat for these projects. He added that the HSIP monies are available relative to the rest of the federal funds that are available, and it is a 90/10 funding split, and going from \$900,000 to \$1,700,000 wasn’t a huge leap in the cost compared to some of the other alternatives, so it is still within that HSIP program eligibility.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. **TIGER Grant Application**

Haugen commented that he did email the board last week to let you know that there are two TIGER Grant applications that the MPO has been asked to write letters of support on. He said that the first one is a second request from the NDDOT. He explained that the NDDOT applied last year to do improvements up at the Pembina crossing, and they are resubmitting it this year and are asking that the MPO write a letter of support, and he did write one last year, so unless you would direct me not to do so this year he doesn’t see any reason not to support that project.

Haugen said that the second one is a request from the City of Grand Forks for their 42nd Street Grade Separation Project. He stated that they, too, asked for a letter of support on that, and, again he doesn’t see why we wouldn’t support that project, and because it is in our MPO area,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, May 20th, 2015**

the MPO does have to submit a second letter that states that if it is awarded funds, we will bring that project into our Long Range Transportation Plan, as well as our T.I.P. He said that he will write that letter, but it will, as he indicated in his e-mail to the City, will also say that even if you are awarded funds it won't be an automatic amendment into the Long Range Transportation Plan and T.I.P., just as the City has been discussing where their local match will be coming from, the MPO has to feel at ease with how that shifts our recommended projects in the plan as well.

2. MAP-21

Haugen reported that at the end of May MAP-21 will no longer be authorized. He explained that last night the House of Representatives approved a two month extension. He said that the reason they used two months is because right now the current forecast is the Highway Trust Fund can last until the end of July, so they didn't have to do any of their pay-for type of budget gimmicks to pass a two month extension. He stated, though that in passing a two month extension to the end of July, we all know that Congress takes August off, so we are all wondering exactly what is going to happen at the end of July. He said that the only reason they went with two months is because they could easily see that the budget forecast would say that the trust fund would be solvent until the end of July so they are punting at least that far, but if they take August off, we aren't sure what they will have to do because then they will have to find another revenue source unless the trust fund is able to somehow extend another month with the revenue coming in, but they don't forecast that. He added that they had talked about extending it to the end of the calendar year, but that would necessitate a \$10 billion dollar infusion into the trust fund to cover those last months of the year, so that gives you some idea of the dollar values that are in play to add monies to the appropriations to make it whole. He stated that it seems like we have at least two months of status quo, then we don't know.

3. Minnesota Legislature

Haugen reported that we knew the outcome of the North Dakota Legislature a month ago, and today we now know the outcome of the Minnesota Legislature, specifically for transportation, and it is pretty much just status quo for the next two years, there wasn't any huge agreement made on the ten year transportation plan or budget proposal, unless the special session does something when it convenes, but who knows.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO ADJOURN THE MAY 20TH, 2015,
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:00 P.M.***

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

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, June 17th, 2015 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Mike Powers, Chairman, called the June 17th, 2015 meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:00 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Mike Powers, Clarence Vetter, Marc DeMers, Warren Strandell, Ken Vein (via conference phone), Steve Adams, and Gary Malm.

Staff: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Jairo Viafara, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; and David Wiosna, GF/EGF MPO Intern.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Powers declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MAY 20TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE MAY 20TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: DeMers, Adams, Malm, Powers, Strandell, Vetter, and Vein.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that the only news he has is that Minnesota has decided that they will show the Kennedy Bridge project in the 2017 year of the next T.I.P./S.T.I.P., whereas North Dakota will keep it in 2016. He explained that all this is is just a timing of one more State Fiscal Year on the Minnesota side, but there won't be any changes to the project schedule itself, it is just a financial thing.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 17th, 2015**

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that you are all already aware, particularly if you crossed it recently, that traffic control is set up for the project. He said that the only other information he has is that North Dakota Cultural Resources will lead the development of the policy on when the color of the lights can be changed, including the days, the colors allowed, etc., which has to be coordinated with multiple partners, and North Dakota Cultural Resources will lead that. Powers commented that he thought they did this downtown. Haugen responded that what has been approved is the ability to change the color of the lights, now they have to reach an agreement as to what days will be allowed to have different colors as well as what color schemes or combinations will be allowed. Powers asked how many people sign off on this. Haugen responded that the two cities, the two states, and at least one local historic preservation commission, and possibility both State Historical Societies. Malm asked how many people were hired to do that job. Haugen responded that unless they are using KLJ to help them with this it is all just current staff person from multiple parties.

DeMers asked if he was correct that the lead on the Kennedy is MnDOT. Haugen responded that he is correct. He added that SRF is the consulting firm on the Kennedy and KLJ is the firm on the Sorlie.

Haugen commented that they did ask if there were any dollars left on the table since the bid came in substantially less than what was programmed, and the short answer was that there wasn't.

Haugen reported that the staff report did originally have July 15th as the starting date of the project, but it has since been corrected to June 15th.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF EGF FUNCTIONAL RECLASSIFICATION

Kouba reminded the board that back in the first part of 2014 MnDOT started a process of reviewing all of the functional classifications throughout the State. She said that they set up processes of how they were going to do that, and the MPO has been involved in this process and have presented most of the information to this body concerning the decision as to which classifications were changed and which weren't. She stated that in the end we had only two sections of roadway changed; U.S. 220 and Bygland Road. She explained that both were functionally classified as Principle Arterials, but the State determined they should be Minor Arterials. She said that we had to go through an arbitration process as we disagreed with this change, but ultimately the decision was that they would become Minor Arterials.

Kouba reported that we have the updated, agreed upon functional classified map, and staff is looking for approval of that map.

MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE ADOPTION OF THE 2015 FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION FOR THE CITY OF EAST GRAND FORKS, AS SUBMITTED.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 17th, 2015**

Malm asked what the effect of going from a Principle Arterial to a Minor Arterial classification. Haugen responded that the major federal funding program is the National Highway, and dropping these from a Principle Arterial to a Minor Arterial eliminates eligibility from getting funding from that program, so for 220 North the ultimate effect might not be so much because it is a State Trunk Highway, and the State DOT controls the bulk of the money, but for Bygland Road, having dropped from a Principle Arterial to a Minor Arterial does lessen the ability to receive funding from the program that has the most money in it. He added that having it be a local road, in the context of competing against National Highway System roadways, he thinks it probably didn't have much chance of getting any funding anyway.

Vein asked where the arbitration took place. Haugen responded that the arbitration was done by a committee of City, County, Regional Development Commission, and someone from MnDOT, and they met and arbitrated five different cases. He stated that Rich Sanders, Polk County Engineer, was the County representative. He said that they did not allow any oral presentations, so we had to submit written documentation, and they reviewed what was written. He added that when they entered into the process we knew that MnDOT was agreeable to allow a third party, neutral to make a final decision, and they decided to side with MnDOT.

Strandell asked if the ADT was the biggest factor in the decision. Haugen responded that for Bygland Road ADT was the biggest factor, but for 220 North it was a statewide policy that came into play. He explained that MnDOT was not consistent across their districts as to how they treated, what they call "Stub Principle Arterials". He said that what they mean by "Stub Principle Arterials" is that for this one mile stretch it was a Principle Arterial, but 220 North elsewhere in the State was not a Principle Arterial, so their statewide policy decision, after they initiated this process and found this consistency, they instituted a policy that there wouldn't be any more Stub Principle Arterials on State Highways, so that is why they changed 220 North.

DeMers asked if there was anything you can do with functional classifications that would set up anything for like a southend bridge, or something like that, or is it all kind of history based. Haugen responded that this is the current functional classification map, which shows both current and future, it is still technically in place, and he highlighted the future roadway what you are talking about. He stated that the map that we are about to approve and adopt, you will see that there are no future designations. He explained that MnDOT and Federal Highways guidance is that future designation is really only a five year at most future, and we really have no roadways in our five year plan to show, whereas this other map is from our Long Range Transportation Plan where, obviously the future is more than five years, and so this is the alignment that is in our transportation plan, which isn't impacted by your action today. DeMers commented that he just wanted to make sure that there wasn't any planning type of tools, it is more what is. Haugen stated that the planning tools are in place.

DeMers asked, if we don't approve this would we be putting ourselves in any kind of funding jeopardy. Haugen responded that we would have to go through some kind of arbitration process with Federal Highways being the arbitrator, and that would put us in a position where MnDOT wouldn't be approving anything of ours until we acquiesce to their functional classifications.

Voting Aye: DeMers, Adams, Malm, Powers, Strandell, Vetter, and Vein.

Voting Nay: None.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 17th, 2015**

MATTER OF UPDATE ON THE U.S. #2 ACCESS MANAGEMENT REPORT

Haugen reported that in the staff report, and also in an e-mail he sent he highlighted that there might be a request to amend our contract with KLJ, particularly regarding the Airport Intersection with U.S. Highway 2.

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that access to the final report is included, as well as the Executive Summary and comments received after our last open house. He said that most of the comments had to deal with the issue of just lowering the speed limit out there, and keep the signals in place. He stated that they tried to beef up the report and add information that explains that lowering the speed limit doesn't have the effect people think it does, and in fact the speed limit out there was lowered from 70 mph to 55 mph, but the traffic continues to go 70 so lowering it to 40 mph or 45 mph wouldn't have the effect people think it would.

Haugen said that he personally met with the Airport Authority over the last two months to go over the report, to talk about all of the intersection alternatives they had for the Airport Intersection, but in the end they decided that they would send another letter to the NDDOT outlining three points that they wanted to make at this time. He explained that when we started this study they sent a letter to the DOT saying that the R-Cut option, or the median closure with the u-turns on either side was a predetermined done deal and they were criticizing why we are doing a study if that is all we are going to consider, but now they are sending a letter stating that they recognize there is a safety issue at the intersection, and something should be done. He said that they also have a longer term goal of having a grade separation out there, recognizing that in the time frame of this study out to 2040, it can't be justified, they acknowledge that but they still want it known that in the long term they still want this. He commented that their third point is that all of our options were modifying the intersection, or removing the direct through movements, and they want it known that they want to still explore alternatives that allow through movement.

Haugen commented that staff met a couple of times to sort of see if we can make a report change, or somehow give the Airport Authority the ability to help us see if there are alternatives out there, and evaluate them as to whether or not there is anything better than what we have already looked at. He said that that is the amendment of possibility to the contract. He added that they all basically agreed that we would prefer to have one report that would be the go-to report, and that there wouldn't be separate competing reports out there, or separate documents out there and so that is why we negotiated a potential amendment to the KLJ contract.

Haugen stated that he did email this potential amendment, the scope-of-work, to this body. He said that it is the opinion of the NDDOT staff, the MPO staff, and KLJ staff that, to the best of our knowledge, there are no other alternatives out there that haven't been explored, and so what the amendment was going to do was to allow the Airport Authority and all of the interest out there at the Airport, along with other staff and members who wanted to go through a workshop exercise of trying to identify any alternatives and lay out the pros and cons of all the alternatives already looked at, and if by chance there are some alternatives that have some promise that we would have KLJ go through the exercise of the more rigorous analysis of them, similar to the alternatives that we did take further along in the report.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 17th, 2015**

Haugen said that the Airport Authority, in their letter, indicated that they would be willing to pay all the costs involved in doing this, and so that helped us engage KLJ with the possibility of doing the amendment. He added, however, that during all of the meetings held concerning this the Airport Director was out of town, and once he returned he has indicated that he feels that perhaps the Airport Authority would rather retain their own consultant, outside KLJ, to bring in more independent views to the process.

Haugen stated that staff's recommendation is, if this is the approach the Airport wants to go with, the Executive Policy Board authorize us to amend the contract and get this done. He commented that there is no cost to the MPO. He added that another thing is that it will still all be self-contained in one report, and ultimately if there is an alternative out there that has merit, we will give it more of an apples to apples comparison to everything else that is in the report. He said that they have everything ready for signature, we just need the Airport to tell us that this is the way they want to go to finance it. He stated that if the Airport wants to go another way, then your action today is moot, it is only contingent on upon them wanting to pay for this scope of service.

Malm commented that the Airport Authority meets next week, and they will get more of a background on what the Director has to say. He said that the thing they are trying to ensure is that the crossing will remain open because in the future, not five year, but maybe twenty that is going to be a necessity as the City grows, to allow access for an overpass or underpass at that time. He added that to them all the other alternative have very big flaws because you end up having to cross four lanes of traffic. He said that in any event they haven't held their final discussion on this yet, they have a meeting next week, and he will bring this up at that time, but they will probably pay the cost of the consultant.

***MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE A POSSIBLE AMENDMENT
#1 TO THE U.S. #2 ACCESS MANAGEMENT STUDY, AS SUBMITTED.***

Malm stated that he would prefer to wait until the Airport Authority comes back and says what they want to do because then we are just going to have to come back and do it all over again. Haugen responded that if they want to retain their own consultant, he wonders how we will work that consultant's product into the report. Malm said that that is what he means, he thinks we need more time to take a look at this. He added that he doesn't agree with the statistics at all. He said there are some relatively easy ones to put into place, like proper signage, because the signage stinks out there.

Vein reported that what he was thinking when he made the motion was, if you decide to go a different direction you are certainly able to do it, but if you do want to go this way we are putting up the opportunity for you to do it through this amendment and it gives you, still, the ability to go either way, and if you agree it doesn't have to come back here again. He said that his thought would have to impact on what the Airport wants to do it would just make this process flow. Malm responded that he understands what Mr. Vein's thinking is, but having sat here for a few years it seems like if somebody makes a decision and it puts a barrier in somebody else's way in a hurry, that you got to fight around it.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 17th, 2015**

Haugen commented that another option, and you have done this in the past, is to authorize the Finance Committee to act on the full board's behalf, so you could defer to the Finance Committee that, whatever decision the Airport decides a week from now, have the Finance Committee meet and make the appropriate MPO action or reaction to that decision. He explained that what he is trying to achieve here is, we seem to agree there is an issue out here that needs to have some funds programmed towards it. He said that what he is concerned with is, if the Airport Authority, in particular, and the State DOT do not agree on the approach, no one will want to take the risk of putting money into the program towards a project that will have a lot of complications and potential "do nothing" report out of it because there are a lot of issues and needs to which they will gravitate those funds toward, so he is trying to make sure that we get money programmed to this intersection to address the issues.

DeMers stated that one of the things he thinks is, to your point is, maybe by doing this it kind of forces people to make a decision, and put those ideas out there. He added that sometimes he thinks that constraint is the best tool for production, and by the MPO kind of saying "let's hear what you have to say" he thinks maybe it allows people to put those considerations into effect sooner than later.

Voting Aye: DeMers, Adams, Powers, Strandell, Vetter, Mock, and Vein.

Voting Nay: Malm.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REVIEW ITEMS

Haugen reported that this is the conclusion of the process that started last November, that we informed you of, whereby Federal Highway gave us a short period of time to answer about twenty-four questions on how our financial management deals with their federal funds. He said that this is part of a statewide review that Federal Highway did with the other two MPOs and the NDDOT.

Haugen commented that there is a document that is bigger and broader than any of the documentation provided to you, that shows everything they looked at, but he tried to limit it to just what was pertinent to us.

Haugen pointed out that there were seven things they really wanted a report on. He said that we had things in three of the seven, and included in the packet were the items of specific interest to us that we needed to take action on.

Haugen said that the first one had to deal with what they felt was an improper use of their federal funds to purchase a refrigerator. He said that we have since credited them for those monies, paying it out of our local pot of funds.

Haugen stated that the second item is still under resolution, and it is a meal that we provided to the U.S. #2 Corridor Steering Committee. He explained that Federal Highway is contesting whether it was a proper meal to provide. He said that we tried to provide them with the proper documentation/justification, but it is still under their review, but if they decide that they are firm in their decision that it isn't eligible for federal funds, then, again, we will pay it back with local funds.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 17th, 2015**

Haugen commented that the third item involved some improper coding of some invoices, and that, too, has been rectified.

Haugen said that the next issues had to deal with forms and processes. He pointed out that he included draft policies/procedures/forms in the packet that we have developed. He added that the Finance Committee met on Monday and they are recommending that you approve them.

Haugen stated that the first one deals with purchasing supplies and equipment. He explained that when we were housed in Grand Forks we were utilizing the procedures that Grand Forks had at that time, and didn't have anything MPO specific, but now we do.

Haugen pointed out that for travel we did have something written down, but, again, it was based on what Grand Forks had, and Federal Highway asked that we make it more MPO specific, so we made modifications to our travel policies and procedures.

Haugen commented that another issue had to deal with the timeliness of getting the Executive Director's timesheet and travel requests signed, which the Chairman signs, and that has been rectified as well.

Haugen stated that another one dealt with petty cash. He explained that back when we were in Grand Forks, and before the advent of the web and electronic versions of everything, we were selling our planning documents, and other things, and a lot of people paid cash so we kept \$75.00 in our petty cash fund to deal with those cash transactions, but Federal Highway suggested that we eliminate it so we have done that.

Haugen reported that we are seeking approval of the forms and policies and procedures submitted.

DeMers asked if Mr. Haugen had any idea of what this audit cost. Haugen responded that it took approximately ten hours of our staff time in November, it took us probably another eight hours of our time going over some draft documents and being involved in a teleconference call that took place, as well as another four or so hours to develop these forms, so at our end it was the cost of Peggy and my time. DeMers said that his point is that it is important that we audit ourselves, but they basically came up with \$536 worth of items, and he would guarantee that the cost of the audit was at least ten times that amount, so although we do need to self-regulate, and we do need to have outside eyes and independent opinions, but it seems like that is the culture that we run into these days, we hear about all their overages and government expenditures, and sometimes maybe we need to stop looking at ourselves sometimes.

Vein asked how often they do these audits. Haugen responded that this is the first one that he has ever been involved with, and he has been with the MPO over twenty years. He added that the other two MPOs probably had bigger issues than we did that were identified through this process. He said that the NDDOT was involved, and they had some issues that Federal Highway identified for them, so of the four entities we were probably the shining light. DeMers said, again, that he understands the need for outside independent audits and those types of things, but we have to also realize that sometimes the financial gains aren't necessarily what they may appear to be.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 17th, 2015**

Vetter referred to the travel expense policies and procedures, under the Per Diem meals section, we don't specify in there that if they leave town before 7:00 a.m. they will get reimbursed for breakfast, or if they come back after 6:00 p.m. they will get reimbursed for the supper meal. He said that it is shown on the travel voucher, but he is wondering if we don't want to spell that out in the actual policies and procedures as well. Haugen said that we can do that.

MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE FHWA FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REVIEW ACTION PLAN, AND TO ADOPT THE POLICIES/PROCEDURES, AND FORMS, SUBJECT TO THE CHANGES AS DISCUSSED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF FY2015 WORK PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

Viafara reported that he included information in the packets that describes one by one all the projects that at the moment are being implemented for funds by the MPO. He said that each project gives you a complete schedule of activities by task, and also gives you an idea who to consult on the project, and the beginning and end dates for the project.

Viafara commented that the idea behind providing you with this information is to facilitate a way for you to follow up on each one of the projects, so you can track goods and services that you will be receiving, and basically to ensure you're getting information on time and keeping up with each one of the projects.

Viafara stated that this document was submitted for consideration at the previous Technical Advisory Committee, and we were fortunate enough to get some comments. He said that he is currently working on advancing a couple of comments made by stakeholders and committee members and hopes to have an updated version at your next meeting.

Powers asked if the traffic count project is ongoing, or is it all there. Haugen responded that there is a third phase, and that is to try to incorporate County and East Grand Forks signal locations. He said that they are trying to communicate with MnDOT to try to get that set up and in place. He added that there have been some Grand Forks signals that they expect will be on-line soon so they can capture data there as well.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON UPCOMING MEETINGS

Haugen referred to the staff report and went over the upcoming meeting schedule:

- 1) EGF Land Use Plan Update 2045 – Open House on Thursday, June 18th from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. at the Riverwalk Center at 211 DeMers Avenue, EGF.
- 2) GF Land Use Plan Update 2045 – Open House Thursday, June 18th from 5:30 – 8:00 p.m. in Rom A102, Grand Forks City Hall, 255 North 4th Street, Grand Forks

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 17th, 2015**

- 3) Glasston Railroad Crossing Study – Steering Committee Kick-off meeting on July 8th at 10:30 a.m. at the Dakota Hall, 1015 North 43rd Street, Grand Forks; and the Public open house will be held on the 9th in the Grand Forks City Council Chambers, 255 North 4th Street, Grand Forks.

OTHER BUSINESS

None

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY STRANDELL, SECONDED BY MALM, TO ADJOURN THE JUNE 17TH, 2015, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:48 P.M.

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

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 15th, 2015 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Mike Powers, Chairman, called the July 15th, 2015 meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:00 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Mike Powers, Clarence Vetter, Marc DeMers, Warren Strandell, Ken Vein, Steve Adams, Jeannie Mock, and Gary Malm.

Staff: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Jairo Viafara, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; and David Wiosna, GF/EGF MPO Intern.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Powers declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 17TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE JUNE 17TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that included in the packets is some information from MnDOT concerning the Kennedy Bridge. He explained that there was a meeting held last week with MnDOT, the City of East Grand Forks, and MPO Staff to discuss the status of the Kennedy Bridge project.

Haugen referred to the staff report and pointed out that he included an illustration of the proposed typical cross-section for the bridge that they are moving forward with. He said that at the top of the drawing you see the existing cross-section, and on the bottom is the proposed

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 15th, 2015**

cross-section. He added that you do need to note that this is still subject to change, however it does appear to be the cross-section that is moving forward in the project development process.

Haugen commented that you will notice that a lot of things are not at standard design widths, i.e., standard driving lanes are typically 12-feet in width, and the ones shown on the diagram are 11.5-feet. He added that the multi-purpose trail would typically be 10-feet wide, and this one is 8.5-feet.

Haugen explained that because of the truss system, and everything needing to be contained within that structure, this is the give and take that needed to be made to accommodate all the different modes, and still fit some safety features like shoulders, guardrails, etc., this is the cross-section that they developed and are moving forward with.

Haugen commented that MnDOT has not asked the MPO to take action on this, but he does believe that they seeking action from both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks Cities as to whether they disagree strongly, or concur with this typical cross-section.

Haugen stated that you will also notice that a median down the middle of the bridge is not being proposed, and that, again, is one of the give and takes necessary to accommodate some of the other modes.

Haugen reported that they also discussed that construction will now most likely flow into 2018; and it is likely that construction will not start until 2017, thus shifting everything forward a year.

Haugen said that during the meeting there was also a lot of discussion on the westbound on-ramp, and it merges onto U.S. #2, which is something that this body mentioned several times in their discussions when MnDOT staff was present at the MPO Executive Policy Board meetings, and it was again emphasized at that meeting with East Grand Forks.

Haugen commented that you will also note that there are still two public engagement opportunities yet to be scheduled with the consultants about this project. He explained that they will most likely cover such things as explaining the typical cross-section, as well as some of the amenities that are being designed into the structure which includes the different lighting options, discussion about some of the treatments they talk about on the multi-purpose trail, etc.

Haugen added that, as presented to you before, determining how to reconnect or make a better connection between the Kennedy Bridge project and our existing trail network is also being considered. He said that on the East Grand Forks side MnDOT is proposing just to run a continuation of the 8.6-foot trail down on the north side along the westbound on-ramp to conclude at River Road, and then are leaving it up to the local entity to try to determine how and when it would connect to the Greenway Trail System, or the rest of the trail system in Grand Forks. He stated that on the North Dakota side there is an existing 5-foot connection on the north side that connects to the Greenway, but doesn't really provide a good connection to the railroad trail that extends west about half a block behind Gateway Drive, so it would be a nice better connection between the Kennedy Bridge and the rest of the Grand Forks system, besides the Greenway Trail, so those are a couple of connections that we will suggest be worked on in

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 15th, 2015**

either our next work program year or the year after, to try to get those connections completed so that when the Bridge opens we will have a better connected facility.

DeMers asked how secure the funding program is for this project. Haugen responded that he will speak first on the Minnesota side. He said that Minnesota is proposing in the T.I.P. to utilize federal funds and proceeds from the bridge bond sale they did about ten years ago. He stated that on the North Dakota side the bulk of the funds is federally proposed, so, because it is primarily federally funded on both sides of the river, Congress needs to make sure there is a robust federal program, or at least a program similar to our current program, to give it more assurability.

DeMers commented that the reason he asked this is because the East Grand Forks City Council discussed a concurrence resolution at their last work session, and they had a couple of questions about how Grand Forks was going to be dealing with this, and then his own thoughts are what are the potential ramifications if they didn't concur, would funding be in jeopardy. Haugen responded that it would just cause the lead agency, and the consultant to have to work harder with the local agencies to get concurrence. He added that with the construction now no longer happening in 2016, or if it does not until late fall, it would allow a little time to resolve all the issues that come up, and if that is an issue it would simply mean that the lead agency and the consultant will have to work a little harder to get concurrence on the typical cross-section.

DeMers asked if the City of Grand Forks had discussed the typical cross-section issue at their City Council meeting. Vein responded that they had not. DeMers said that it would be interesting to hear what Grand Forks has to say about this. Vein asked where the City of East Grand Forks is at on this issue. DeMers responded that it was brought to their attention that MnDOT would appreciate a Concurrence Resolution from East Grand Forks and Grand Forks as for the typical cross-section, as proposed, but they have some reservations. Vein asked if they had a recommendation on what they would like to see different. Vetter responded that he thinks a lot of the concern is because they are removing the median from the center of the bridge, and East Grand Forks' concern is for vehicles coming from the on-ramp, particularly in the winter, and the fact that the median is kind of a safety factor for them and has prevented a lot of head-on collisions, so if they remove the median on the bridge how is that going to affect the median coming off the bridge and going back quite a way, and they haven't given them any indication of what that is going to be. Vein commented that he personally would say that he would look at the lane widths because it seems like trucks get bigger and with the narrower lanes he thinks it could be an issue; but they have not had council discussion on this yet. He added that he certainly understands and appreciates, personally where the City of East Grand Forks is at, and he would agree that the median does have a safety issue. DeMers commented that the lanes would be $\frac{3}{4}$ of a foot narrower, without a four-foot median. Vein agreed, you're narrower and you don't have the median, so safety would be a concern.

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that there isn't anything new to report on the Sorlie Bridge project at this time.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 15th, 2015**

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE U.S. #2 ACCESS MANAGEMENT STUDY FINAL REPORT

Haugen referred to the staff report and pointed out that he included the motion that was forwarded from the Technical Advisory Committee. He stated that there was a lot of discussion at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting about how to proceed with the approval of the U.S. #2 Access Management Study final report, and in the end this was the motion that was adopted with one dissenting vote. He pointed out that it grants approval, but also recognizes that there is an Airport Authority disagreement with the alternatives for the Airport Drive and County 5 intersection.

Haugen reported that another part of the motion concerned comments received from the NDDOT, which were included in the packet, and are presented in a manner in which you have been given an idea of what page in the report the comment was generated from, and what our reply is. He stated that all of these comments have been imbedded in the final report document itself, but the Technical Advisory Committee also wanted to have this document stand by itself in an appendix as well.

Haugen reiterated that last month the board authorized a potential amendment to the contract if the Airport Authority was willing to execute it, but they have declined the offer. He explained that their reason for declining the offer are: 1) they have not budgeted for the cost of doing the amendment; and 2) they were a bit concerned that having KLJ review KLJ work was probably not something they felt was in their best interest, so the amendment is not being forwarded, and therefore we are trying to conclude the U.S. #2 Access Management Study final report, and are recommending approval, with the Technical Advisory Committee's recommendation to approve with the notation that the Airport Authority doesn't agree with any of the alternatives presented for the Airport Drive intersection.

Haugen reported that most of the comments received from the NDDOT didn't substantially change the report; however the one thing that was stressed was that in the end, that, again, from this planning document nothing is going to be constructed, designed, or determined as there is still the NEPA process and a more detailed project design needed, so before anything is done at that intersection there will be a lot of opportunity for all parties to be involved in the decision process prior to any final design of that intersection.

Vein asked if there is a timeline for when they would anticipate that the improvement would go forward. Haugen responded that when they started this project there was \$2,000,000.00 programmed for turning movement improvements along U.S. #2, and it was described as: "from I-29 out to the Grand Forks County line", but it wasn't defined as to what exactly those improvements would be, so we were hoping that we could come to an agreement so that that \$2,000,000.00 could be programmed for this intersection. He added that since the start of our study, and perhaps because of the discussion we had, the NDDOT has focused those funds on U.S. #18 Intersection out at Larimore. He said that they are in the final design stage of modifying that intersection out there to the Larimore exit and the rest stop on U.S. #2, so right

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 15th, 2015**

now there is no defined funds out there so it can go through the normal solicitation process that we do every fall, and one of the sponsoring agencies would have to submit a request for us to consider programming funds for that. He added that it was identified to the Local Road Safety Improvement Program as, within a five year window, as being a high priority intersection for safety funds.

Malm asked if the DOT take the money that was on that and put it out at Larimore, is that what you're saying. Haugen responded that it was programmed as a non-defined specific location along the U.S. #2 Corridor, and then it was programmed to that specific intersection at Larimore. Malm commented that nobody likes what they did at the Larimore intersection either, so now they have a fight out there, they're not happy with that because they were doing some of the same things out there, but it will probably go through.

Malm stated that he has a real problem that the name of this organization is Metropolitan Planning Organization, and the City of Grand Forks is going to grow out there, and if we put a goofy intersection in there we will end up having to redo it all over again, at a much bigger cost than trying to do something for the next fifty years, and the only answer, if we are going to run an airport out there is that we need to have an overpass. He said that he knows there isn't money for that, but if we start doing other things than we just create a barrier and somebody ends up saying: "No, we've done it and that's the end of it and we aren't going to put any more money into it". He added that we have done that with bridges and overpasses over the interstate, and he thinks it is about time we say that this is not the way to do it, and Mr. Dame can bring up his comments. He asked if Mr. Dame is ready to put something in their budget to have someone else study this next year. Dame responded that they are trying to get a budget together to be able to look forward to doing some additional studying on that intersection from the Airport Authority's standpoint.

Malm asked why we would want to go ahead before the Airport Authority does anything. He said that he reads this resolution and he doesn't even know what it says. Vein commented that in reading what they have in the update it sounded like at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting there were attempts to remove all information regarding the intersection, but that didn't pass, so this seems to be the fallback, and it wasn't unanimous, but at least this one did pass. Malm said that he understands that, but he talked to people who have been at the public hearings that said that there is a great deal of people who are very disappointed with this decision on what they are doing out there, that that wasn't going to solve the problem, and we are putting a band-aid on it. He added that there is a great number of people that use the airport who are not from Grand Forks, not from North Dakota, and you get out there and get in a goofy situation like you're going to do out there, you're going to drive people across four lanes of traffic when you come out of the airport to go east, because you have to cross the two lanes to the west, and then you have to cross at least one of them to get into the next driving lane, you're going to have another hang up farther out.

Vetter asked if they can approve this and take the airport intersection out of it. Haugen responded that the short answer would be in doing so you would be jeopardizing the total federal investment in the study if you try to remove the work that has been completed. Malm asked, though, if they can't wait to see if Mr.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 15th, 2015**

Dame and his organization are willing to have someone look at this. He added that nobody would hire KLJ, and there isn't anything wrong with KLJ, but why would you hire the team that denied the intersection to relook at it, they don't have any reason to relook at it except to put some money in their pocket.

Haugen commented that the alternative motion then, would maybe be to approve the final document subject to an amendment that if the Airport completes a study, the findings of that study be amended into the report.

DeMers asked what the desired outcome of an Airport study would be, because he thinks it would basically be that an overpass is needed, so why even study it if you know what you want, or is it a feasibility option, what is the extra study going to prove. Vein added that, unless someone has some fresh ideas that we aren't aware of, he would think they probably looked at a majority of them. He added that the only real way to solve the issues at this intersection is with an overpass. DeMers agreed, adding that the big problem is the cost, so it comes down to whether another study is going to say it is more feasible than what we currently know. He said that he would think that the money is better spent, not on another study, but on some, for lack of a better term, fundraising, because how do you come up with the gap funding.

DeMers commented that he thinks, when you look at creative solutions, he would say this is out there, and he would never come up with something where we are at, but obviously the goal of the other side would be to provide their own justification for an interchange. Malm said that that may be, but they have no other plans that they see about how to deal with this on a temporary basis, and you start talking about taking out traffic lights, and they didn't make any other suggestions, so is there something that could be a temporary fairly good solution. He added that when he listened about the Airport Authority and them saying that this is a dangerous intersection, it becomes dangerous when one truck had a terrible accident out there and hit a van and killed several people, and the other was a judge that got involved when his daughter or wife got hit coming out of there, and we got traffic lights out of that one, is there some temporary solution until we can go to the State Legislature and say fund this, it's important.

Vein stated that another thing he remembers hearing was that lights actually make the intersection less safe than it was before the lights were added, but it was more a political issue when the judge's wife or daughter were in an accident. He asked if we could ever go back to something that is at least an improvement of what is there today, and remove the light. Haugen responded that there is an interim solution recommended in the report itself, but it is meant to just be an interim as it is doing something, but it isn't achieving a whole lot, it is making a very small marginal improvement at the intersection.

Haugen reported that the traffic signals increase the crash frequency out there. He added that the Local Road Safety Improvement Program identified roadways that, because of just the inherent characteristics of the roadway or the intersection, or because of the length of the curve, or the radius of the curve, that these are features that are highly indicative that future crashes will be occurring in those segments. So the Local Road Safety Improvement Program identified this intersection not because of the fatality that happened there in the past, but because of the characteristic of the intersection. He added that the fatalities really come into play when you

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 15th, 2015**

look at the top ten high crash locations across the State of North Dakota, and where this intersection comes out in that top ten.

Vein stated that he thinks Mr. Malm had a great suggestion, that we go back to the Legislature in the next session, and tell them that this is one of the top ten dangerous intersections in the State, and see if we can get some state funds.

Malm commented that if we make it difficult to get to and from the Airport, we will lose a lot of businesses that won't want to come out to the airport, or fly people in, they will just go to Fargo.

Powers asked if we were to vote this down would we lose the whole study or the whole access to the airport. Haugen responded that you would. He explained that they went through the proper processes, engaged the stakeholders, engaged the public, held several public notice meetings, however the planning study itself does not say that this is the solution, and that is the only solution that will be carried forward, and it identifies a lot of alternatives, it identifies some fatal flaws, it identifies other alternatives that are feasible, some are more financially feasible than others, so it gives us a range of alternatives to consider, when and if someone wishes to try to program funds for improvements at that specific intersection.

Mock asked if these were the only alternatives that would be studied if we approve it. Haugen responded that when they go into the NEPA process, because this was not a PEL (Planning Environmental Linkage) study, they would not eliminate alternatives. He added that they do have a fiscal component on it, so as the NDDOT has been identified as a lead sponsor for this intersection, if they came to the MPO and asked if we want to program \$1,000,000.00 at this intersection, we would have to question whether that would give them enough money to consider other alternatives than an RCUT, or just something small; if they came to us with \$10,000,000.00, it could mean they would be a little more expansive in their alternatives, but it probably still doesn't include an interchange. He said that this is part of the challenge with fiscally constrained planning documents, and fiscally constrained T.I.P.s, that we don't have \$20,000,000.00 to put in there.

Malm stated that we are in the process of building, out at the Grand Forks Airforce Base, a piece of property that is bringing in several major industrial people, and those people don't drive anywhere, they are going to want to fly, and the can't fly into the airbase so where are they going to fly into, Fargo if our airport doesn't function correctly, so it could have a very serious economic effect on Grand Forks.

Haugen reiterated that, again, if you want to take a stronger stance than just recognizing that the Airport Authority disagrees, he would recommend you approve subject to amending any pertinent findings from the follow up study the Airport might engage in so that it's approving the document, but acknowledging that there is a follow-up study that might be forthcoming and that might come up with a better solution. He added that the whole document would be amended to reflect this a year from now when that study is done and concluded. Vein stated that this would only happen if the Airport does their own study. Haugen agreed, adding that if they do their own study he would see it needing to engage similar stakeholders that this current study did; city, county, state, MPO, and citizens.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 15th, 2015**

Vein commented that, from his point of view, he isn't sure that, just like the Airport Authority not agreeing with the results of this study, the City is able to agree with this outcome either, so he thinks it is more than just the Airport Authority, it's the City and probably the County as well.

Malm asked if the County of Grand Forks contacted Mr. Haugen, and is he meeting with them. Haugen responded they had, and he will be meeting with them. Malm commented that he tried to pass a motion against this, but the County Board wanted to hear from Mr. Haugen first.

Vetter asked if this needs to be approved today, or can it be tabled until the County and the City of Grand Forks has a chance to look at it and get back to us. Haugen responded that the short answer is that we can table it today, however we have expired contracted service period with KLJ, and if any substantial changes are made to the document he is sure that KLJ would be happy to request an amendment to the contract for compensation to do that.

MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO TABLE THIS AGENDA ITEM UNTIL THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS AND GRAND FORKS COUNTY PERSONNEL HAVE HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO LOOK AT THE FINAL U.S. #2 ACCESS MANAGEMENT PLAN STUDY DOCUMENT.

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

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FINAL DRAFT OF ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE PROGRAM MANUAL

Viafara reported that this is the second time that you have been sent the Environmental Justice Program Manual for consideration; the first was back in February, at which time we received comments and criticisms from our federal agencies, which were addressed. He said, however that in October a new round of comments dealing with guidelines and so forth came back again for our attention, and therefore, when responding to them the approach taken was mainly through the NEPA process rather than planning policy that we were required to use for the type of project style that the MPO usually undertakes. He stated that as a result the MPO staff became aware of the need to amend the program in a manner that was able to really address the concerns brought by the NDDOT and FHWA, and in order to respond properly the new document was completely redrafted and has been sent for consideration to those agencies and they are in agreement with the result you are considering today.

Viafara stated that we are bringing this to the MPO Executive Policy Board for your approval, confident that those comments brought by these agencies have been addressed properly, and we believe that this document will serve the MPO, in terms of guiding environmental programs in the future.

Haugen commented that, if you will recall, when we adopted our Long Range Transportation Plan in December of 2013, Federal Highway and the NDDOT responded back that they would relieve us of our T.I.P. freeze only if we addressed updating our EJ Manual, so this is the follow-

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 15th, 2015**

up activity that we were required to do in order to maintain an unfrozen T.I.P. document. He said that we believe we are in full compliance with what is required, and staff is seeking approval of the document so we can use it in our forward planning/programming efforts, but also to ensure that the T.I.P. remains unfrozen.

MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE PROGRAM MANUAL, AS SUBMITTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF PHASE III-A OF A.T.A.C. COUNTING PROGRAM

Haugen reported that this is labeled at Phase III, but if you look at the document you will notice that it talks about Phase III-A. He explained that this is a continuation of our video capture of turning movements and counts at intersections in Grand Forks. He said that it is labeled "A" because, how we engage A.T.A.C. is through a Master Agreement, and this would be Addendum 6 to the Master Agreement. He stated that the Master Agreement is an agreement between A.T.A.C. and the NDDOT, us, and the other two MPOs, and it is going to expire at the end of September, so there will be a new Master Agreement in October.

Haugen referred to the Scope-of-Work for Phase III-A and explained that it is what A.T.A.C. believes they can get accomplished between now and September 30th. He pointed out that the intersections that they will be working on to get the video detection up to being able to capture vehicles up and running, and to establish and include them into our software websites are:

1. 32nd Avenue South and South 24th Street.
2. 32nd Avenue South and Northbound I-29 Ramps.
3. 32nd Avenue south and Southbound I-29 Ramps.
4. Gateway Drive and North 47th Street.
5. Gateway Drive and Westbound I-29 Ramps.
6. South Columbia Road and 11th Avenue South.
7. South Washington Street and 47th Avenue South.

Haugen commented that Phase III-B will be presented to this body towards October, and that will finish out the remaining intersections in Grand Forks and will also explore East Grand Forks and how we can get the same capabilities with either the existing equipment in East Grand Forks or to work with MnDOT to help them identify what improvements they need to make to the signals, but this is continuation of our counting program, adding more intersections into the mix.

Haugen reported that he wanted to mention that one of the things that will be added to this is train event data. He stated that right now when a train goes through, or adjacent to some of these intersections, and it pre-empts the traffic signal, we can capture that electronic data and help us identify the movement of trains in Grand Forks, so that is something that will be added on to Phase III-A.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 15th, 2015**

MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE SCOPE-OF-WORK FOR PHASE III-A OF THE TRAFFIC COUNTING STUDY, AS SUBMITTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF CONTRACT FOR THE I-29 TRAFFIC OPERATION STUDY

Haugen reported that the RFP was approved by this body several months ago. He stated that we did receive four proposals, and the Selection Committee did interview all four firms. He explained that there was a basic grouping of the four into two groups; two were using, right from the start, some software tools that we felt were very critical in order to have a successful study done, and two were not using those tools.

Haugen stated that in the end the Selection Committee narrowed their selection between the two firms using the software tools, and ultimately selected KLJ.

Haugen pointed out that included in the packet was a copy of the original scope-of-work proposed by KLJ. He said that, as indicated in the staff report, negotiations were held, and there weren't any substantial changes made to the work being done, just some clarification on some of the steps to be taken.

Haugen referred to the scope-of-work, and went over the changes briefly. He explained that one thing they will be doing for us is, instead of just taking our travel demand model forecast output and relying on that, they want to use a couple other scenarios to help everyone understand the importance of I-29 traffic and potential future accesses.

Haugen commented that one of the scenarios is, as we have in our Sustainability Livability goals, a reduction of trips so one of their scenarios would be, if we achieve our goals in that our model would have fewer trips being produced and fewer vehicles of traffic out in the area.

Haugen stated that the second scenario would consist of, as our earlier discussion about how secure funding is on the rehab of the Kennedy Bridge, this scenario would look at a 20% reduction in funding, primarily federal funding to our area, and what this means to our future street network. He explained that originally it was assuming that that 20% hit would impact both local and state systems, but as our current Long Range Transportation Plan identifies and emphasizes, most of the hit would trickle down to the local system, so it is important that we maintain the hierarchy of the State Highway and Interstate System first, so we would shift, actually we have already shifted in the Long Range Plan with the financial constraint that we already have, that some of what would normally be deemed local dollars are already shifted to maintain the State Highway System, so then this further shift of that 20% to maintain the State Highway System it would impact the local system, so this scenario had to be re-written so they understood that it isn't impacting the regional system, but would mostly impact the local system.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 15th, 2015**

Haugen commented that the second area, specifically related to alternatives, is that they would be doing micro-simulation. He said that the first scenario that was talked about was the Regional Macro area, now we are talking about micro area, looking at specific interchange locations and so on. He stated that it was just a matter of re-wording, and this was something that Federal Highway was trying to make sure we emphasized, so that we are looking at our existing system first and trying to solve all problems with the existing interchanges, so, for example Task 4.3 previously talked about focusing on the 47th Avenue location, we had them re-write it to say that we are actually looking at 32nd Avenue, but one of the alternatives might be at 47th Avenue, so it is just changing the wording so we are focusing or saying that we are looking at not just adding to the system but are looking at alternatives that modify the existing locations.

Haugen stated that the last thing that we are still trying to get clarification on, and for some of you this may be new information, it's a section on 7.2, ultimately we might be recommending modification to the accesses to the interstate. He explained that over a year and a half ago, when Grand Forks was first trying to do an interchange justification report or an interchange access report, we were told that it was not eligible for MPO funds to assist in it, therefore the City of Grand Forks engaged a consultant with entirely local funds, but because of the location of this to PEL, where we are linking planning with the early stages of NEPA, all the work we are doing that does the traffic operations analyses would be written in Appendices A and B, so that it can actually be submitted as the front end of an IAR.

Haugen commented that we are fairly confident that this will be allowed, but we don't quite yet have full concurrence from the State. He stated that the reason for our confidence that it can be allowed is because they are currently allowing it both in the Fargo and Bismarck areas.

Haugen reported that these are the negotiated things we did from what the Selection Committee reviewed, so staff is recommending the execution of a contract with KLJ to do the I-29 Traffic Operations Study.

Vein said that you said that during the selection process a couple firms used a software package, while a couple didn't. He asked if KLJ used this package. Haugen responded that they did. Vein asked if they can do the study for the budgeted amount of \$175,000. Haugen responded that they can.

MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE EXECUTION OF A CONTRACT WITH KLJ TO PERFORM THE I-29 TRAFFIC OPERATIONS STUDY.

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

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON GLASSTON RAILROAD CROSSING STUDY

Haugen reported that last week they had the kick-off meetings for the Glasston Railroad Crossing Study. He stated that Olsson and Associates were in town, and they held several private meetings with individual stakeholders, they also had a kick-off meeting with the Steering Committee, and a public open house.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 15th, 2015**

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that copies of the basic information that was distributed at the public open house was included. He stated that there are three key things, and last week all three were highlighted. He said that the first thing that we hope to accomplish with this is just educating ourselves and the public of what future train movements might be happening in Grand Forks.

Haugen commented that last week not only us, but also some industries that are trying to locate in Grand Forks, were learning railroad operations. He said an example would be, the nitrogen plant found out that BNSF will service them only through operations on the Glasston having to go through the rail-yard. He stated that he thinks the plant had hoped that some of their rail service could be from the north, but that will not be the case.

Haugen reported that other things we are educating each other on is, again using the nitrogen plant as an example, when they get serviced by a train, it is one train servicing them, but for us it is counted as two trains because it is blocking the crossing twice, once up and once back, so just so we are all aware when we talk about one train versus two trains we understand the perspectives that are going on.

Haugen commented that the second purpose of the study is to focus on the Glasston Subdivision conflicts at at-grade crossings with increased train traffic, and type of train traffic. He said that we were able to identify in the first effort what mitigation we can do to make the conflicts the least painful, and to try to be pro-active and get them implemented prior to the pain being experienced.

Haugen stated that the third effort is, if the North Dakota State Mill is able to locate a loading/unloading facility over on the Glasston Subdivision, can we eliminate all the train traffic on the Mills Spur, south of Gateway Drive, and if so what can we do with the abandoned or vacated right-of-way.

Haugen said that, again the information in the packet is just the kick-off information, and we did have an open house last Thursday, at which about a dozen people attended.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON BYGLAND ROAD STUDY

Kouba reported that, as you will recall, we hired Alliant to do this study. She said that back in May an open house was held and we presented some information that was gathered on the quantitative part of what is happening on Bygland Road, and we held the meeting to gather some of the qualitative part of what is happening on Bygland Road, getting input from the public as to what they see is happening on Bygland.

Kouba stated that since that meeting, Alliant has come up with a multitude of alternatives, of treatments of possibilities of what could happen along Bygland Road, which will be presented to the public on July 23rd at the Senior Center from 5:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, July 15th, 2015**

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Summary of Work Program Activities Schedule For 2015 Update

Haugen reported that in your monthly agenda packet, under Other Business, you will see this activity project report that Mr. Viafara is putting together for us. He stated that each of the listed work items are identified, and it gives us a completion date, as well as a progress report.

2. 2045 East Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update Web-Link

Haugen reported that a website is up and running for the 2045 East Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update: www.theforksmpo.org/Pages/EGF2045LUP.html.

3. 2045 Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update Web-Link

Haugen reported that a website is currently being worked on for the 2045 Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update. He stated that when it is up and running the link will be made available.

4. Congressional Act

Haugen reported that by the end of the month Congress needs to take action. He stated that it looks likely now that they are going to do an extension to the end of the year. He added that they need to find five to eight billion dollars to do the extension, and it looks like most of the monies will come from the recapture of fees and more efficient tax collections, so there is not really a direct connection between this and transportation, it is sort of budget offsets that aren't totally related to the highway trust funds purpose.

Haugen commented that there are some different bills coming from both chambers, and he will try to keep everyone informed the best he can, but right now it seems like the focus is on extending it to the end of the year.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO ADJOURN THE JULY 15TH, 2015,
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:06 P.M.***

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

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 19th, 2015 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Mike Powers, Chairman, called the August 19th, 2015 meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:08 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Mike Powers, Marc DeMers, Warren Strandell, Steve Adams, Jeannie Mock, and Gary Malm.

Absent were: Ken Vein and Clarence Vetter.

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

Guest(s): Mike Yavarow, GF City Engineering.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Powers declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JULY 15TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE JULY 15TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: DeMers, Adams, Mock, Malm, Powers, and Strandell.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that the latest news, besides the fact that they have now switched sides on the bridge, is that the project is going well and that MnDOT now intends to do a temporary fix to the approach on the Minnesota side of the bridge this fall.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 19th, 2015**

Haugen commented that we would expect, now, that both sides of the bridge will have temporary fixes done to their respective approaches before winter sets in this year. He added that both sides will also work together in 2019, when North Dakota begins work on DeMers Avenue, to do a more permanent fix to both approaches.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen stated that, as discussed at the last MPO Executive Policy Board meeting, there have been some conversations about the proposed cross-section, as well as some communications between the engineering departments, MnDOT, NDDOT, and others; and the real issue or discussion point is these 4-foot 3-inch shoulders, and whether they truly need to be that wide; and reduce the drive lanes or in absence of a median, and he believes they are still discussing that and learning from each other's point of view, so it is ongoing at this time.

Haugen commented that on the Grand Forks side he would suspect that their City Council will be informed, and perhaps asked to take a position on this, but he isn't sure if the same will be asked on the East Grand Forks side. He added that, again, this is pretty much being led by the engineering staff on both sides.

Haugen reported that, you will notice later on when we talk about the T.I.P.s and S.T.I.P.s, that the project had always been programmed in FY 2016, both financing and start date; but you will now notice that on the Minnesota side the financing has slipped to FY 2017, however the project may still start in FY 2016 but will go farther into FY 2017 than was originally anticipated.

Powers asked for clarification as to why there isn't going to be a median. Haugen responded that it has to do with them being able to provide the 4-foot 3-inch shoulders and the barrier between the multi-use trail. He added that, as you will notice, a lot of the trail width, the driving lane width isn't what the default width standard would require so in order to make everything fit inside the truss system the median was one of the casualties, so far.

Haugen reported that on the Minnesota side they are trying to address the west-bound on-ramp merge issue, which was one of the concerns he heard about, and the reason for the median on the Minnesota side. He stated that he thinks part of the answer is that there is only so much room inside the truss to be able to fit everything in, so the median was one of the things that was taken out in order to be able to do so.

Haugen explained that they are trying to address the real issue of the median, which, from what they heard on the Minnesota side, is that it is needed for west-bound traffic merge safety. He said that they are trying to get that corrected, or situated so that the need for the median isn't quite as pronounced as we all perceive it to be now.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT RFP FOR 32ND AVENUE TRAFFIC SIGNAL COORDINATION PLAN UPDATE

Haugen reported that this is our last major work activity to get started on this year. He said that it simply focuses on 32nd Avenue, between Washington Street and I-29.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 19th, 2015**

Haugen stated that we have developed signal coordination plans for all of the arterial roadways in Grand Forks, and 32nd Avenue was the very first one we did back in 2008. He said that the plan was updated once during the Long Range Transportation Plan process, and now with our A.T.A.C. camera counting program the City of Grand Forks asked us to assist them in making sure that the 32nd Avenue Coordination is up to snuff.

Haugen commented that this is a fairly simple scope-of-work, and we have budgeted \$20,000.000 towards the effort. He added that we still expect to have the work done in October, with the report finalized in the November/December timeframe.

Haugen said that the Technical Advisory Committee reviewed the RFP, made a couple of minor tweaks, and, along with MPO Staff, recommend approval so that it can be released and we can get the project underway.

MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO GRANT APPROVAL OF THE RFP FOR THE 32ND AVENUE SOUTH TRAFFIC OPERATIONS AND SIGNAL COORDINATION PLAN UPDATE, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: DeMers, Adams, Mock, Malm, Powers, and Strandell.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF MINNESOTA SIDE 2016-2019 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that we approved the draft document back in April. He stated that since April there have been three changes:

- 1) East Grand Forks Project #3 – East Grand Forks needs to replace their fixed-route vehicle and originally we showed this being financed with federal monies; however the State of Minnesota has since informed us that they will be using financing 80% using state monies. He pointed out that in our T.I.P. table it still shows zero dollars under State, and the reason for this is because our District is vehicle focused, and so to them State means something related to their highway dollars, so they don't want us to show anything other than highway dollars in the State of Minnesota under the State funding heading, that is why it is shown under Other, but it is still State money on the transit side.
- 2) Kennedy Bridge Project – Discussed above.
- 3) State Funded Project East Grand Forks received - it is a local road improvement program project. He explained that the State Legislature sets aside funds for a competitive grant process, and East Grand Forks applied for a project on 5th Avenue N.E. He stated that currently 5th Avenue N.E. comes up to the old railroad bed, but that railroad is essentially abandoned so this project will lower 5th down to a more normal at-grade level, and East Grand Forks was awarded the State monies to do this project. He said that it is a significant enough project that it needs to show up in our T.I.P. document.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 19th, 2015**

Haugen commented that we did advertise a public hearing at our Technical Advisory Committee meeting last Wednesday. He stated that there was no one present at the meeting to speak on this item, now were any written comments received, and MPO Staff and the Technical Advisory Committee recommend approval of the Final Minnesota Side 2016-2019 T.I.P., as submitted.

DeMers asked about TED dollars, and whether or not, if a project is fundable with these dollars, do they have to be these types of projects. Haugen responded that it would have to be shown in this document. Haugen explained that the TED is another Minnesota program that is trying to tie transportation economic development, and on the application one of the first questions is is it consistent with the transportation plan, and if so it would be submitted into the T.I.P.

DeMers commented that they have become aware that there is \$30,000,000 available, however because the project has to be on a State Trunk Highway, they are looking at a couple of projects on Highway #2. He asked if it would be premature to approve this document, or does it have to be approved now, or can it be amended later. Haugen responded that it does need to be approved now, and if you are awarded TED monies we would have to amend this document to show that at that time. He added that when your TED application gets submitted, we will get a letter from the MPO Executive Director indicating if the project(s) are consistent with the MPO's Transportation Plan.

DeMers asked, though, if we approve this document today, then the proposed projects wouldn't be consistent if they aren't already in the T.I.P. Haugen responded that the T.I.P. isn't our plan, it is something else.

Haugen stated that the only other thing to note is that there isn't a lot of highway investment going on on the Minnesota side, but you will see that there is a lot of investment on the North Dakota side.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE FINAL 2016-2019 MINNESOTA SIDE T.I.P., AS SUBMITTED.

Mock asked if there is any issue with one State having the Kennedy Bridge in FY 2016 and the other in FY 2017. Haugen responded that it is just a coordination issue between our T.I.P. document and their S.T.I.P. document. He explained that we had a similar issue when the Sorlie Bridge was thought to be a major project in 2018, where North Dakota showed it in FY 2017 and Minnesota showed it in FY 2018; so we used that as our template to show what is going on now with the Kennedy Bridge, but there isn't a problem with the different dates.

Voting Aye: DeMers, Adams, Mock, Malm, Powers, and Strandell.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON U.S. #2 ACCESS STUDY

Haugen reported that, as you will recall, at your last meeting you tabled this item. He stated that he did present this to both the Grand Forks County Commission and the Grand Forks Service

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 19th, 2015**

Safety Committee. He stated that there were some good questions from the Grand Forks County Commission were raised, but he isn't sure if they have taken any formal action on this yet. Malm responded that they haven't. Haugen said that the Grand Forks Service Safety Committee made a motion to receive and file the document, and he believes this is what the City Council did as well.

Haugen commented that there is a little bit of additional information on this that he would like to combine with discussion on the next agenda item, which is the North Dakota Draft S.T.I.P., because in that document, for the first time, many of us locally, became aware of a \$22,500,000 project that starts on U.S. #2 from 69th Street west to the Grand Forks Airforce Base. He said that what is described is a complete reconstruction of the roadway, thus the \$22,500,000 price tag.

Haugen explained that the project is shown as being funded in FY 2018, but the intent is to do the work in FY 2019. He stated, however, that just like with the Sorlie Bridge discussion, where they started out with this huge dollar value and a \$30,000,000 replacement description; the U.S. #2 project is starting out as the most extreme project, and it might end up being a reconstruction project, but it is also likely that it might end up being more of a preventative maintenance project as well, so they will be doing more pavement testing to see if it at the point where it needs to be replaced or if some kind of treatment can be done to extend its life.

Haugen reported that between now and next spring, the way it is showing up in the documents is that if they do a complete reconstruction, then in 2019 they will address the Airport Intersection at the same time. He said, then, that as we have been discussing, the study itself doesn't eliminate all alternatives, or does it focus only on one alternative, that when a project is programmed, during the project development, when they engage the NEPA process and such, they will again involve all the stakeholders and look at all the alternatives and through that process they will come up with something like "this is the project we will do, and whether we address the Airport Intersection or not, has to deal with the extent of the main project, which is the pavement condition on U.S. #2". He added that if this becomes a preventative maintenance project; just like the Sorlie Bridge where they just ended up repainting it and they really didn't address any of the other issues; on U.S. #2 their normal scoping won't address the intersection at all, but if it is anything from a major rehab to a reconstruction then it will be part of the project. He said, then, that 2017 is when they will be engaging in that project development process to help determine what the intersection improvement will be during the 2019 project, but there is always a do nothing alternative outcome from that process.

Haugen summarized by reiterating that until the Draft S.T.I.P. came out from North Dakota there hadn't been much knowledge at the local level that the NDDOT was looking at doing a major project on U.S. #2 in this area. He said, though, that now that we have that information, it is possible, from the Airport's point of view, that if they are thinking about investing a few dollars to have a fourth consultant look at the Airport Intersection, because of the timing of this project a fourth consultant will probably be engaged by the NDDOT to look at the intersection, so you may not have to but won't know until next spring when the NDDOT has scoped the project and has determined that it won't be a preventative maintenance, but will instead be a major

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 19th, 2015**

reconstruction or rehab, and you will know that there will be an intense study of that intersection with that project at that time.

Haugen commented that both the Technical Advisory Committee and MPO Staff still recommend approving this subject to acknowledgment that the Airport Authority doesn't like any of the alternatives for the Airport Intersection.

MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO GRANT APPROVAL OF THE U.S. #2 ACCESS MANAGEMENT STUDY, ACKNOWLEDGING THAT THE AIRPORT AUTHORITY DOES NOT LIKE ANY OF THE ALTERNATIVES FOR THE AIRPORT ROAD AND COUNTY ROAD #5 INTERSECTION.

Voting Aye: DeMers, Adams, Mock, Powers, and Strandell.

Voting Nay: Malm.

Haugen stated that, obviously the \$23,000,000 for that stretch of U.S. #2 does not include a grade separation structure at the Airport intersection.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON NORTH DAKOTA SIDE T.I.P./S.T.I.P.

Haugen commented that staff is not asking the board to approve a Draft T.I.P. document. He explained that the principal reason for that is because North Dakota sort of went out of sequence and published their Draft S.T.I.P. prior to their cooperative engagement of either of the other two MPOs or this MPO on a Draft T.I.P.

Haugen stated that because they have already produced a S.T.I.P., and are asking for public comment on it, and because the timing of it did not allow staff to get a Draft T.I.P. fashioned together for public input requirements, we are allowing for you to forward comments you might have on the S.T.I.P. to us, but, again, we aren't asking for adoption of a Draft T.I.P. this go-around. He added that next month it is most likely that we will be asking for approval of a Final T.I.P. on the North Dakota side.

Haugen referred to the packet, pointing out that the pertinent pages of the document were included, and went over the information briefly.

Haugen commented that one bit of good news is that they moved the Columbia Road, 40th to 47th Avenues South, project up a year. He explained that it was 2017 for the year we originally requested the project, it was originally programmed to be done in 2017 a couple of T.I.P./S.T.I.P. documents ago, and last year they delayed it to 2018, but this year when we submitted out candidate projects in December, at that time it was our understand that it was still going to be programmed in 2018, so we argued that when they delayed the project they didn't adjust for year of expenditure, so we said that they needed to give us more federal funds then because they were causing the project costs to increase because they were delaying it. He stated that the amount shown is the amount we were asking for, they are awarding us the full amount, but they are also moving it a year ahead, so that is double good news, that the project is now back to when it was originally programmed, plus we got another \$700,000/\$800,000 in federal funds attached to it.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 19th, 2015**

Haugen pointed out that you will also notice that DeMers Avenue in 2019 is now showing up, and, again, they are currently scoped in the T.I.P./S.T.I.P. as reconstruction, however they will go through the project development process and it might end up being something less, such as a mill and overlay rather than a complete curb-to-curb reconstruction of DeMers Avenue.

Haugen reported that one other bit of information shown on here is, actually we had submitted, on the City's behalf, a project on the Urban System, the University Avenue Mill and Overlay project; that was not funded in the Draft S.T.I.P., which isn't good news.

Haugen referred to pages showing the actual District information, and went over it briefly. He stated that within this our Urban Projects are included, and you will see North Columbia Road, the section between 11th Avenue and 14th or Knight Drive, will be done next year. He added that you will also notice on the Kennedy Bridge project they still show it as being funded in 2016.

Haugen commented that we did submit several projects for TAP monies, and one was funded. He stated that the project funded is a multi-use path from 42nd Street west underneath the Interstate on DeMers Avenue over to 48th Street. He pointed out that the project description is incorrect and the total dollar amount is incorrect, but the federal portion is correct as it is the max allowed.

Haugen reported that there are some Highway Safety Improvement projects that were awarded funds. He said that, if you will recall, in the discussion we had in December, they have now separated the safety improvement projects; one is high crash locations, and the other is a systematic approach for areas where there is a likelihood for accidents to occur.

Haugen stated that they separated out the City's request into the single confirmation lights on Gateway Drive project, at a cost of \$120,000. He explained that those are the red light running cameras that are part of the Local Road Safety Improvement program.

Haugen commented that Grand Forks had requested more money for turn lane improvements on 32nd Avenue, but they were not awarded any additional funds at this time.

Haugen said that another curious thing that is showing up again is, in the past we had school sign replacement throughout Grand Forks being funded with these funds. He stated that they showed up in the T.I.P./S.T.I.P. one year, but were taken out the next year, and they are showing up again this year.

Haugen reported that this is the highlights of the Draft S.T.I.P. that is out. He added that, again, they are not asking for a formal adoption of a Draft document at this time, and they are still trying to work with local and state partners to figure out what all the projects are in our study area.

Haugen stated that as part of the communication, NDDOT did ask the cities to work through the MPOs on comments. He said that they did receive a letter from Grand Forks City staff, which is included in the packet. He added that the real news was the big U.S. #2 project on 69th Street West, and how it impacts the Airport Intersection.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 19th, 2015**

Haugen referred to a map, and pointed out some things that may be coming up in the future, going over them briefly.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON BYGLAND ROAD STUDY

Kouba reported that this is just an update. She stated that there has been a little movement on it, adding that in July a public meeting was held to present as many alternatives as they could possible come up with. She said that they did get some feedback, and there weren't very many concerns with the various alternatives.

Kouba commented that the Steering Committee met after the public meeting and narrowed down the alternatives to those they felt were the most viable. She stated that they also came up with some various timelines as to when the different alternatives might be done.

Kouba stated that one of the first projects the Steering Committee felt would be the most beneficial is the restriping of Byglund Road so that it has a bike lane, extending the turn lane at the intersection, and creating a painted ?? throughout that area.

Powers said that one thing he would like addressed, once they do paint this up, is where you have a left turn lane, and you have that area that they stripe at an angle, then all of a sudden you're turning left, what is that, it's no-man's land. Kouba responded that it's basically, it's kind of a safety issue where someone is trying to make a decision, and she knows a lot of people in the southend, they pretty much know if they are going to be turning left at that intersection so they get in the right of way right of way, but if you're not quite sure, it allows people to know that this is where you go to turn left, so that you're not making that decision at the last minute and creating an accident. She added that the person that knows they are going to turn left there, they are going through and sometimes they don't remember that they should stay behind the person in front of them even though they haven't quite gotten into the area where they are supposed to be turning. Powers commented that he gets questioned on that about once a month, and it's hilarious sometimes, like if you're going towards the bridge and you have that left turn there, he has been driving along and he is going to go straight, but he looks in his mirror and he can see this car coming up and all of a sudden someone in front of him scoots over in front of that car coming up and they both turn left. He stated that somehow or other we need to clue people in to what that is for. Haugen responded that this project is striping that left turn bay. Powers said that that would help a lot. Kouba said that having the median painted completely throughout that whole section will also help so that people will know, there isn't all of a sudden this bump-out, it's a continuous painted median as opposed to this very short out-bumping of the median that they are trying to create for safety reasons.

DeMers asked if this was the \$300,000 project. Kouba responded that it was. She added that there are some things that we can do, this particular number is an estimate based on a certain type of paint, which is a little more expensive. She stated that the suggestion is, at this section, to do an extra right-of-way now so that in the event there is a need to do some grinding away of paint at the start of the project, we wouldn't have to wait until later, but that is the kind of detail

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 19th, 2015**

that we want you to look at. DeMers asked if this project is just for what is illustrated, or is it for the length of Bygland. Kouba responded that it is for the length of Bygland Road, all the way down to the schools. She pointed out what would be painted throughout the rest of Bygland Road, there would be a bike lane, then the driving lane, both driving lanes, and then a bike lane, and then a parking lane would be along the west side of Bygland. She said that this is due to the simple reason that there are more homes, and thus driveways on the west side as opposed to the east side. She added that there is a median and left turn lanes there as well.

Haugen commented that this is a fairly low cost solution to several issues that were identified to us. He explained that speeding was one issue identified, and currently because there is only a center line, and there is wide pavement, it is kind of a free-for-all and nobody knows where their space is, and so automatically Minnesota law would lower the posted speed limit down to 25 by installing the bike lanes. He stated that they are suggesting removing parking on just one side of the street, and they are suggesting it remain on the west side. He said that by striping a parking lane on the west side, a bike lane, the driving lanes, and then another bike lane you've given all users, particularly the motorists, a sense of where they are supposed to be spaced on the pavement, and also it is a bit more confining than their current environment, which will lower the speeds a bit, so that is what this first \$300,000 is trying to address.

DeMers asked if this means that the speed limit could be posted at 25 mph. Haugen responded that it could be, but it would be a City decision. Kouba added that it could stay at 30 mph, but wouldn't be suggested it be any higher than that. DeMers agreed, adding that he thinks 30 is fine, but if you go down to 25 it might upset a lot of people because that is a long road to go 25 on.

Powers commented that he was under the impression that bike lanes weren't all that popular on Bygland. Kouba responded that it just depends upon where you're looking, and who you're talking to. She said that she knows there is a group of people that don't like bike lanes, or they don't think it will be used, and it depends upon the time of day too as she has driven there and has seen people biking right on Bygland Road, and there is transitioning, wide enough sidewalks.

Powers asked how often you see cars parked on Bygland. Strandell responded that everytime they hold the Annual Fall Arts and Craft Event you have a lot of vehicles parking on Bygland. Powers agreed, adding that that is about the only time though. He said that when you go further out by the schools you never see a vehicle parked on the road.

Haugen reported that at the public meetings they held, most attendees weren't in favor of bike lanes, but they also did an on-line survey and most of the responses were in favor of them. He added that when you look at the cost of these alternatives, \$300,000, versus trying to build a ten-foot wide separate off-street path you are looking at ten times that amount.

Kouba commented that one near-term alternative would be a roundabout at Rhinehart and Bygland. She stated that it would allow for larger vehicles or trucks to be able to navigate through there, but it will be considered a mini roundabout. She added, however, that the larger vehicles probably won't feel as comfortable as they would if they were on a larger roundabout.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 19th, 2015**

Kouba stated that another fact is that a roundabout would slow people down, and allow for other vehicles to come in. She said that, once again, one of the issues people have is that a lot of northbound traffic, first thing in the morning, anyone heading south, as well as on Rhinehart would be able to access first before the northbound people can access, so getting the few cars that come in off Rhinehart out there first and then moving those. She added that it is a continuous mode, you're always moving on a roundabout, you're not stopping, which wouldn't be the case with a stoplight or stop signs, you would have to stop all the time, you can't leave it blinking yellow as that is considered as there being something wrong with the signal, so it isn't encouraged, which is a popular alternative, but at the same time with a roundabout it is very more neighborhood friendly, which she thinks is a consideration for the corridor itself as it is considered a neighborhood because you are going past homes and schools.

DeMers asked how the striping project work with a roundabout. Kouba responded that it will work the same. She pointed out that there is a bike lane on both sides of the road. She said, however that you wouldn't be able to have parking adjacent to the roundabout, but you would be able to have it on all other areas of the roadway. DeMers asked if bikers would go off the road by the roundabout. Kouba responded that with this type of roundabout they would. Haugen added that bicyclists have the option of continuing in the driving lane, or taking the outside option. He stated that the biggest detriment for him is that we could not warrant a traffic signal at Rhinehart and Bygland in our 2025 or 2040 plan, and without being able to warrant a signal, there would be little chance that you would receive state or federal assistance in financing one; whereas this roundabout allows you to install it tomorrow if you had the funds, you don't have to meet a warrant or anything to put one in.

DeMers asked about funding for a roundabout. Haugen responded that in 2018 you would have City Sub-Target funds to pay for a roundabout. He explained that the City Sub-Target fund has roughly three quarters of a million dollars, or \$1.1 million dollars, that can be used for this alternative.

Kouba commented that some of the more long-term alternatives are putting in some left turn lanes when warranted; construction of another roundabout at 13th and Bygland. DeMers asked if the roundabout at 13th and Bygland is a greater priority than one at 5th and Bygland. Kouba responded that it is. She said that one of the things that has been suggested for 5th, to help alleviate some of the sight issues that have been brought up, is to realign it, bringing it over and aligning 5th up with the existing driveway access area. She stated that by doing this we would also allow for another roundabout at that location in the future.

Kouba reported that staff will be presenting these alternatives, in this order, at a public meeting in September, as well as to both City Councils as well.

MATTER OF PERFORMANCE REPORT UPDATE

Viafara reported that at the moment the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan is the document that is guiding all the planning activities for the region. He said that this plan was updated in

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, August 19th, 2015**

2013, and it was then in conformance to the parents of MAP-21. He explained that one of the issues that MAP-21 requires is the evolution of the Citizen's Performance Measures, so goals, methods, and targets were given and they are included in the report.

Viafara commented that the purpose of this is for us to be able to proceed with the evolution of the four elements that are included in the plan:

- 1) Streets and Highways
- 2) Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities
- 3) Transit System
- 4) Freight

Viafara said that at the last Technical Committee meeting we discussed this situation, and members of the committee would like to know exactly how they can help to select and to advance this particular project, so we are preparing a document that allows us to gain their insight and support, but at this time we would like the Technical Advisory Committee to help us determine a baseline year to establish the comparison for the performance analysis trends, and to help us consider specific information that will come from the existing transportation infrastructure condition, and its performance.

Viafara stated that lastly we would like them to help us to define which ones are the most critical issues and challenges that are being faced by the transportation system in the planning area.

Haugen commented that this is one of the blessings of MAP-21 – we are going to be annually producing this document.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO ADJOURN THE AUGUST 19TH, 2015,
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:08 P.M.***

Voting Aye: DeMers, Adams, Mock, Malm, Powers, and Strandell.

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 16th, 2015 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Mike Powers, Chairman, called the September 16th, 2015 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, Marc DeMers, Ken Vein, Clarence Vetter, and Gary Malm.

Absent were: Jeannie Mock, Steve Adams, and Warren Strandell.

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

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Powers declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 19TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY VEIN, TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 19TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: DeMers, Malm, Powers, Vetter, and Vein.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Haugen referred to the staff report included in the packet, and pointed out that it indicates that MnDOT and NDDOT representatives presented an update on the status of the Kennedy Bridge project at the Grand Forks Service Safety Committee meeting last evening, including some concepts that they displayed, which he did forward to this body yesterday afternoon for your review.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 16th, 2015**

Haugen stated that he was unable to attend the meeting, so he isn't sure what transpired, and he would ask Mr. Vein, or one of the Grand Forks staff members present if they might be able to share any new information from that meeting.

Haugen referred to slides illustrating some of the proposed concepts, and explained that this is a working draft of what kinds of lighting effects could be used to light up the outside of the truss system, as well as to light up the interior for the roadway, adding that they can obviously change the color of the lighting with this technology as well.

Haugen commented that another thing he is sure was discussed was the cross-section. He referred to an illustration of the proposed cross-section, and pointed out that it does not include a median, but it does include a multi-use path on one side with a rail. He added that it does not have the vehicle lane striping or the shoulder striping, but it gives you an idea of the cross-section.

Vein asked if Mr. Haugen had an illustration of all of the cross-sections. Haugen responded he did, and put up a slide illustrating three cross-sections. He pointed out that the top cross-section is what is currently on the bridge. Vein stated that you basically have 28-feet from curb-to-curb each direction, with a shy-way on each side, so does that mean there are 12-foot wide driving lanes with a 2-foot shy-way on each side. Haugen responded that he could look in the Kennedy Bridge report to see if that information is included.

Powers asked if they have done anything with the lighting yet. Vein responded that he thinks the lighting of the trusses has been finalized, and he understood that the Engineering Department and the DOTs have all come to some type of agreement on maintenance.

DeMers asked if there was a difference between the plan with and without the portal lighting. He said that it seemed like there was a model that had basic horizontal portal lighting and some that had just vertical truss lighting. Vein responded that it sounds like they only have the ones from the outside that are pointing down. DeMers commented that he would imagine that if we wanted the portal lighting, it would be an extra cost. Vein said that they didn't say that, but they said that they wanted to make sure that the lighting didn't shine in drivers eyes and wouldn't be a distraction to them.

Haugen referred to the Planning Study Report, and pointed out it states that currently there are two 12-foot lanes, then there is a 3-foot shy-way on the outside and a 1-foot on the inside. DeMers added that this would be due to there being a median in the center. Vein said, then, that there would be 3-feet of shy-way. He referred to the new proposed cross-section, and pointed out that it shows 11.6, 11.6 and a 4-foot shy-way on the outside.

Vein stated that the question they raised last night, and he thinks we might have talked about it as well, is the concern they have about going from a 12-foot lane to an 11.6-foot lane, which is a narrower lane; and then they are getting rid of the center median, which for him is a safety issue on the bridge. He added that they are also adding a bicycle/pedestrian path which doesn't meet the required 10-foot width either. He said that this means we are going, from a driving perspective, from safer 12-foot lanes with a median and shy-way, to no median and on-going

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 16th, 2015**

traffic on less than a 12-foot lane, and then a bikepath that is 1 ½ foot narrower than we would typically see for a bikepath.

Vein commented that he tries to be very respectful because the project is obviously proceeding to this phase; but as we look at that cross-section, and identify the concerns with it, and we note that we started out with what he thought was the potential for two total bridge replacements at one time, the Sorlie and the Kennedy, and now we are down to just two rehabilitation projects, he wonders if there has been any thought to actually creating a separate pedestrian bridge somewhere between the two that can service the downtown and Highway 2, which would then allow us to maintain the 12-foot lane widths and the safety we currently have. He said that he asked this question, and Mr. Hille responded that, and this is how he interpreted his response, the MPO had said no to a separate pedestrian bridge. Malm commented that the MPO was actually pushing for a separate pedestrian bridge, but MnDOT kept saying no. Vein said that that is his interpretation of what was said, because he asked about that and they said no, it was the MPO that didn't want one.

Haugen reported that the MPO Executive Policy Board itself recently talked about a cantilevered structure, not a separate facility; that was the stance that we pushed a year ago, and that was not forwarded. He explained that early on in the planning study, Mr. Hille did approach him about a completely separate structure, but said that it would be a completely separate project, and a completely separate funding mechanism; and at that time he told Mr. Hille that you have very many unknowns whether you could even do a separate bridge given the flood protection project and need to remember there are federal law and state law that says that if you are rehabbing a structure you have to accommodate all modes, so he must have interpreted that as a "no".

Vein said that he isn't against accomplishing the accommodation of all modes of transportation, but he thinks this is a matter of timing. He explained that, when he was doing some site business for the water treatment plant, he was in Phoenix a month ago and they had built what he thought was a gorgeous bike/pedestrian facility. He thought that it is something we should have; it was architecturally nice, it served a purpose, and why can't we be thinking of something like that. Haugen commented that in our Bike/Ped Plan we do have the additional non-motorized crossing closer to the Sorlie, actually utilizing the old railroad pier as part of new bridge structure, so in our plan we do identify a new crossing for bike/peds, but it is near the downtown.

Haugen stated that, again, back to the first discussion, we had thought of having a complete separate structure, but were told it would be financed completely outside the scope of these two bridge projects, and there would be no guarantee that there would be any financing for it. He added that he also isn't sure that if you pursue it that MnDOT or NDDOT would open up the window to finance a separate structure. Vein responded that he doesn't know if anyone is opening the window, all he was alluding to is that we scaled these two projects back significantly from where they were at one time, and it seems to him that we built a bridge that has lasted for fifty years, and we want it to last another fifty years, and we are just backing off on the standardization, we did 12-foot lanes in the past, so is there a way that we can make it better instead of making it worse.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 16th, 2015**

Vein commented that it was just himself and Terry Bjerke at last night's Service Safety meeting, and Mr. Bjerke's comments were that we are doing this just so we can have a bikepath on the bridge, and if there is another way to do this, we need to see what the potential is to get a separate bikepath. He stated that, again, we looked at one hanging off the side of the bridge, but he thinks that because of some historical issues we couldn't do that, not that it wouldn't have been the right thing to do from a transportation standpoint. DeMers asked if that was the reason for our not doing a cantilevered bikepath. Haugen responded that they have not formally requested the 106 Review process on it, but their fear is that it would be deemed an adverse impact to the historical nature of the bridge, plus they have their issues of being able to use their maintenance equipment on a cantilevered structure.

Powers said then, the way Mr. Vein interprets the plan, is that the median is definitely gone. Vein stated that the way it is right now, today, the issue that was brought forth yesterday was an information only item so there weren't any motions made, but he made it clear that we are concerned about the proposed plan, and both DOTs were there to hear this, but if we don't do something it will just proceed as it is, and even if we do something it may proceed. He added that one thing they didn't mention is, okay, if we do what they want to now, could we then, when we get a separate pedestrian bridge constructed, revert back to having wider lanes and a center median. He said that for him, maybe that is an option for us, because maybe we don't get it next year, but they said that this project would be bid late 2016, for probably as 2017 construction timeframe. Yavarow commented that it is scheduled for next fall for construction during the winter months, but added that the important thing is timing of the funding, particularly on the Minnesota side. Vein said, though, that on the same token, from his perspective, he isn't seeing an urgency to have to do this, although he knows you want the funding while it is available, but what would happen if we waited a year, if that is what it would take to get something more. Yavarow responded that part of the problem is that with Minnesota, they have this fracture critical business where their money is running out of the State, although he doesn't know all the details. Haugen explained that 2018 is when their Chapter 152 Bridge Bonding they did after the I-35 collapse expires, and all bridges have to be addressed by then. Vein asked, though, if they would have all the construction of all the bridges done by then. Haugen responded that the importance of the bridge bonding, and you heard about it in the T.I.P. last month, is that it isn't all bridge bonding funds being used to fund Minnesota's half of the Kennedy Bridge, they are actually paying back the feds in 2018, and you will see that in the North Dakota T.I.P., so it is a smaller amount, it isn't 100% State Bonding, so the argument of bonding is a little bit weakened by the fact that they are paying back with federal funds at a later date.

Vein said that his question for us is, do we want it, and to what level do we want it, and are we willing to at least pursue it if there is the ability to push this because if we don't it isn't going to happen. Powers commented that he thinks we should pursue looking into it further. DeMers said that a big part of this comes down to what the cost will be. He explained that if you are talking about whether or not there is the ability to fund it through other means, or if you have to self-fund it, you would be talking about a multi-million dollar project, and he is pretty sure East Grand Forks doesn't have its share right now. Vein responded that Grand Forks is in the same situation. He added that he isn't looking at self-funding, that would not be an option. DeMers

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 16th, 2015**

said that it would mean that staff would have to look at what are the possibilities to do something like this. He stated that another question he has is, is there any evidence, and he has actually seen evidence to the contrary, that says that shrinking lanes doesn't make things less safe, it actually, to a point, makes traffic more safe, but he would like to know if the engineers have included such evidence to support this decision, or are they just looking at fitting it in.

Vetter said that his concern all along is with farm equipment, and he thinks with the narrower lanes we are going to have problems moving farm equipment back and forth across that bridge. Powers added that he also has a concern with vehicles on the bridge when it gets slippery, just begging for an accident. Vetter commented, though, that he doesn't know if we will get anywhere with any of this, but that was the thing with the bike trail, we raised a lot of concerns with having the bike trail on the bridge as there isn't enough room for it, but they didn't want to hear anything other than that it is going on the bridge.

Vein stated that, normally, a narrower width would usually slow traffic down a little bit, but he thinks the intent is to move traffic safely across and manage the speed limit. DeMers commented, though, that we know how speed limit signs work on the bridge now, it is an autoban on there now.

Powers asked if anyone wanted to make any recommendations on this item. Haugen asked if we need to invite MnDOT staff to present to this body their rationale for their design cross-section. He said that he knows there has been a lot of technical communication between staff as to why a 4-foot shoulder on either side is necessary versus more space dedicated to driving lanes. Vein responded that he doesn't think that is the issue, he thinks the rationale makes sense, when you only have that width to work with and you need to have a bikepath, they've done the best job they can of accommodating the bikepath, but for him it is more of a political issue, of can we take the savings we have from reducing the two projects to rehab projects, and use those funds to put in a separate structure and still accomplish the same. He said that to him we have two choices, we either accept what we've got, or we ask for the ability to include a separate structure.

Haugen reported that the risk you run would be whether a separate structure would be allowed within the flood project. Vein commented that there would be a lot of details on what the height of the structure would be, what the impacts would be to the flood project, all of that would have to be taken into consideration.

Powers asked if it would make sense to invite MnDOT back for further discussion. Haugen responded that there are a lot of questions being asked that current staff cannot answer, so it might make sense to invite MnDOT to a meeting for further clarification and discussion. He added that, again, there could be a reluctant commitment to even entertain assisting funding a separate structure, that is probably the biggest question. Vein asked who the best people would be to answer that question. Haugen responded that on the North Dakota side you would be talking about, if not Director Levi, then District Engineer and on the Minnesota side you are either going political on having to talk with the director, otherwise you would be looking at the District Engineer.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 16th, 2015**

Vein commented that we didn't have a motion by committee, or more specifically, council so that we have the directive to do that. He said that he thinks the Service Safety Committee would probably feel pretty comfortable, and would certainly be agreeable to try to have a separate path. He added that he talked a bit to Todd Feland about it and he felt very comfortable that that would be a good solution to this, but he isn't sure about the East Grand Forks side. DeMers responded that he isn't opposed to having a separate path, but he is real concerned about where the funding would come from. Vein stated that he is looking for the funding to come from the feds, they are the ones doing this, they are the ones requiring it, so to him that is a significant issue and why they should fund it. Vetter agreed, adding that we need to go forward, but he recalls that when we had the discussion of a separate bridge early on in this process we talked about putting it between the two bridges and were told that because it would be too far away from either bridge it wouldn't meet the guidelines, so if it were closer to the Kennedy Bridge he wouldn't have a problem, but again funding is the issue, and the money has to be there.

Haugen suggested that we can write a letter asking a couple specific questions: "If they could entertain a separate bike/ped structure, would they commit to the cost of it rather than placing it on the current bridge", otherwise we can pursue it but if they aren't willing to commit any funding towards it how do you make a decision you want to pursue it.

Vein stated that his feeling is that we let them know that this would be our preference, including the funding, and that maybe we, at least on the North Dakota side he wouldn't mind a visit with Grant Levi to talk about it so we can determine if there is a possibility or not. Vetter said that we need to approach this from the standpoint that we are concerned about the width of the lanes, and the solution would be to leave the trail off the bridge, then we can get the lane width back to where we feel comfortable, and then we ask how we address the bike/ped issue and that would be to put in a separate structure. Vein agreed, adding that we need to let them know that we are looking at a long-term safety issue for us. He added that he knows that they will probably say that they are meeting the minimum standards, because they aren't going to purpose anything that isn't safe, but he just thinks that it is short-sighted to look at just the minimum at this point on this highly traveled bridge.

MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE DIRECTING STAFF TO WRITE A LETTER TO NDDOT AND MNDOT OFFICIALS INFORMING THEM OF OUR CONCERNS WITH THE PROPOSED KENNEDY BRIDGE DESIGN, AND OFFERING OUR SUGGESTION THAT A SEPARATE BIKE/PED STRUCTURE BE CONSIDERED, AND THAT FUNDING OF THAT STRUCTURE BE PURSUED.

Voting Aye: DeMers, Malm, Powers, Vetter, and Vein.

Voting Nay: None.

DeMers asked if anyone recalled what the estimated cost of a separate bike/ped structure was. Haugen responded that it is around \$3,000,000 for a cantilevered structure, and around \$5,000,000 for a totally separate structure.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 16th, 2015**

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2015 MPO SELF-CERTIFICATION

Haugen reported that this is an annual document that the MPO has to produce. He explained that there are many federal regulations, codes, etc., that we have to follow and/or achieve, and then we have to show in a written document how we are complying with those. He said that staff and the Technical Advisory Committee are recommending approval of the 2015 MPO Self-Certification document that shows that we are meeting the Three “C” Planning Process requirements.

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE 2015 MPO SELF-CERTIFICATION DOCUMENT, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Aye: DeMers, Malm, Powers, Vetter, and Vein.

Voting Nay: None.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE NORTH DAKOTA SIDE
FY2016-2019 T.I.P**

Haugen reported that included in the packet is the Draft T.I.P. that went out for public comment. He reminded the board that back in December they saw a presentation of the candidate projects, and this is the result of what has happened since then.

Haugen referred to the document and went over the changes briefly.

TRANSIT:

Haugen commented that we had talked about two demand response vehicles, and we now have approval for three. He pointed out that the total funding for them is \$125,000, with \$96,000 federal. He stated that he didn't update the numbers, he is just identifying that we did get approval for three demand response vehicles as well as approval for funding for the Mobility Management Position, Ali Rood is currently in that position.

Haugen said that we are still in the process; and they just opened up the application period for the 5339 Program, so it is still our intent that we need to do a bulk replacement of the fixed route coaches in Grand Forks, and we are trying to get bulk approval, and they keep funding us one bus at a time so we still have three fixed route vehicles that need to be replaced.

RECREATIONAL TRAILS:

Haugen reported that no projects were submitted so we have not been awarded any funding for recreational trails.

TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM (TAP):

Haugen explained that this is the consolidation of the old Safe Routes To School Program, Transportation Enhancement Program, and the Scenic Highways Program; and the difference

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 16th, 2015**

now is these allocations can only flow through the City of Grand Forks, previously the other entities could apply.

Haugen reported that we submitted three projects, but as you can see only one was funded, however it was the top priority. He added that the \$290,000 in federal funding is the maximum allowed; so even though the total project cost is over \$800,000, the State maxes out their contribution of federal funds at \$290,000, so we did receive the maximum.

Vein asked where this project is located. Haugen referred to a map and pointed out that it is a multi-use path located along DeMers from 42nd, under the interstate, to roughly 48th Street, and is shown in solid red, adding that it will connect to the existing trail.

DeMers asked if this project will still be done if changes are made to the rail that goes through here. Kuharenko responded that there shouldn't be any need to revise the rail in that area, so the only thing they need to worry about at this point in time is acquiring the easement necessary to get the path through there. He added that because it is fairly narrow, and the bikepath, especially underneath the bridge, would have users fairly close to the roadway we would need some kind of separation between the trail and traffic, and because of the close proximity to the railroad tracks we may need some kind of separation there as well, so those costs were considered in the \$809,000.

DeMers commented that he had heard that in order to make it more manageable for BNSF they would like to cut the corner there, so he just didn't know if that would cause any problem for this project. Williams responded that the area Mr. DeMers is referring to is on the north side, and this project is on the south side of the railroad.

HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (HSIP):

Haugen reported that, if you recall, the City submitted four projects, the top priority was trying to up the ante, if you will, on a project that was already programmed, so \$800,000 was already programmed and the City was seeking another \$800,000 to do turn lane improvements and such on 32nd Avenue.

Haugen stated that he also explained about the Local Road Safety Program, and to give you some idea of what these Red Light Confirmation projects were back in December; well in the end this is what has been funded. He pointed out that they did fund the Systemic from the Local Road Safety Program. He explained that because of the request to sort of double the effort on 32nd Avenue the State of North Dakota has decided not to program any funding toward that project any longer, and they are asking the City, State, and MPO to collectively work on a more comprehensive approach to 32nd Avenue, so the monies we did have programmed has now been unprogrammed, but opportunities in the next go-around, if we reach agreement on what to pursue, will be available.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 16th, 2015**

CURRENT STATUS OF PROJECTS:

Haugen commented that from the Regional side, or NDDOT projects, in December we knew that they were deleting the turn-lane project, and that turn-lane project actually turned out to be the intersection at Larimore, or Highway 18 and U.S. 2.

Haugen stated that originally in December they told us that they were delaying the University Avenue Overpass project, the repainting, but in-fact it was done this summer. He said that they also told us that they were delaying the North Washington Mill and Overlay project, but they did that this year as well.

Haugen commented that one thing they have been consistent with, however, is delaying the DeMers Avenue project. He explained that with the Sorlie Bridge project going on they decided to delay the DeMers Avenue project from the bridge to 6th Street to 2019.

Haugen said that we discussed this project last month on the U.S. 2 Study, they added this major reconstruction potential on U.S. 2 from 69th out to the Air Force Base. He pointed out that it is listed as pending, so if monies are available it will be done in 2018, but if it isn't it will be first in line for funds in 2019. He explained that we are currently showing the total project cost, but NDDOT asked that we put in a note indicating what portion of the project is located within the MPO study area, which is roughly about 3/12's of the project.

LOCAL URBAN SIDE:

Haugen reported that we had a request to do University Avenue, but that was not funded, so in 2019 there will just be some small projects done in Grand Forks and East Grand Forks on the local side.

REGIONAL SIDE:

Haugen stated that on the regional side they are programming, again, the DeMers Avenue project, between the bridge and 6th Street. He said that they have also added in a mill and overlay of 5th Street, or U.S. Business 2, from DeMers Avenue to Gateway Drive.

ILLUSTRATIVE PROJECTS:

Haugen said that for the year beyond NDDOT always asks us to start listing candidate projects, and we are still showing the reconstruction of the South Washington Street Underpass. He added that each year this project has slipped a year, so it is now shown for FY2020.

Vein asked what the scope of this project is. Haugen responded that it essentially includes the area North of the DeMers Intersection to 1st Avenue North.

Vein commented that, just a point of interest, he remembers asking for this project to be repaired in 1986. He explained that it was noted as defective in the early 80s.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 16th, 2015**

Haugen commented that the reason they are putting this project off is, their latest rationale is because the Kennedy is slipping a year, they are trying to not have too much traffic disrupted at one time. He added, though, that a year ago we were looking at both bridges being major disruptions, so.

Haugen said, just to summarize. on our Transit Capital side we are getting three projects instead of the two requested, but we are still hoping to get the major Fixed Route buses; for TAP we got one project, it is our top priority, but the other two weren't funded; on the HSIP we ended up with just the systemic side, which are Red Light Running Confirmation Lights on Gateway Drive.

Vein asked if the Red Light Running Lights, is that just having them tied together. Haugen responded that they add a little color light, and a blue light is the traditional one, that, when the signal turns red the blue light comes on so the one officer is made aware of that, so by looking back at the signal if anyone is coming through the intersection he will know that they have come through a red light. He added that this means that instead of having two policemen observing it would require only one, and they would be using the signal technology confirming the light was red. Vein said, then, that this is primarily a law enforcement issue, for people going through red lights. Haugen responded that it is a safety benefit because red light running is a major crash hazard, and Gateway Drive, through their whole analysis, Gateway Drive rose as one of the top corridors where we have red light running crashes occurring. Vein asked who would be enforcing that. Haugen responded it would be primarily city staff. DeMers commented that this would mean needing less policemen, as you would need one versus two at the intersections.

Haugen continued that the end result of the Regional Road Program, from what was submitted back in December is that they moved up several projects, and you will notice that at the bottom of the table he tried to add in the U.S. 2 from 69th to the Air Force Base change.

Haugen stated that on the City side we have only talked about, perhaps, the one negative, and that is the University Avenue project not being funded in 2019; but if you recall in December we also talked about the current funding for South Columbia, 40th to 47th, and that we are only getting about \$3,000,000. He said that because they pushed it out a year we are asking for the Year of Expenditure increase, and because we aren't getting the \$2,820,000 we also decided to ask for the \$2,820,000, thus we are showing \$3,920,000 federal, and moved it up one year so it is now being done in 2017 instead of 2018.

Haugen referred to a graphic illustrating where all the projects are. He stated that, if you recall we did the environmental justice update, and we do have three projects that are within or touching our Environmental Justice area, so we had to write up a little section describing whether or not the project has an adverse impact or a positive impact, and we feel that all three areas will be benefited by the projects being done there.

Haugen commented that, just to note, we have to do what is called an Annual Listing of Obligations, Appendix 1 in the document, and we noted that NDDOT is modifying our T.I.P. without our knowledge, so we are pointing out to them that they are sort of screwing up a bit, and hopefully in the future they will change their methods of modifying the T.I.P.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 16th, 2015**

Haugen stated that in the document itself we do have these five project changes:

Project #17 should have been blank. He pointed out that throughout the project listings there are several that are intentionally left blank, and Project #17 has some dollar values showing, but no project description, and those values should not be shown.

Project #20 is the Confirmation Light project on Gateway Drive. He stated that there is actually \$1,000 more in the total project cost than is shown, so it will be increased to \$129,000 and spread out 80/20.

Project #25 is a project on North Washington, north of Gateway Drive. He said that we carried over the mill and overlay description, but they did that project this year so what they are doing in Project #29 is more of a surface treatment or sealcoat project.

Project #27 is the Gateway Drive project from 69th. He explained that we just have to note that 3/12ths of the project is located within the MPO Study Area.

Project #36 was the one programmed safety project we had on 32nd Avenue. He stated that this project is now being dropped from the T.I.P. because the State is not programming the funds to that project anymore, and you will have to resubmit if you want the project done. He added that they are suggesting that if we really want to make that project more multi-dimensional and more comprehensive we should take a bigger view of what the 32nd Avenue Corridor needs.

Vein asked when is the reconstruction of 32nd Avenue anticipated. Haugen responded that in our Long Range Transportation Plan it is shown in the out-year after 2030. Haugen commented that we prioritized the reconstruction of South Washington, south of DeMers, over 32nd Avenue for a variety of reasons.

Kuharenko referred back to Project #36, and commented that he thought we were going to keep it in because it was in the Draft T.I.P. even though NDDOT was looking at removing it because it would match the Draft T.I.P. Haugen responded that that was the case, but since then the final decision was made that NDDOT isn't going to fund it in 2019, so we can't show it in our T.I.P. because it is not going to be funded, thus we have no reasonable expectation of funding for it, so the T.I.P. would not be fiscally constrained if kept in.

Haugen explained that at the Technical Advisory Committee we had discussion of whether we should drop the project as a recommendation from the Technical Advisory Committee, and at that time the decision that it wouldn't be funded was not known, but since then they informed us that they aren't going to program 32nd Avenue with safety monies, so we can't show it in our final T.I.P. document unless you want to commit 100% local dollars.

Haugen reported that we did advertise for a public hearing at today's meeting, and noted that written comments would be accepted until 11:00 a.m. this morning, but did not receive anything, so staff is recommending approving the Draft Final North Dakota side FY2016-2019 T.I.P. with these noted changes to the project listings.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 16th, 2015**

MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE NORTH DAKOTA SIDE 2016-2019 T.I.P., SUBJECT TO CHANGES AS NOTED.

Voting Aye: DeMers, Malm, Powers, Vetter, and Vein.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON THE GLASSTON RAILROAD CROSSING STUDY

Haugen reported that a public meeting was held last evening, and a Steering Committee meeting yesterday afternoon.

Haugen referred to information included in the packet, and explained that it is a summary of the comments received at the July 8th Kick-Off meeting. He stated that they had about eighteen people attend, and they discussed the issue of the University area having grade crossing issues. He said that at that time they were suggesting the priority should be this issue, but they also wanted us to be aware that if we can't do anything with the grade for vehicles, perhaps we could address the bike/ped crossings.

Haugen stated that this study is also looking at the Mill Spur to see if we can get service to the Mill and properties north of Gateway Drive via a different route.

Haugen said that what they heard yesterday from the North Dakota State Mill is that they are sort of at a standstill with BNSF, primarily over negotiation of costs of service, so the proposed Mill Unit Train Landing Facility over on the Glasston Subdivision is also at a standstill, or at least isn't moving forward very quickly.

Haugen commented that, with this information, and as you see in the staff report, there is interest in a Trans-Load Facility being sited, most likely on the Glasston Subdivision, so in the staff report they did identify that the Economic Development Corporation would like to engage Olsson and Associates to do a trans-load market facility analysis that the EDC would finance 100%, therefore our State and Federal partners aren't concerned with our amending our contract to allow the analysis.

Haugen explained that the benefit we would get would be that some of the future train traffic you see is somewhat dependent on whether the trans-load facility is feasible or not, so we are suggesting that, although due to timing constraints we don't have an estimate from Olsson available today, you authorize the MPO Finance Committee to review the scope-of-work and, if appropriate, execute the contract amendment, which, again, will be 100% financed by an outside agency, we would just be a sort of conduit for the work, but we will see a benefit as well in that we will have a little firmer grasp, or more knowledge as to the likelihood of the trans-load facility impacting the Glasston line or not. He added that the numbers shown are assuming the trans-load facility having some impact on the number of trains going on the Glasston Sub.

Haugen pointed out that even with as many as twelve trains a day under the current train/quiet zone/safety index, our quiet zone would still be safe and available. He stated that the threshold does move, and is modified, under a regular basis, because, based on today's threshold, even

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 16th, 2015**

with this train traffic, and with these future volumes, our quiet zone along the Glasston Subdivision is still safe.

Vein asked where the Glasston Subdivision is located. Haugen responded that it is located parallel to 42nd Street. Vein asked how far along north does it go. Haugen responded that it goes all the way to a community named Glasston up by St. Thomas, North Dakota.

Haugen commented that currently there are two unit trains utilizing the track, one is for the coal facility by Ardoch, and the other is for the grain elevator just south of the Washington interchange.

Viafara reported that there were about fourteen people at last night's public meeting, and they were very keen on bringing the issues with the crossings to the engineer's attention. He said that another issue of importance to the public is the presence of emergency management personnel, and people from the city being at these meetings as consideration of emergency events, and access needs to be addressed. He added that another question people brought to our attention is that they would like to know what kind of materials are bring carried by the trains.

Haugen stated that what they are hearing is that on the Mill Spur, if the Mill can negotiate the appropriate cost of service to land unit trains, that's their preference and what the market is really pushing them towards and they don't have any property on the Mill itself, they would land at Glasston and use Glasston as a way to get over to the Mill. He added that, with this, all the other businesses that rely on the train service of the Mill Spur, are willing, and think they can work well to have the train service for them to come from the north as well, via the new connection that the Mill will create with its new facility at Glasston.

Haugen commented that BNSF is very hopeful that can work because then they obviously don't have all the headache and heartache they currently have with the train traffic going on the Mill Spur, through the residential neighborhood and causing comments, complaints from the train noise, as well as the inconvenience of the track.

Haugen said that in order for the Mill to land unit trains it will likely need to build a loop-track , and then reconnect rail line so that they can shuttle from the unit train unloading facility, shuttle the grain over to their mill; so with that new track connecting the Mill to its unit train, BNSF can service all the rest of the industries north of Gateway.

Haugen reported that the Mill has expanded its output 30%, so it needs more raw material to come in, and the market is really forcing them to go to the unit train delivery system, but they are still negotiating with BNSF the actual cost to make it so the Mill is accepting that change.

Vein asked how many trains go north off the mainline to the Mill each day. Haugen responded that there are usually two trains, but never usually more than four. He said that sometimes they have to do some double movement to ensure the Mill gets enough cars, so they are basically providing empty cars in the morning, and then picking up full cars, but sometimes they don't

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 16th, 2015**

have enough empty cars in the yard so they will go up and service the Mill so they can continue their operation, and then do a second trip, or a third trip to get more cars up there. He added that the two to four trains has been constant since we did the Mill Spur rail safety improvement as part of the quiet zone, and Glasston, when they established the quiet zones there were only three trains a day, now we are up to six trains a day on the Glasston Subdivision, with a potential for more.

Powers said, then, that all the crossings from Gateway to 2nd Avenue North would be eliminated. Haugen responded that they wouldn't be eliminated, you would just have more frequent blockage, and with unit trains you will have lengthier blockage. Malm stated, though, that if you build this spur up there you wouldn't have a train going up there anymore. Haugen responded that you wouldn't have any trains on the Mill Spur, but you would have more trains on the Glasston Subdivision. Powers added that all the blockage you have in town would be eliminated. Haugen responded that all the blockage on the mill spur would be eliminated, but you would be increasing the blockage on the Glasston Spur. Williams added that it would move from Gateway and Washington to Gateway and 42nd.

Haugen reported that the fertilizer plant has all the permits it needs, so it is now just at the mercy of the financial picture. Vein commented that we already have an issue with blockage, so would this impact traffic on Columbia Road and 42nd; it would have to wouldn't it because they would have to cross to the east side. He asked if most of the trains come from the east or the west to go north. Haugen responded that most of the traffic is from the west, but most of the trains that go north on the Glasston Subdivision, it is really dependent on what they are going up north for, but the coal unit train is the most regular one, and that comes from the west, but has to come into the yard and rearrange so it can go north. He added that most of the traffic is from the west, then east. Vein asked if, with this modification would we be making the issue on 42nd and DeMers worse rather than better. He said that it eliminates the downtown, but are we going to add and have more stoppage at that location. Haugen responded it will, explaining that with the NPN, the potential for a trans-load, and with the State Mill, it will have more train traffic in general, and more train traffic on the Glasston Subdivision, but less traffic on the Mill Spur.

Discussion on the State Mill expansion ensued.

MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING THE MPO FINANCE COMMITTEE EXECUTE A CONTRACT AMENDMENT, IF NECESSARY, TO LOOK INTO THE FEASIBILITY OF A TRANS-LOAD FACILITY, WITH THE ADDITIONAL COST TO BE 100% FUNDED BY THE GRAND FORKS ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION.

Voting Aye: DeMers, Malm, Powers, Vetter, and Vein.

Voting Nay: None.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON THE 2045 EAST GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN

Kouba reported that they are at a point with the Land Use Plan where they feel they are getting somewhere. She stated that they held an event where they gathered, basically, input from the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 16th, 2015**

public on how they see how everything is going, and now we have taken that information and have created a map of how we think things will grow out into the future.

Kouba commented that they see there is need for residential, and have included some median density residential where there might be a few low-rise type apartment complexes constructed; and have combined commercial and residential and industrial and commercial so that we get some density so that we aren't spreading our services out too far in advance or jumping over areas, which is something they want to be very cognizant of that so we aren't spending money where we don't need to.

Kouba stated that how they came up with this was by looking at population projections, figuring out how we are going to grow, and looked at some growth rates after which, along with the Steering Committee, suggested that the .9% increase is what we need to use for future growth. She said that in addition they looked at employment projections, and our consultant determined how much land would be needed for industry and for residential growth. She explained that they split this into a kind of near term, which is out to 2025; and then mid-term in 2035; and long-term in 2045.

Kouba reported that by doing this split we were able to kind of pinpoint the areas where the growth was likely to be located, and so between the overall land use to this, shown in gray, those are the areas they also looked at as to what kind of land use would be, but they don't predict out to 2045, that will be developed yet, but they want to make sure they are still looking out even beyond that to make sure the uses are compatible to each other.

Kouba commented that there is nothing unusual, but a little bit on the fringe, but mostly we are growing, we looked at scheduling things to be growing out into areas that we definitely know are going to happen, and there is more compact usages so they are closer to the City, but still on the fringes.

Kouba referred to a map that illustrates another vision of that phasing, and pointed out that you are seeing it all together at once, what uses will be going in where.

Kouba stated that they then worked on figuring out how to give people a better concept of what these areas would be. She said that they chose some pilot areas, and settled in on that northern location. She added that they do know that there is one area that is already being approved to be developed, which has been expanded into the City, and some of it annexed already; and they figured that they know of at least one usage that will happen there, so they need to determine what the other usages will look like and how they will work together.

Kouba commented that the second area is kind of looking at how the industrial/commercial works, and how we can get some residential close enough to the area where people can get to work, but distancing it enough so that single family homeowners don't feel like they are listening to some sort of industrial noise background.

Kouba said that the final area is in the southend of town, where they have tried to hope for the best and prepare for the worst, or prepare for things to stay the same. She explained that there is

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 16th, 2015**

a desire for a Southend 32nd Avenue Bridge, of course, in East Grand Forks; and to kind of prepare for that they know that along with the structure a little more commercial usage of land will come, but they aren't predicting it will come until that bridge is built. She added that to prepare for the possibility, and also to fulfill some of the needs residents there are wanting, they are trying to fit some more neighborhood oriented commercial use, so it will be some smaller in stature type of businesses that we would see down there, so they predicted that mixing of usages.

Kouba reported that the last thing they did was to go through, so they are waiting for those concepts to come back to us, then they will present them at another meeting at another time.

Kouba commented that they have also been working on their goals and policies; and have pretty much established the goals, and they included them in the packet today. She added that they will be going through the full goals and policies with the East Grand Forks Planning Commission at their October meeting to get finalized input, and will update the City Council once that has happened.

Kouba stated that they are bringing forward all of this information to the public tonight at 5:30 p.m., here in this room, and then will be moving forward with all their other activities; finalizing the plans and writing the full document.

Powers asked what the exact population of East Grand Forks right now. Kouba responded that right now we only have estimates, and that is roughly 8,900. Powers asked when the census was done last. Kouba responded that it was done in 2010, and that population figure was 8,604. Haugen explained that for East Grand Forks the past population forecast they have been using an annual growth rate of 1.2%, and as Ms. Kouba reported we have scaled that down to .9%. He stated that the building activity this decade, to-date, just hasn't been there to really maintain a 1.2% growth rate, although from 2000 to 2010 there was a 1.4% annual growth, but the last years of that decade and the first five years of the current decade we didn't feel that 1.4% or even 1.2% should be used.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON THE GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN

Haugen reported that the Grand Forks Land Use Plan update is behind East Grand Forks', in terms of where they are in the schedule, and that is by design.

Haugen commented that a month ago they kicked-off their on-line website survey; and then last week they did more one-on-one public participation opportunities, so they held four events throughout the week:

- 1) Wednesday they held the formal traditional open house at Grand Forks City Hall – About fifteen people attended.
- 2) Thursday evening they held the first of what they termed “pop-up events”, which is essentially rather than having people come to you, you go to the people. This first event was held at the French Fry Feed.
- 3) Friday evening they were at the JLG Rocks event at the Town Square, Downtown Grand Forks.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 16th, 2015**

- 4) Saturday morning they were at the Farmer's Market in the Town Square, Downtown Grand Forks.

Haugen explained that they were basically using three tools; two of them were asking people to give them their top three or top five priorities on these type of bold statements, or policy statements, and have them place dots on them; and the other was a map of Grand Forks that they asked people to identify on it the places they really love that we should protect and try to replicate, the places they feel we really need to pay attention to, identify what those are, and then to also identify any other thoughts they might have concerning land use.

Haugen stated that with those events having taken place just last week the consulting team is still assembling the product. He added that they are working with the Grand Forks Land Use Sub-committee of their Planning and Zoning Committee, but have had some challenges in getting the members together, trying to meet with them twice, but both times only one member has shown up at the meeting. He said that they do have a Technical Memorandum out for their review, and are waiting for that committee to give us some feedback on it before we release it, so they hope to have a video conference with that committee on Monday at 4:00.

Haugen commented that one of the big questions they have on the Grand Forks side is the annual rate of growth. He said that the actual recent building permit activity would indicate a more aggressive growth rate than we have ever experienced in the past, so they are kind of struggling and hoping for better guidance on what they should use.

Haugen reported that during the 2000 to 2010 decade they had a .7% annual growth, but the recent building activity would suggest a 2% to 2.5% growth rate, so that is a big jump, thus they are trying to get a little more comfortable feel from the Land Use Sub-committee as to what rate they would like us to consider.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON THE PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT

Viafara reported that in the packet you will see three examples of a Performance Measure Report.

Viafara referred to the three reports and pointed out that the first one is the one that we are working on; the second one is the one that they got from the Fargo/Moorhead COG; and the third one is the Minnesota 2012 Scorecard.

Viafara explained that for the last two months MPO staff has been working on implementing this. He said that they have considered all the goals and objectives included in the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan, and have reviewed MAP-21 goals and measures, and little by little they have been able to define key purposes and objectives in all the data collection and activities to support the development of the Vital Metrics Dashboard report for the Grand Forks/East Grand Forks MPO.

Viafara stated that we are now developing a list of components on demographics and are doing the transit evaluation. He explained that the final idea is to establish a way to allow us to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 16th, 2015**

monitor, evaluate and visualize the condition and performance of the transportation system as expressed by the community and demographic indicators linking the planning area to the national and regional goals and local goals.

Viafara reported that at the moment they are just putting together these two areas demographics and transit, and they expect to have a list ready for the next meeting for your review and consideration.

Haugen commented that, just to identify, again, why we are doing this, is because MAP-21 is requiring us to do performance based planning, so we have identified in the plan what our performance measures are, and what our targets are, and now we are trying to report our progression towards those performances, so this will be our first performance based report.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

***CHAIRMAN POWERS DECLARED THE SEPTEMBER 16TH, 2015, MEETING OF THE
MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD WAS ADJOURNED AT 1:31 P.M.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

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

**Wednesday, October 21st, 2015 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers**

CALL TO ORDER

Mike Powers, Chairman, called the October 21st, 2015 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, Marc DeMers, Ken Vein (Via Conference Phone), Clarence Vetter, Gary Malm, Jeannie Mock, Steve Adams, and Warren Strandell.

Staff: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Jairo Viafara, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; David Wiosna, GF/EGF MPO Intern; Jay Sandeen, GF/EGF MPO Intern; 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.

DISCUSSION ITEM(S):

a. Roll Call Voting

Haugen reported that NDDOT, as our oversight agency, has informed us and the other two MPOs that whenever we do a motion, and approve, it we need to record a roll call vote on that motion, so our practice will have to change so that all motions except the minutes and adjournment will now need to have a roll call vote taken. He explained that this is per what their interpretation of the North Dakota Century Code states regarding votes.

Haugen added that the Technical Advisory Committee will also be following this new rule.

b. November and December Meetings

Haugen reported that in November MnDOT would like to have about thirty minutes of your time to discuss all of their statewide planning efforts that are taking place, so on top of your regular agenda, we will hear from them as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 21st, 2015**

Haugen stated that in December, Federal Highway North Dakota, would like to have about thirty minutes of your time to discuss, basically MPO 101, so, again, he would ask that your block out some additional time for this meeting as well.

Powers asked if the information being discussed by MnDOT at the November meeting would be similar to what is included in the e-mail he got earlier this week about those regional meetings in Mankato, Brainerd, and St. Cloud. Haugen responded that it will be similar to that.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 9TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 9TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Yes: DeMers, Malm, Powers, Vetter, Vein, Adams, Mock, and Strandell.

Voting No: None.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that, as you've noticed, the Sorlie Bridge project is essentially done, with the exception of the aesthetic lighting, which is still about a month away from being done. He added that there is a ceremony tomorrow, a ribbon cutting type ceremony that hopefully you were invited to.

Haugen explained that the NDDOT contacted MPO staff and we forwarded all of this board's names and contact information for them to use for the rest of the process, so basically our involvement was just to provide them with your names, otherwise we don't know much else about the ceremony tomorrow.

Haugen commented that it is hoped that by the end of November the aesthetic lighting will be installed, and maybe there will be another ceremony of sorts to allow for everyone to see the lighting, as well as how many color combinations can be done.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that, per the Executive Board's instructions last month, a letter has been written to the lead project engineer from MnDOT District Two, Joe McKinnon. He hopes it conveyed the message that you wanted it to.

Haugen commented that the response that we've received from MnDOT, to-date, was two-fold: First, they are still drafting a letter just acknowledging they received the letter from you, and then that they will be attending the November meeting to engage you in more discussion on the Kennedy Bridge project.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 21st, 2015**

Powers stated that he would just like to say that he wanted to compliment Mr. Haugen on the letter, it was very well done. Strandell commented that he would also like to say that if we are going to talk about a pedestrian bridge, we should be revising the plan for the Kennedy, with the walkway there and taking out the center median and such. Haugen responded that he thinks that what we will hear from MnDOT is, federal law and state law kind of is a requirement to continue down that path on the Kennedy Project, and what might be able to be entertained is that at some future date, if there is a separate bridge, and if it is located within the state law proximity of the Kennedy Bridge, then perhaps they can modify that cross-section of the Kennedy to change the lane widths and the dedications to different modes of traffic, but he thinks the current path that they are taking is kind of where we will end up short-term, however we will find out more at our next meeting.

Vein asked if there will be a separate meeting with MnDOT or will it be one of the agenda items. Haugen responded that it will be part of the November Executive Policy Board meeting, not a separate meeting. He added that this will also be the same meeting that MnDOT Headquarter will be at making presentations to you.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2016 MINNESOTA STATE PLANNING AGREEMENT

Haugen reported that this is our annual agreement with the State of Minnesota. He explained that they provide us with roughly \$11,000.00, and we need to execute the contract with MnDOT in order to access those funds, which are used as local match to our federal dollars.

Haugen commented that the contract has not changed from our prior agreements with Minnesota so staff is recommending approval.

MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING THE CHAIRMAN AND THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE THE ANNUAL MNDOT STATE PLANNING AGREEMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Voting Yes: DeMers, Malm, Powers, Vetter, Vein, Adams, Mock, and Strandell

Voting No: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

Malm suggested that the County follows the same voting rules, but instead of actually doing a roll call vote they say “assuming a roll call vote” and then everyone can vote by voice. He said that doing roll call for every agenda item can drag a meeting out forever. He asked that Mr. Haugen check into this method, adding that they use it in North Dakota all the time. Haugen responded that when this issue was brought up there was a bit of discussion about just this. He explained that the MPO Directors met at the end of September, which is when they were given this direction, and they did discuss possibly doing something like this, but the direction they got was that we needed to do individual roll call voting, but he will ask the question again, and will

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 21st, 2015**

work with the other two MPOs to see how their boards are reacting to this, and see what can be done.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED NORTH DAKOTA SIDE 2016-2019
T.I.P. AMENDMENTS**

Haugen reported that last month we approved the North Dakota T.I.P., and typically we need to reconcile our T.I.P. document with the Statewide S.T.I.P. shows, and in this case there are two projects that need to be included in our T.I.P. document.

Haugen commented that the first project is actually taking some really old federal dollars and putting them to use. He explained that they are SAFETEA-LU dollars that were pegged for Safe Routes To School, non-infrastructure projects. He stated that North Dakota did not annually award anything in this program, and now the dollars are about to expire, so North Dakota decided to use the \$500,000 and do a statewide campaign on Safe Routes To School, and basically a statewide campaign on bike/ped education, encouragement and enforcement. He stated that, although, not all of the \$500,000 will be spent in our MPO area, some of it will so that is why it needs to be included in our T.I.P. document.

Haugen reported that the second project is a project that came before the NDDOT late in the process. He stated that they did some analysis of the University Avenue Overpass deck on I-29 and determined that they need to do a deck overlay, and so in 2017 they are now programming roughly 250,000 to do that project.

Haugen commented that staff did advertise that a public hearing would be held on this item at today's meeting.

MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE OPENING THE PUBLIC HEARING.

Voting Yes: DeMers, Malm, Powers, Vetter, Vein, Adams, Mock, and Strandell

Voting No: None.

There was no one present for discussion.

MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE CLOSING THE PUBLIC HEARING.

Voting Yes: DeMers, Malm, Powers, Vetter, Vein, Adams, Mock, and Strandell

Voting No: None.

Haugen stated that in the advertisement they also stated that written comments could be submitted by 11:00 a.m. today, none were received, thus both Staff and the Technical Advisory Committee are recommending the board adopt these amendments into the 2016-2019 T.I.P. document

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 21st, 2015**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE NORTH DAKOTA
SIDE 2016-2019 T.I.P AMENDMENTS, AS PRESENTED.***

ROLL CALL VOTE:

***Voting Yes: DeMers, Malm, Powers, Vetter, Vein, Adams, Mock, and Strandell
Voting No: None.
Abstain: None.
Absent: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE CONTRACT FOR THE 32ND AVENUE SIGNAL
COORDINATION PLAN UPDATE**

Haugen reported that this is an RFP that the board approved in August for release. He explained that they received two proposals, and the Selection Committee met and interviewed both firms, and are recommending hiring Alliant Engineering to do the study.

Haugen stated that the budget for the update is \$20,000.00 and Alliant's cost proposal was for \$19,999.99, and met all of our Scope-of-Work requests.

Haugen commented that Alliant is currently doing work with us on the Bygland Road Study, and has a long history with working with our Signal Coordination Plans in Grand Forks, so we are pretty confident that they will be a good fit for this project as well.

Haugen reported that the timeline is pretty tight to get this done, however Alliant is pretty confident that with their prior knowledge of the system, they will be able to meet the deadline.

***MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING THE
CHAIRMAN AND THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH
ALLIANT ENGINEERING TO PERFORM THE 32ND AVENUE SIGNAL
COORDINATION TIMING PLAN UPDATE, AT A COST NOT TO EXCEED \$20,000.00.***

ROLL CALL VOTE:

***Voting Yes: DeMers, Malm, Powers, Vetter, Vein, Adams, Mock, and Strandell
Voting No: None.
Abstain: None.
Absent: None.***

Haugen said that he would add that this will be the first study in which we will be utilizing the video capture traffic counting, so we have consultants pretty encouraged by the amount of data, and the detail of that data, available. He added that this is our first example of why we initiated that counting program, this is one of the uses we will be using it for.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 21st, 2015**

MATTER OF SOLICITATION FOR 2017-2020 T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS

Haugen reported that, even though we just adopted the 2016-2019 T.I.P., and we also just amended it as well, we are already starting the next T.I.P. cycle project solicitation.

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that he included a power point presentation that he will briefly go over, just to highlight the different programs we are soliciting projects for, and the timeline for each of those individual programs.

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

Haugen stated that for the most part everything on the North Dakota side is due at the end of November, and the Executive Policy Board will receive them at its December meeting, and will pass them on to NDDOT. He added that the Minnesota side they are due at the end of December, and in January the Board will receive those projects for approval to forward on to MnDOT.

Haugen pointed out that the study area is important so that people don't just focus on projects that are inside the City limits, but also those that extend out into our study area as well.

Haugen commented that on the North Dakota side, and we will see this later, is that it isn't just a four year timeframe, but they also want projects for that fifth year on the State Highway System.

Haugen reported that MAP-21 is still being implemented, and a lot of things are still left undone, so what we are doing today, and what we do tomorrow, and probably for the next several months, is subject to change, so keep it in mind that just because it is done this way today, it doesn't mean that it won't change tomorrow.

Haugen stated that the year of expenditure is now a critical item. He explained that our revenues are growing at only a 1.5% rate, but expenditures are at a 4% rate in North Dakota and 5% in Minnesota, so as projects get delayed there will be a cost inflation in there but no revenue to pick up the slack.

Haugen referred to slides illustrating the different funding programs, and explained what each one is for and the submittal timeline for each.

Haugen said that he would ask that you work with your staff to come up with project ideas, and go through the proper process and boards/committees for approval. He added that on the North Dakota side they all have to go through the City Council, and on the Minnesota side the County, City and School District can all apply separately.

Vetter asked if the City and County staff know these timelines. Haugen responded that they are aware of them, and he believes that they have already done some work with them on some candidate projects.

Vein stated that he had to sign off for another meeting.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 21st, 2015**

MATTER OF UPDATE ON THE DRAFT PERFORMANCE REPORT

Haugen reported that he just wanted to let the board know that Mr. Viafara has successfully completed his six month probation period, and has agreed to continue work with the MPO, and we are happy to continue working with him.

Viafara stated that for the last two months the MPO Staff has been working on collecting the data, doing the analyses, in order to produce a draft for the Performance Measurement Report.

Viafara said that the Metropolitan Planning Organizations are required to develop a performance report that evaluates the condition and performance of the transportation system on a regular basis. He explained that staff is providing you with the initial five areas of the report, and they are: demographics, livability, community profile, transit operations, and street and highway systems.

Viafara commented that when staff presented this report to the Technical Advisory Committee, we were grateful to receive very positive feedback from some of the members. He added that this feedback included matters dealing with editorial improvements. He stated, however, that something important also came to our attention, and that was a comment about livability. He explained that we are working with the AARP and federal partners, that allows us to more or less compare what is happening in Grand Forks and East Grand Forks in comparison to what we call “peer cities”.

Viafara stated that those peer cities are Missoula, Montana; LaCrosse, Wisconsin; Fargo, North Dakota; and Moorehead, Minnesota, Greeley, Colorado; and Sioux Falls, South Dakota. He said that idea is that these cities are more or less similar in geography, economic development, and size for us to measure not only transit, but also livability factors.

Viafara said that they are currently working on completing the report, and are working on safety issues, crash data analyses, and are putting together a series of tables that will provide a clearer overlook at what is happening with our transit system; and they we will proceed to do that analysis of all the factors that are a requirement of MAP-21.

Viafara stated that staff is asking the board to please review this report and submit your comments. He added that the board is the decision makers, staff is working for you, therefore we would like to know exactly what information you would like to see in the report. He said that staff would appreciate receiving comments by November 1st.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. 2015 AWP Project Update

Haugen reported that this is a monthly report that staff provides to keep you informed of where we are at with the activities in our current work program. He stated that, with the execution of the contract for the 32nd Avenue Signal Study, everything after today everything will be under

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 21st, 2015**

way, and various completion dates are reported in this document. He added that the purpose of this document is to try to give you monthly progress on the individual activities underway.

2. Vacation

Haugen reported that he is taking a family vacation so he will be out of the office for the next few days. He added, however, that on Friday morning there is a meeting in Bemidji with the MnDOT Commissioner and the District Engineer to talk about Minnesota Transportation Financing, and he did hear from two of the Minnesota board members that they would not be able to attend, however he is wondering if either of the remaining two members were going to attend. Both members responded that they would not be able to attend either. Haugen stated that Mr. Viafara would be attending in his place, so the MPO will have representation.

Haugen explained that this is a one-hour meeting beginning at 11:00, and if there is anyone from the North Dakota side that would like to join Mr. Viafara you would be more than welcome.

3. November and December Meeting Extension Reminder

Haugen reminded the board of the fact that both the November and December meetings may go a little longer than usual, so he would ask that everyone please block some additional time off for both.

Powers asked if Ms. McNelis could send the board members a reminder that these two meetings may run a little longer than usual. Haugen stated that we could adjust the starting time if anyone wishes. He explained that originally it was assumed that everything would be back loaded, and we start at noon so the meeting could go until 1:30 to 2:00, but if you would rather start a little earlier we could accommodate that as well. Consensus was to keep the starting time at noon.

ADJOURNMENT

CHAIRMAN POWERS DECLARED THE OCTOBER 21ST, 2015, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD WAS ADJOURNED AT 12:37 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, November 18th, 2015 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Ken Vein, Secretary (in Chairmain Mike Powers; absence), called the November 18th, 2015 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: Marc DeMers, Ken Vein, Clarence Vetter, Gary Malm, Jeannie Mock, and Warren Strandell.

Absent: Steve Adams and Mike Powers

Staff: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Jairo Viafara, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; David Wiosna, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Vein declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 21ST, 2015, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 21ST, 2015, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Yes: DeMers, Malm, Vetter, Vein, Mock, and Strandell.

Voting No: None.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen stated that they are currently working on installing the aesthetic lighting fixtures right now. He reported that, as you may have noticed, on the south side of the bridge there are some loose wires and light fixtures at low levels. He explained that during the painting of the bridge, they kept one side of the pedestrian walkway open, and they lit it with these lower light fixtures,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 18th, 2015**

and they are just waiting until the permanent fixtures are in place, then they will be removed and the sidewalk lighting will then come from the arc, so the lights will follow the arc of the truss system, and not be at a flat level all the way across.

Haugen stated that staff asked the NDDOT if, perhaps another little ceremony would be held to showcase the lighting ability, and were told that there hadn't been anything planned, but we may have sparked interest in possibly doing some sort of demonstration of the new aesthetic lighting possibilities.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that we did receive a response from MnDOT in the form of a letter, which was included in the packet. He explained that in his communication with the MnDOT District Office they indicated they would be attending today's meeting, however it appears that they weren't able to do so. He added that they also did not attend last week's Technical Advisory Committee meeting either.

Haugen referred to the letter and explained that his take on their response is essentially that the Kennedy Bridge Cross-Section is going to accommodate all modes on it, and that is what will be done with the project. He added that as far as an additional bridge across the river for bike/peds, they support our work and will continue to work with us on it, but they don't have any real special funding sources to accomplish that; neither to assist in studying it, or with its construction.

Haugen pointed out that they also noted that the savings that we identified in our letter to them; savings from going from complete replacement to major rehab on the Kennedy and minor painting on the Sorlie, could not be used for the things we identified, but instead were, on the Minnesota side, reprogrammed towards their critical fracture bridges; and on the North Dakota side have been spent elsewhere across the state.

Vein said that he knows there was a delay in getting the new light fixtures for the Sorlie Bridge, but as far as we know they are all here now. Williams responded that as far as she knows they are here, that is what they were presented. She added that they are working on installing them now. Vein asked what the completion date is. Haugen responded that the last he heard was that they would be done installing them right before Thanksgiving, so next week.

Haugen commented that he hasn't received any updates on whether a committee has been formed to iron out an agreement on the use of colored lighting on the bridge.

Vein stated that they appreciate that staff followed through on the boards' request to send a letter to MnDOT regarding bike/ped accommodations. He said that we may not like their response, but it is out there. He added that at this point there is little that we can do even if we don't like the response, as he would concede that from a federal administrative response that is what you would expect, that each person has their rules and regulations that they are trying to follow, he

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 18th, 2015**

just doesn't agree with them; but is there any other recourse available to us, because he does think that for the betterment of the communities of East Grand Forks and Grand Forks, it would be nice to have a dedicated pedestrian path that crosses the river and connects the bikepaths on either side because it is very difficult to get across the river, and he thinks that if we are trying to be a more bicycle friendly, walkable community, we need a separate bike/ped crossing, so we need to look at how we can make it happen instead of just accepting that it couldn't happen via this process.

Haugen reported that as far as what the MPO can do is, move away from the Kennedy project and take MnDOT up on their offer to assist us in trying to identify funding for a separate bridge over the Red River for non-motorized traffic. He added that they identified a specific funding source, but that is not the only funding source available from the federal program, so his answer would be to keep bringing it forward as a priority item and direct MPO staff to ensure that MnDOT and NDDOT are together in the same room to have that item specifically discussed.

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE A REQUEST THAT MPO STAFF ENSURE CONTINUED PURSUAL; WITH MNDOT AND NDDOT, TO DETERMINE FUNDING OPTIONS, ETC., FOR A NON-MOTORIZED BRIDGE OVER THE RED RIVER.

Malm commented that this is simply to say that we have to keep pushing this forward to try to find some funding, otherwise when the Sorlie has to be repainted again we will come back, whoever is sitting on this committee, will come back to it again.

Vetter stated that we will be looking at our Long Range Transportation Plan next year correct. Haugen responded that that is correct. He added that he was just going to say that later on on the agenda we have a big topic about Minnesota Multi-Modal Plan, plus their MnSHIP Investment Plan, so that would be an opportunity to address the issue and comment to those documents. He said that they have a Statewide Bike-Plan that Mr. Viafara is going to a meeting about in Thief River tomorrow, so he will have that same message for that document, and then next year we will start our own local Bike/Ped Plan update, and the following year we will have our Street/Highway Plan update done, so those are further opportunities to continue the conversation, past even a joint meeting you just requested.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Voting Yes: DeMers, Malm, Vetter, Vein, Mock, and Strandell

Voting No: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Adams and Powers.

Haugen added that they are going to have some meetings addressing the Kennedy Bridge project, and one of the topics that they will be addressing is while the project is being done they want to keep the greenway trail open, so he would think that during those discussions it would be another opportune time to remind them of, if we only had a third bridge, it could help mitigate some of the concern about keeping the trail open.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 18th, 2015**

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF ND FTA #5339 CANDIDATE PROJECTS

Kouba reported that back in September we started the process of solicitation of projects for transit funding, specifically the FTA #5339 program; which is typically used for vehicle replacement, vital equipment, and building rehabilitation/maintenance projects.

Kouba stated that Cities Area Transit submitted a prioritized list to the Grand Forks City Council, and we are now bringing that list to the MPO Executive Policy Board for their approval as well.

Kouba explained that the first prioritized project is for vehicle replacement; and the second is a miscellaneous capital project that isn't specifically listed in our Transit Development Plan currently, but it does fall under maintaining our fleet in that it is maintenance software that will allow the mechanics on staff to be able to keep track of what maintenance needs to be done, when it needs to be done, as well as other internal management issues.

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE GRAND FORKS CITIES AREA TRANSITS' NORTH DAKOTA FTA #5339 APPLICATION AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE MPO LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND TO GIVE THE PROJECTS PRIORITY RANKING, AS PRESENTED.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Voting Yes: DeMers, Malm, Vetter, Vein, Mock, and Strandell
Voting No: None.
Abstain: None.
Absent: Adams and Powers.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT FINAL BYGLAND ROAD STUDY REPORT

Kouba reported that this is the final draft of the Bygland Road Study, the final step in this study's process. She stated that, basically, they have gone through a lot of the different projects, and they have come forward with recommendations; previously here as well as the East Grand Forks City Council. She pointed out that not much has changed since they brought forward many of these recommendations previously, and last night the City Council approved adopting this document, and staff is looking for approval to adopt it as well.

MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE ADOPTING THE DRAFT FINAL BYGLAND ROAD STUDY REPORT, AS PRESENTED.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Voting Yes: DeMers, Malm, Vetter, Vein, Mock, and Strandell
Voting No: None.
Abstain: None.
Absent: Adams and Powers.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 18th, 2015**

Haugen said, just to give you an update on the Roll Call issue, staff did forward the request from the last meeting, Mr. Malm suggested that the Grand Forks County Commission does roll call using the term “assuming a roll call vote”, so we did submit that language to the group, if you will, and the only response we received is that Fargo/Moorhead would also like to try to pursue that as well, but have not heard back from the DOT as to whether or not it would be acceptable.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO THE FY2016 UPWP

Haugen reported that we have several projects that we have contracted throughout the year that will carry over into 2016. He explained that a year ago, when we adopted the 2016 Work Program, many of those projects weren’t anticipated to carry through, so this is a simple amendment to our timeframe, as identified in the work program, and there are no financial implications. He stated that if we don’t do this amendment now, come January 1st all of these projects are stopped until we do make an amendment to the 2016 Work Program, so this is trying to get not just your approval, but to be able to submit it to our State and Federal partners for their concurrence as well, so that come January 1st there is no delay or stoppage of these activities.

Haugen commented that there have also been some specific dates identified in the contract and scope of work with consultants, so we have changed the contracts to reflect those exact dates.

Vein asked if these were the projects that were highlighted in yellow in the document. Haugen responded it was.

Haugen stated that the staff report indicated that this really affects just three of the studies: 1) the counting program that ATAC is engaged with; 2) time extension for the East Grand Forks Land Use Plan, which was originally to end at the end of 2015, but will carry over into 2016; and 3) I-29 Traffic Operations Study.

MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT #1 TO THE 2016 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM, AS PRESENTED.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Voting Yes: DeMers, Malm, Vetter, Vein, Mock, and Strandell

Voting No: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Adams and Powers.

Haugen reported that sometime in either December or January you will have a proposal to make further amendments to next years’ work program, but this one was to make sure that there were no delays with the current projects.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF PHASE III-B OF THE TRAFFIC COUNT PROGRAM

Haugen reported that this is just a continuation of the Traffic Count Program.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 18th, 2015**

Haugen explained that, as you will recall, back when we approved Phase III-A of the Traffic Count Program, it was also discussed why there is a Phase III-A and Phase III-B, and that is because there is also a Master Agreement, and these are addendums to that agreement. He said that the Master Agreement expired at the end of September, and we had to renew it but there were too many intersections, so they split up those intersections, placing some in Phase III-A under the original Master Agreement, and the rest in Phase III-B under the new Master Agreement.

Haugen referred to the document in the packet, and pointed out the list of intersections included in Phase III-B, and said that since we just approved this it will carry over into next year, and some of these intersections aren't quite set up completely yet, but as they come on line the video counting will take place.

Haugen cited an example of how they are using this data. He explained that in doing the 32nd Avenue Corridor Study it allowed the consultant to use data from this program, and they were very happy to be able to have this amount of data to help them with the signal coordination that we asked them to do in a short timeframe.

Haugen referred to slides illustrating how the data is being gathered, and how it is being used and went over the information briefly.

DeMers asked what policies the MPO has that guide the use of data that is collected from these videos. Haugen responded that we don't have a written policy, so we use the data only for ourselves and our member jurisdictions traffic operation studies. DeMers said that this is just something he thinks all policy groups, especially public policy groups need to be aware that we are generating data that could be used potentially in a policy investigation, but there could also be a downside to this that we should at least think about, in terms of how it could be used. He added that people, he thinks, have an assumption that the data is private. Vein commented that there is a certain amount of transparency with the data that we have, that is available. He added that something like this, how would it be available to the public, it isn't on the internet, correct. Haugen responded that it is password protected right now. He added that this data is just vehicle count data, it doesn't identify color, or type of vehicle, or anything on the vehicles, it is just a count of the vehicles.

Williams reported that this information is all public information, and anyone that calls her and asks for it, she gets it for them, so there isn't anything that is being withheld. She added that she receives calls from realtors, businesses, etc., requesting traffic counts at various locations, so it is all public. She stated that the Centrex System is owned by the City of Grand Forks, and it is a closed system because of security reasons, but anybody that needs any of this information they can get it for them.

DeMers commented that he thinks that the fear isn't necessarily the data that is derived, but at some point video is captured, correct. Haugen responded that they draw a rectangle, and the video captures or senses when something crosses through that rectangle, and it counts it; so it isn't like security cameras that record and keep recording for a period of time, it is real-time count, and there is no video captured as part of it.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 18th, 2015**

Vein asked if there is other data out there that is more specific to what we are talking about; that we have recorded and available to the public. Haugen responded that the MPO does not have anything like that.

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE SCOPE-OF-WORK FOR PHASE III-B OF THE TRAFFIC COUNTING STUDY, AS PRESENTED.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Voting Yes: DeMers, Malm, Vetter, Vein, Mock, and Strandell

Voting No: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Adams and Powers.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF CONTRACT EXTENSION WITH SRF FOR THE EAST GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN UPDATE

Haugen reported that, as explained earlier with the work program amendment, the East Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update was originally going to end at the end of December; they are in the final stages of it but we saw the necessity of carrying it over into 2016, so this is a necessary contract amendment to show that the concluding date is now March 31st, 2016 instead of December 31st, 2015. He added that there are no financial implications, they aren't requesting any additional funds, so it is a simple and clean extension of the project timeframe.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE CONTRACT AMENDMENT WITH SRF FOR THE EAST GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN UPDATE, AS PRESENTED.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Voting Yes: DeMers, Malm, Vetter, Vein, Mock, and Strandell

Voting No: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Adams and Powers.

SUSPEND AGENDA

Vein reported that because we have to wait until 12:45 for the MnDOT update, we will suspend the agenda to hear discussion on Agenda Items 12 and 13.

MATTER OF DRAFT PERFORMANCE REPORT

Viafara reported that staff has been working on improving the Draft Performance Report based on comments received from the stakeholders. He said that those comments were reviewed by the Technical Advisory Committee, and include an improvement on the livability chapter of the report.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 18th, 2015**

Viafara commented that the livability chapter is a very important component given that we are providing information that may have the potential to contribute to the betterment of the Land Use Plans and some planning related issues in both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks.

Viafara stated that they also, in cooperation with the Cities Area Transit expanded the metrics and the policies framing the work of the local transit agency, which could potentially contribute to improvements on the livability for the users and other transit dependent populations in town.

Viafara said that in cooperation with NDDOT and Minnesota Public Safety, they tabulated all the information required to analyze traffic crash data in order to assess roadway safety in the planning area. He stated that this will be in the report, accompanied by a series of maps that will locate the intersections with a number of fatal crashes or property or those events causing injuries to the public.

Viafara explained that they also analyzed the average annual daily traffic information in order to examine the levels of roadway congestion. He said that they took a number of intersections on 32nd Avenue and those will be provided in the report. He stated that in addition to this, they also did an analysis of traffic volumes in the same intersections for both during school days and summer days, when students, particularly UND students, are away.

Viafara pointed out that the tables illustrate the behavior of some intersections at the moment, so we notice an increase in usage of some of the segments.

Viafara reported that staff is currently working on putting together an analyses of the functional classification, and the pavement conditions, and freight. He stated that with those three items they expect to have further information available for the next meeting. He added that they are striving to prepare a summary that will be more or less readable, and ready for your consideration of approval.

Vein asked, on the pavement conditions, you said that you will be providing a summary review of the pavement conditions, is that a visual that you are looking at for the pavement conditions, or is there actual video data. Viafara responded that when they submit the report for the boards consideration, you will have three tables that will indicate the condition of the three systems. He added that they are using the number of center lane miles, which is basically a measure that is taken in the center from the beginning to the end of that particular segment. He said that in some cases, sometimes, it is measured on both sides to make sure that the segment is properly measured. He stated that those will be given to the board, in terms of the good conditions, satisfactory conditions, and those roadways in fair condition or roadways that may require some attention in terms of repairs. He said that you will then have three or four pictures that will give you an idea of what a segment in fair condition actually looks like, so that is a list to indicate that whenever we are going through a segment, more-or-less we can have an idea, very subjectively, of what kind of roads are we dealing with at the moment. He stated that this is important because North Dakota has a policy of smooth rides, so they would like, as much as they can, to have the roadway in their system to be in a very satisfactory rank, basically 80% or over. He added that Minnesota also strives to accommodate the requirements of the drivers, so this is exactly how the two systems are currently.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 18th, 2015**

Viafara commented that there may be some new findings that may require the boards' attention as policy makers in terms of expenditures, allocation of resources, proposed projects, or a list of what kind of roadway you would like to have in the system.

Haugen reported that there won't be additional video, but the one thing that will change from the Pavement Management report we received earlier this year, is that there will be a map showing what areas have treatments during this last construction season. He stated that they will be working with local staff to make sure the Pavement Management Software was updated to reflect those treatments that took place, the work that was done.

Discussion on school safety issues ensued.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. 2015 AWP Project Update

Haugen reported that this is a monthly status report that staff provides to keep you informed of where we are at with the activities in our current work program.

Haugen stated that as of last month all projects are underway, the 32nd Avenue Coordination Plan Update was the last project to get under contract.

Haugen said that, just for your calendars, December 9th, which would be a Wednesday evening, we will have our public inform meeting on the 32nd Avenue Coordination Study Update, so they will be trying to inform the public as to what they will be doing, as far as timing plans, and what improvements will occur with the new updated timing plan. He added that following that, the consultants are scheduled to appear before the Service Safety Committee on Tuesday, December 15th to update the committee on the work being done; and then before this body on Wednesday, December 16th to give a report on what they have accomplished.

2. Briefing On Glasston Railroad Crossing Study – Public Meeting November 17th

Haugen reported that an Open House was held last evening, with about 24 people in attendance. He stated that, currently, the Glasston Sub has six times on average per day where there is a blockage of the roadway and the Mill Spur has two to four depending on the availability of rail cars for the Mill.

Haugen stated that what they are projecting in the future, based on the potential land uses going in is twelve trains on the Glasston, so it is doubling. He added that they did look at this, and did the calculations and determined that the quiet zone would not be at risk, even with the doubling of the train traffic, and also the increased vehicle traffic; the only caveat to that statement is that that threshold index is adjusted periodically, so if it stays at it is currently we are safe.

Haugen commented that for the Mill Spur, assuming that the Mill is not able to land the unloading facility on the Glasston Subdivision, they will have to have more frequent train

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 18th, 2015**

service; and also the length of the trains, or the time they are blocking will increase because the trains will have to have more cars attached to the, but they don't have enough property to land a unit train so it won't be unit train length, but they will be as lengthy as they can reasonably get by with.

Haugen reported that they presented two options; the first one is, because if they can get everything shifted to Glasston, to focus our conflicts between the trains and the vehicles (bike/ped/transit) is to do a grade separation at Gateway Drive. He said that at 6th Avenue and University Avenue there is not enough separation, and the topography and land uses around there aren't conducive to doing any other type of grade separating, so the only feasible one is at Gateway Drive. He stated that, at the request of the University of North Dakota they would really like to see fencing up and down the Glasston Subdivision on both sides of the rail, with openings only at University Avenue and 6th Avenue.

Haugen commented that 911 and emergency managers would like to somehow get notified of the rail blockage. He stated that our equipment is advanced to a point where if we add a little more to it we might be able to accomplish that ability, so we are in fairly good shape to consider that project because of the updating of equipment we have done in the past, so it is possible we could help the response routing, if and when we can do this.

Haugen stated that this is assuming that the Mill Spur can be abandoned south of Gateway Drive. He added that if that should occur it would be converted into green space.

Haugen referred to a slide and explained that it is a concept of the grade separation. He stated that both Gateway Drive and 42nd Street would be depressed down. He said that the only real concern, in terms of access, is the access to the financial institution at this location, as access to it would not be the best solution, but from a technical standpoint it would be feasible.

Haugen reported that the cost, particularly for the grade separation, is in today's dollars \$28 to \$29 million. He said that they did require that a benefit/cost analysis be done, and it does it come to a better than 1/1-1 benefit cost, so even though it has a high price tag, it also provides a lot of benefit.

Haugen stated that they do have draft report that is being circulated among staff for review and comment. He said that he didn't use this as a hard number for the cost estimate, they had a meeting yesterday and there are some engineering considerations that might adjust the cost up or down, but it gives you a sense of where they are at with the study.

Haugen commented that in terms of public input, they mainly received a lot of frustration about the increased trains on the Glasston Subdivision, and whether we can quiet the noise of the trains. He added that they appreciate the quiet zone for the horns, but they are expressing a lot of frustration about the train noise itself.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 18th, 2015**

**MATTER OF MNDOT UPDATE ON MINNESOTA STATEWIDE MULTIMODAL
PLAN AND STATEWIDE HIGHWAY INVESTMENT PLAN**

Haugen referred to the packet, and stated that there is a lot of information regarding MnDOT's update on the Minnesota Statewide Multimodal Plan included, including a detailed report on the three investment approach scenarios; A, B, and C. He said that the last piece is a survey they would ask that everyone consider filling out. He added that someone from MnDOT was supposed to present this via conference phone, however they have been unable to connect so he will try to give it himself.

Haugen said that, as the staff report tried to identify, this is an update of a document they did a couple of years ago, it is required by the Minnesota Legislature.

Haugen referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request), and gave a brief overview of the information presented.

Haugen stated that one thing he is sure MnDOT would try to convey to you is, if they were to meet all of their performance targets, that would be a \$36 billion dollar investment over twenty years; at best they could only identify \$20 billion in revenue, so there is a \$16 billion dollar gap. He said that the \$16 billion dollar gap is only addressing state highway needs, so they acknowledge that the gap could double or triple that or even more as they don't know how much the county or local jurisdictions might have in needs as well, so part of the message is this next legislative session will need to let everyone know that there is still a huge funding gap, and the legislature is being primed to address that with a ten year investment package.

Haugen pointed out that they also did a lot of trends analysis, showing about twelve trends that they have been tracking, some have to deal with technological advances; they are looking into autonomous vehicles to see how much of an impact they can predict they will have on the system, so they have done a lot of trends analysis and that information is available.

Haugen stated that there are thirteen different slices to the pie, and they do a lot of analysis of the current condition, and identify some of the needs, so they have gotten a lot of data, and have done a lot of work to get to the point that they can present this.

Vein asked if the MPO Executive Policy Board is going to make a recommendation on behalf of the MPO as to what we feel their approach should be. Haugen responded that you may do that as an MPO, but they have only now been doing this by having individuals filling out the questionnaire, but if you want to put this on the agenda next month, and have staff give you a recommendation on which approach the MPO might want to engage with, that would certainly be an option. He added that staff will also work with the East Grand Forks City Council, and if Polk County wishes we can get their information to them as well. Strandell suggested that a call be made to Rich Sanders to see what he thinks.

Haugen reported that the other half of this presentation that was to be discussed briefly was the Multimodal Plan, which gets back to the bike/ped issue we discussed earlier. He said that they

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 18th, 2015**

are open to comments, and their website is: www.minnesotago.org and he would encourage you to go there and get as much information as you want, but also to leave comments on these issues.

Haugen stated that he attended a stakeholder meeting a week ago in Brainerd, MN, and he encouraged going with Approach C, but to scale back the Twin Cities Metro-mobility just because he thinks the Met Council's Transportation Plan is on the light rail or the transit side, which isn't part of the highway investment, and this is the highway investment strategy, so he told them to go with Approach C, but to take some of the monies out of the Metro-mobility and spread it to the other areas.

Haugen commented that they held these sessions at the Minnesota State Fair earlier this summer, and they got a lot of support for Approach B, and the stakeholder forum he was at, as well as two others, Approach B got the most support as well.

DeMers said, then, that the question is; as East Grand Forks and Polk County expand, or wants to expand in search of basically for highways and bridges, you're going to have to get it from the regional and local highways and Greater Minnesota pools, so you have only 1.1% and .3% of the funding available if you want to put a bridge in, those are the pools you're looking at. Haugen responded that that would be correct. Vetter stated that that is fine, adding that that we will update our transportation plan next year and move it up on the ladder.

Haugen referred to Approach C, and pointed out that what you would really be trying to target would be the 1.1%, and under Approach C that slice of the pie grows to 8.2%, and then, as he explained, his suggestion was to trim back the Twin Cities Area Mobility 7.2% and invest it elsewhere. He explained that truly it is the Met Council's strategy to invest in public transportation, or light rail extensions, or bus rapid transit, as their solutions.

Haugen reiterated that there is more detailed information on each of these pie slices that he can mail to the board if desired.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO ADJOURN THE NOVEMBER 18TH,
2015, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:01 P.M.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, December 16th, 2015 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Mike Powers, Chairman, called the December 16th, 2015 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: Ken Vein, Clarence Vetter, Gary Malm, Jeannie Mock, Warren Strandell, Steve Adams, and Mike Powers.

Absent: Marc DeMers.

Staff: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Jairo Viafara, GF/EGF MPO Senior Planner; Teri Kouba, GF/EGF MPO Planner; David Wiosna, GF/EGF MPO Intern; and Peggy McNelis, GF/EGF MPO Office Manager.

Guest(s): Jane Williams, GF City Engineering and Mike Anderson, Alliant Consulting Group.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Powers declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 18TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 18TH, 2015, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

Voting Yes: Malm, Adams, Vetter, Vein, Mock, Strandell, and Powers.

Voting No: None.

MATTER OF FHWA MPO 101 PRESENTATION

Haugen reported that Stephanie Hickman, FHWA-ND, is going to be giving a presentation via video conference on MPO 101.

Hickman stated that she is with the North Dakota Division of the Federal Highway Administration, and periodically they like to go out and give a presentation to our MPO Policy Board, kind of a refresher course and also to make sure that they answer any question you may

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 16th, 2015**

have so she will proceed. She said that if anyone has any questions she would encourage you to please interrupt her with those questions so that we don't get too far beyond the place where you had your question.

Hickman said that the purpose of this presentation is to provide the MPO Board Members with an overall overview of the federal perspective on the Metropolitan Transportation Planning process.

Hickman referred to a slide presentation and went over it briefly.

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

Haugen thanked Ms. Hickman for her assistance with the MPO, and congratulated her on being nationally recognized for the work that she does. He asked that Ms. Hickman please inform the board of the transition from herself to Sheri Lares.

Hickman reported that Sheri Lares is their Environmental Program Manager and Planning Specialist. She explained that their agency is moving to more combined positions, so when they brought Ms. Lares on board she came on as a dual position of environment and planning, and so as her work load with environment permits they are moving the metropolitan program over to her, and at this point she has responsibility for Bismarck and Fargo, and for now the GF/EGF MPO remains with Ms. Hickman, but as Sherie's workload allows, they will transition the entire metro program to her, and she is expecting that to happen over the course of the next year.

Information only.

SUSPEND AGENDA

Powers stated that we have Mike Anderson, Alliant, present for a brief presentation on the 32nd Avenue Signal Coordination Plan. He stated that because of the weather he is suspending the agenda to allow for Mr. Anderson to give his presentation so he can leave and get on the road as soon as possible.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON THE 32ND AVENUE SIGNAL COORDINATION STUDY

Haugen reported that, as you should know, we did timing updates for the 32nd Avenue Corridor in Grand Forks. He stated that, as you have seen, and as Ms. Hickman alluded to, we go from a work program to the transportation plan and then ultimately to the T.I.P.; so in our work program we identified that we would retain a consultant to do the update for the signal timing plan for the 32nd Avenue Corridor, and Mike Anderson from Alliant Engineering, who we did hire to do that task, is here today. He added that Mr. Anderson has updated the timing plans, spending several days last week fine-tuning the plans in the field.

Haugen referred to the packet, and explained that it includes highlights of the outcomes from the update. He added that Mr. Anderson does have a power point presentation that he would like to give as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 16th, 2015**

Haugen commented that you may have heard, as well, that this is really the first time that we have been able to really use the traffic count data that we are capturing from the video cameras, so he thinks that Mr. Anderson will touch on how valuable and informative the data was for him.

Anderson reported that over the last seven or eight years Alliant has been pretty heavily involved in a lot of the timing work throughout Grand Forks. He added that in regard to the 32nd Avenue project he does have some slides, but most of the information is in the plan update.

Anderson stated that the primary goal of this was to update the coordination plans for 32nd Avenue. He said, however, that he also worked with Public Works on a similar project to update the timing plans on Columbia Road, with the new signals on the south-end, as it made a lot of sense because these two corridors really need to work together, particularly the south-end of it, so it made a lot of sense for them to take the two projects and kind of integrate them together, so the Columbia Road and 32nd Avenue plans were all built together and then implemented last week.

Anderson said that another part of this was transit signal priority. He explained that back in 2010 timing signals were installed at about 28 intersections throughout the City, twelve of them are located on 32nd Avenue and Columbia Road, so as part of their effort they went through and performed an audit, looking at all the timing that was in there, making sure everything is still programmed correctly, working, and then updated all those parameters to be compatible with the timing plan. He stated that they completed this work last week as well.

Anderson reported that the Alerus Center event timing was also implemented in 2010 with the city-wide project. He said that they did look at the timing that was out there for 32nd Avenue and updated it, so they put in new outbound timing plans for 38th Street and the two ramp signals. He added that he did also add schedules to the Centrac System, so that all the signals that are part of the event plans, on 32nd, 42nd, and DeMers can easily be enabled now.

Anderson stated that another part of this was the ramp queue flush program, related to the Alerus Center, whereby traffic backs up on I-29. He said that the idea is, when that scenario happens, to institute a program that would then give a green light to the ramp signal, and a green light to 38th Street, to flesh that all out. He stated, however, that there is a bunch of hardware and equipment that is needed to make that happen, so we can draft recommendations in regard to what is needed, and then once that is all put into place they will be able to put this program in.

Anderson said that, finally, the study also looks at some more cost improvements that can address some of the safety issues that are out there, and also some operational things that would further make improvements and improve traffic flows.

Anderson reported that, as Mr. Haugen mentioned, the video detection cameras were huge assets. He stated that for a corridor like 32nd Avenue that is very commercial, the traffic volumes are quite different than what we see elsewhere in the City. He said that normally when they do these types of projects they rely on one day of data, so being able to have data, historical data, was very valuable. He referred to a chart, and pointed out that it shows that there is a big variation in

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 16th, 2015**

the monthly volume out there, there are some months when the volumes are low, and some when the volumes are high.

Anderson stated that another interesting thing on 32nd Avenue is, for information, is that traffic has grown quite a bit, so it feels like there is heavy traffic out there because there is, it has grown over the last seven years, since 2008, by 27%.

Anderson said that he implemented this all last week, and spent pretty much all day Thursday, Friday and Saturday fine-tuning and making small adjustments to the traffic conditions that he was seeing. He stated that he did get to see a Saturday in December, which is probably the peak days for 32nd Avenue, and he did what he could by making some adjustment to help some of the traffic patterns that were occurring.

Anderson commented that, overall, they have eleven timing plans that run to handle all these different traffic variations that occur. He referred to a graphic that shows the traffic volumes on 32nd Avenue in red, and the timing plans in a colored blotch, and explained that it does show that as traffic volumes are going up and down the timing plans are changing with them. He said that they are trying to make sure they have the right timing plan cycling and working with the volumes out there.

Anderson stated that what they are finding is that the improvements are subtle in nature in that they might not be obviously recognized. He explained that he says that because if you were to drive down 32nd Avenue and Columbia Road the sequencing of the lights is going to feel about the same, and it kind of is because that is what makes sense for the spacing of the signals and the left turn arrow operation, that sequencing is really what works good for the flow. He said that what he tried to focus on was addressing some of the more difficult intersections of 38th, 34th, Columbia, and doing what he could to increase green time for left turn movements, increasing green time for the cross streets, and kind of making those intersections work a little bit better.

Anderson referred to a graph that was included in the packet, and explained that it illustrates, from a level of service grade perspective, that in general the level of service didn't change. He stated, though, that what they did see over the course of the day on the plans is that about half the intersections experience a small reduction in delay, a couple went up in delay, and a lot stayed the same. He added that from a travel time perspective they are estimating that we would experience about a 13% reduction in travel time in the evening peak, and 5% in the morning. He said that when they look at this from a network wide perspective, considering all of the intersections together, they are estimating about a 3% reduction in overall delay, a 4% reduction in vehicle stops, and a 2% reduction in the fuel consumption and air quality emission output.

Anderson reported that the real positive with this is that maintaining your signal timing and maintaining optimal performance of your intersections is probably one of the best things that you can do as an agency to manage arterial corridors. He explained that one of the big benefits of doing that is that with a lot of these corridors we are kind of preserving capacity, and how we do that is with the signal timing, so if you continue to operate with optimal signals it may be

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 16th, 2015**

possible that you can postpone and/or eliminate some of these big ticket road capacity improvements. He stated that he thinks the agencies up here have really done a good job about being pro-active about this; they retimed the signals here for the first time in 2008, in 2010 all the corridors in town were updated with new timing plans, in 2012 the am peak and pm peak plans were all updated citywide, and in 2014 Washington Street was updated, and now last week Columbia Road and 32nd Avenue were updated again. He commented that the first time they do signal timing plans is when we see our largest benefit, in 2008 they saw a greater than 20% reduction in stops and a 30% reduction in travel time; but every time they do this they see those percentages getting lower, but the benefit is still high because the actual labor cost for this work is pretty cheap, and what we saw with this project is that the benefit/cost ratio is 29/1, so that is a pretty good return on an investment for a project.

Anderson reported that there are some low, or lower cost geometric and safety type improvements that have all been discussed or brought up before, or highlighted here, that would help with managing some of that growth. He stated that these include things like constructing dual left turn lanes at Columbia Road, addition of right turn lanes at 20th, extend the left turn bay at 38th to help with event scenario, extension at the west-bound left turn lane at 34th and 31st.

Anderson commented that probably the big thing, though, would be realignment of the left turn lanes at 20th, 31st, 34th, and 38th, to give a more positive off-set, similar to the project done on Washington Street, that would be a huge safety improvement to give better sight lines for the vehicles making a left turn. He added that along with that they would suggest flashing yellow arrow installations at those signals. He explained that the big advantage of that is that we can now re-look at how the arrow sequence is, right now we need to have those arrows come up first in the cycle, if we go to flashing yellow arrow we can then do a lead leg operation where the arrow might come up last. He said that the advantage to that is traffic flow improvement, as we would be able to move more traffic along 32nd Avenue more efficiently with that type of operation.

Anderson stated that the last thing is the event queue he mentioned. He said that he knows that Public Works is in the process of acquiring the equipment to be able to do this, so once that equipment is out there, they will be working at putting that program in and testing it so that is ready for the backup scenario that may occur.

Anderson reported that the draft report was submitted November 30th, and they are looking to wrap up the final report by the end of December.

Vein said that he has a few questions, but he thinks he will probably wait as it is getting kind of late, but it is interesting, the left turn arrows you are talking about, and how there will be improvement by going to a flashing yellow versus a constant green, that there is actual timing improvements by doing that. He said that you also mentioned something about allowing, for years we have had all left turns go first, and now you are saying that there is improvement in timing by not doing that, and he doesn't understand how that can be so he would like to hear more, but not today. Anderson responded that there are huge improvements doing this because it is a traffic flow thing. He added that their challenge with these corridors is that, if you have a one-way street, one-way street timing is very easy as traffic is going in one direction; but it is the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 16th, 2015**

two-way traffic that causes problems, being able to move traffic in both directions is benefited by bringing up the arrow first, or sometimes last.

Vein commented that, you talk about the continuous counts that are going on at 38th, is there software out there that would take into account these counts on a real-time basis, and make adjustment, because you tweak the timing now, but that software could maybe tweak it continuously based on actual traffic. Anderson responded that there are adaptive control systems out there in the market that do that in somewhat real time, where they are constantly monitoring the volume that is at an intersection and adjusting the timing, those systems are available, but there is a cost with them, but that is always an option. He stated that 32nd Avenue, of all the corridors in town, if you were to try an adaptive control, that would be the corridor he would put it on.

Powers asked, again, when the final report would be completed. Anderson responded that it will be done by the end of the month, or sooner. Powers asked if Mr. Anderson would be coming back before this body at that time. Anderson responded that he would be submitting a report to Mr. Haugen, and he believes that this is their last official report to this group. Powers commented that he would like to spend more time on this, but we are running late, but we can do it when we get the final report.

RESUME AGENDA

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen stated all the lights are in place. He pointed out that he did take a photo last week just to give you an idea of what the bridge looks like with the lighting on. He added that there is a committee meeting tomorrow afternoon to start to work out the agreement as to when the colors will be allowed, what days and what color will be allowed during those days.

Haugen stated that tomorrow evening at 5:00 p.m. they will be doing a test of the system, and it is scheduled to be a two hour test, so multiple colors and multiple themes will be tested at that time.

Malm commented that the new lighting doesn't light up the sidewalks when you go over it though. Haugen responded that they did some work on that last week. Malm stated that he went over it last night, maybe his eyesight is going, but it was just like being in the dark. Powers asked if the sidewalks are dark. Malm responded that the whole bridge is dark still. Haugen said that they would mention this to them tomorrow. Powers said that he is planning on going to this tomorrow night so he will walk the bridge to see what he thinks.

Vein asked if they were meeting at a certain location. Haugen responded that he doesn't know the exact location they will be meeting. Vein commented that the best place to look at it, obviously, would be away from it.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 16th, 2015**

Haugen reported that there are seven agencies involved in the agreement: City of East Grand Forks (Mayor Stauss), City of Grand Forks (Crystal Schnieder), NDDOT (Local Staff), MnDOT, Minnesota SHIPO (State Historic Preservation Officer), North Dakota SHIPO (State Historic Preservation Officer), Federal Highway. He said that they will be meeting at 1:00 and will work on the agreement, and will also get a little education on the system itself, and then at 5:00 they will come to the bridge to enjoy the light display, and then go back at 7:00 and finalize and plan for their next meeting.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that the 106 Report has been released, the 106 is the historic preservation document explaining what the project is going to do that may or may not have an adverse impact on an historic property. He said that he has a copy of the report if anyone is interested in seeing it. He stated that he did include what the local historic preservation commission's reaction to the report is, their motion, showing that they concur that there are no adverse effects, but request further discussion regarding the lighting plan, plaque, and the barrier. He explained that the barrier they are referring to is, again; the multiuse trail is inside of the truss, and the barrier between that and the vehicle traffic lanes, that is the barrier that the Historic Preservation Commission wants to have further discussion on.

Vetter asked if there are only two individuals on that committee, Slater and Sickels. Haugen responded that that is just who made the motion and seconded it, there are more on the committee.

Haugen commented that the lighting plan for the Sorlie will just be a starting point, there will be a separate lighting plan for the Kennedy that will be worked out.

Powers asked Ms. Williams what the instrument is that is used to measure candle power. Williams responded that it is a watt meter, but if it is LED you measure in lumens. Powers asked if anyone has done that. Williams responded that she doesn't know. She added that she doesn't have an instrument to measure lumens, she does have one for candles, but not for lumens, but they can find someone that does. Powers said that that would be the first course of action, just take a walk with that in your hand and walk down one side and up the other.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF HOLIDAY BONUS HOURS

Strandell asked if this was the same request as last year. Haugen responded it was.

MOVED BY STRANDELL, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE A FOUR HOUR HOLIDAY BONUS FOR MPO EMPLOYEES.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Voting Yes: Malm, Adams, Vetter, Vein, Strandell, and Powers.

Voting No: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: DeMers and Mock.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 16th, 2015**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF NORTH DAKOTA FY2017-2020 T.I.P. CANDIDATE
PROJECTS**

Haugen reported that a copy of the slide presentation that will be given is included in the packet. He stated that this is for the North Dakota side, the Minnesota side will be done next month.

Haugen commented that, just as we heard from Federal Highway, this is our responsibility to make sure that it is consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan, and all the sub-elements, and to prioritize the projects subject to the funding available.

Haugen referred to a graphic and explained that it shows that it is not just inside one city, that we also have a study area that expands out a couple miles outside the City Proper, and any regionally significant project needs to be in our T.I.P. document, either for approval or for informational purposes.

Haugen stated that the process is continuous, as we heard, just as we got done approving a T.I.P., we started soliciting for the next round.

Haugen said that there are some unknowns. He explained that this slide, in the past, talked about MAP-21 unknowns, MAP-21 is now defunct, and we have FAST unknowns. He said that until it is all implemented, what we do today is subject to change, so just because you are approving something today doesn't necessarily behold you to future decisions.

Haugen pointed out that inflation is the same as it has been, but he will note that under FAST the first year, generically has a 5% increase in fund, and then each year after is 2% per year. He said that you can see that we have been using a 1.2% per year growth, FAST does have a little bit more money, however they also created more programs so we will see how it is implemented. He stated, however, that even if it is 2% or even 5% a year, over the five year period of FAST it is not keeping pace with inflationary costs, so we lost purchasing power.

Haugen reported that on the North Dakota side Recreational Trails are actually due at the end of January, and will come to us for review, otherwise today we will look at the TAP, or what used to be the TAP, safety, and our urban local and urban regional projects.

Haugen stated that the TAP, which FAST removed as a stand-alone separate program, and instead inserted into the Surface Transportation Program, but has it as a set-aside so, again, 5% increase in funds, but what they did was to take X amount of those funds and set it aside only for what used to be TAP, but left project eligibility the same.

Haugen said that the only other change is that FAST now allows others to submit projects. He explained that MAP-21 eliminated it and only allowed municipalities or counties to submit projects, but under FAST they are opening the window for others to submit projects and not necessarily have to go through the local government unit. Vein asked who they submit project to. Haugen responded they would submit them to the MPO, and we will still have to review them all and prioritize them.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 16th, 2015**

Haugen commented that this year we only received one TAP project, and it came from the City of Grand Forks and was vetted through their process. He said that there were other projects identified, but the one that has been forwarded to you for consideration is Phase II, a shared use path along DeMers Avenue. He referred to a map and pointed out where the project is located.

Haugen stated that both Staff and the Technical Advisory Committee find this consistent with the Long Range Transportation Plan, and give it prioritization for submittal to the State.

Haugen reported that the next program is the safety, or HSIP (Highway Safety Improvement). He stated that this is a 90/10 split, 90% federal and 10% local funds.

Haugen stated that, if you recall, last year North Dakota implemented a new program where they focused a lot of their safety on, not high crash locations, but on pro-active strategic initiatives to sort of prevent crashes from occurring, so everything is now based off the local roads safety program document.

Haugen reported that the City of Grand Forks has three projects they have submitted to us, and they have prioritized them as:

- 1) To address red light running at signalized intersections by putting backplates with retro-reflective borders.

Haugen stated that most of the new signals already have this in place. He added that this project is to take those signals that aren't due for a major revamp anytime soon and get them so they have this ability to help with red light running.

- 2 & 3) The next two projects deal with making signalized intersections safer for pedestrians and bicyclists to cross and go along the corridor.

Haugen stated that, from a local roads safety document, in yellow are the statements that tell us these are the high priorities; red light running and pedestrian and bicycle intersection. He pointed out that there is a decision flow tree, if you will, and the local safety program prioritizes the confirmation lights as the strategy for red light running instead of backplates, and last year we did submit an application for confirmation lights on Gateway Drive that were awarded and will be installed in a couple of years; also the new signals in Grand Forks are already getting the confirmation lights installed. Haugen referred to a slide and explained that it is an example of what the backplates retro-reflectivity looks like.

Haugen reported that, again, staff and the Technical Advisory Committee are recommending the projects as being consistent, although we do note that the number one priority is not the confirmation lights, it is a different strategy than what is in the local safety program, and we recommend you do the same.

Haugen said that, as you look at the Urban Program, locally we always look at what is current in the T.I.P. that may be changed, and not just the addition of the last year of the T.I.P., so on the Urban Side Local

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 16th, 2015**

there is one change in 2017. He explained that there is a traffic signal that was designated for 42nd Street at Garden View Dr., and the City is asking us to consider relocating it to Washington Street and 44th Avenue instead. He added that the cost estimate does not change, the location has changed, so it is an easy dollar for dollar swap, it isn't too challenging of a request to have to decide on.

Haugen stated that on the Regional side there are a couple of additions coming into the current T.I.P.; and from a fiscal constraint perspective, these years should already have been fiscally constrained so these projects are trying to squeeze in to the funding scenario.

Haugen reported that the first two are traffic signals at two locations; Gateway Drive and North 55th Street and DeMers and West Columbia Ramp or 30th Street. He explained that there has been a lot of discussion on the DeMers and West Columbia Ramp, the Boden area, on whether there is a need for a traffic signal there to accommodate some of the pedestrian conflicts that are taking place, or if it should be at 30th Street, so depending on the project development the location will have to be narrowed down by next year, or when we do a final approval of the S.T.I.P.

Haugen commented that on the Regional side, in response to 32nd Avenue and the ramp queuing, the State is trying to squeeze in, both at 32nd and at Gateway Drive, a ramp queuing pre-emption type of system in place that we aren't backing traffic up on the interstate. He pointed out that in 2017 DeMers Avenue is going to have some pavement work done on it, so that is sort of the thought process of why we need to put this in 2017, so that it can be part of that already existing project on DeMers Avenue.

Haugen reported that for the new T.I.P. Year, 2020, the City, on the local program is resubmitting the University Avenue Overlay, which was submitted last year but not funded. He stated that it is just being forwarded again for consideration, and the year of expenditure has been adjusted an additional year so we aren't using an old estimate.

Haugen stated that on the Regional side, the big project is the South Washington Underpass Replacement. He explained that in previous years we have always showed this as the "plus-1" year, but now we are really trying to get programmed, and since they are in the neighborhood they are also going to do some pavement work just north of the underpass replacement area, up to and including Gateway Drive.

Haugen commented that on the regional side, we have been asked to submit not just the four years of the T.I.P. plus one year, and again they are working on North Washington, in and around the bridge replacement area on the north side.

Haugen gave a summarization of the T.I.P. candidate projects, referring to a slide with a table listing the projects and changes discussed.

MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE LIST OF CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE FY2017-2020 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING, AS PRESENTED.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 16th, 2015**

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Voting Yes: Malm, Adams, Vetter, Vein, Strandell, and Powers.

Voting No: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: DeMers and Mock.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON I-29 TRAFFIC OPERATION STUDY

Haugen reported that he included a copy of a brief power point presentation that was given to the Technical Advisory Committee last Wednesday. He referred to the staff report, and pointed out that it gives you the website you can go to to review the full existing conditions report of the document.

Haugen stated that he wants to go back to explain why the ramp queues are being done. He referred to a photo illustrating an example of what he frequently encounters on his daily commute to work. He explained that it shows the I-29 off-ramp northbound to Gateway Drive, adding that this is related to our Glasston Study as well, because when the train, particularly a unit train, is blocking the roadway here, the traffic does back up considerably because there isn't any movement that traffic can use to go east, and as the traffic from the west builds up and blocks this area people have nowhere to go but to get off the ramp and wait.

Haugen commented that, looking at the pre-emption data, he was parked at this location for roughly ten minutes during a ten minute closure, he arrived five minutes after the pre-emption of the train signal to stop traffic, and behind him there were several vehicles lined up by the time he left, however he did not take a photo of that. He added that one nice thing is that the dual left turn lanes are not block, and the signal cycle keeps going so if you're westbound you still get your regular call, it is just that we have problems today at times, particularly when there is a train at DeMers Avenue during major Alerus Events.

Powers asked if there isn't an ordinance that dictates how long a train can block an intersection. Haugen responded that it is only if they are stopped, but if they are moving they can block an intersection forever, so their trick is to keep the train in motion, going back and forth, or to stop and start many times.

Vein asked if traffic eventually backs up on to interstate at times. Haugen responded that it does happen on occasion.

Haugen reported that he believes there is going to be an attempt, which Ms. Williams can explain further, of trying to free up storage space during these events. Williams explained that what happens when the train comes is that the signal at Gateway and 42nd goes into its pre-empted state, and holds the traffic going eastbound; and then what happens is that back at the ramp the eastbound people come in and fill all the space between in and sit and wait and traffic backs up onto the interstate. She stated that what they are going to do is when the signal at 42nd goes into

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 16th, 2015**

pre-empt they are also going to pre-empt the eastbound through movement, however the eastbound left turn will still work, westbound will still work, that way the traffic will stack from there back and allow the interstate traffic to come in and fill in the area between the ramp and 42nd, it will just give them some more storage room so that they hopefully aren't storing on the interstate.

Haugen stated that they do have the existing conditions report. He said that, just to highlight a few things: 1) all intersections operate at a level of service "c" or better today, although we do have some issues they are all operating at an acceptable level of service; 2) we do have some crashes, however they aren't related to any really correctable things, they are related to weather, speed, driver error, etc.; and 3) the infrastructure of the interstate condition, by-and-large is in good shape.

Haugen commented that the one thing that they do note in the existing conditions, when we look out at the 2040 volumes, each of our existing interchanges, excluding the North Washington one; so the Gateway Drive, DeMers, and 32nd Avenue, all three have capacity issues by the 2040 timeframe, so if we don't do anything we will have gridlock to the extent where we would have traffic backing up onto the interstate.

Haugen briefly went over each individual area:

1) North Washington

Haugen stated that we have some really odd geometrics because the railroad is skewing the roadway alignment and the ramp alignment, so what we might see is improvements to the geometry, maybe removing some access points that are very close to the ramps and that influence traffic, but from a current and future volume we aren't seeing any concern at this time.

2) Gateway Drive

Haugen reported that we just completed the study and we do have an alternative that works well for us, at a reasonable cost. He said that this study will look at that and reaffirm it. He added that we might have to, because we are also doing part of a linking environmental study, look at this a little more closely to see about the retaining wall and whether existing businesses can remain open, so that might be the type of tweaks we will see on Gateway Drive, but because we aren't going to reinvent what we just completed on the U.S. #2 Study, we won't open up a lot of alternatives that have already been reviewed and discarded.

Vein asked, then, if the loop would replace the one to the east, and there will be two modes of access. Haugen responded that if you're going northbound and want to go westbound you can take the loop and not have a stop condition. Vein said the, that the other one would be for eastbound traffic only. Haugen responded that that is correct.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 16th, 2015**

Powers asked what the need for a retaining wall is. Haugen responded that the retaining wall is there to show that it could be accomplished without buying out properties. He added that we do need a little ramping up to the interstate because the interstate is going over Gateway Drive at this point, so you need to get traffic on the ramp up.

Malm asked why the City doesn't, in its forward thinking, when properties along these intersections go for sale, buy them at that time instead of having to come back and pay ridiculous amounts of money later. He stated that they could have done that with the underpass on Washington Street, both properties there have been for sale, but one has been sold again so someone will be getting a good deal out of that one in the future. Haugen responded that there are a couple of answers to that. He said that it doesn't prevent you from having to go through the NEPA process, it also doesn't eliminate or cause you to lose that property with the project, and then you get tax revenue, unless you are for sure getting a project done soon, the property does still generate some economic development.

3) DeMers Avenue:

Haugen reported that they do know that there is a proposal to do the grade separation. He said that the one thing we do know about the grade separation is that even with it, the intersection of DeMers and 42nd isn't designed to be able to carry the capacity of 2040 traffic, so we will need to address some additional improvements. He added that we also know that the underpass is very limited because of the piers, as to what additional capacity we might be able to squeeze onto DeMers Avenue underneath the interstate, so, again, today it is operating at an acceptable level of service, we know there are plans for future projects, but we also know there will be capacity issues with future traffic volumes that we are trying to identify and address.

4) 17th Avenue Overpass:

Haugen stated that, again, it is required that we look at all alternatives, and 17th Avenue was at one time a recommended alternative, so we will revisit it to see if it should be reconsidered or not.

5) 32nd Avenue:

Haugen commented that 32nd Avenue is probably the most publicly recognized intersection, and is the reason for the corridor study. He stated that even though we heard today that the level of service is "C", we also heard that the traffic volumes on 32nd are growing quite rapidly.

Haugen reported that the City's Land Use Plan puts somewhere up towards 60% of the future homes and employment in and around the 32nd Avenue Intersection area, so it is where the City is growing. Powers asked Mr. Adams if he agrees with that comment. Adams responded that he did not agree with it. Powers said that he doesn't either.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 16th, 2015**

6) 47th Avenue:

Haugen stated that, besides looking at just improvements at the interchange itself, part of this is to look at whether or not an additional interchange is necessary. He added, however, that when looking at 47th Avenue as an option, they will also look at just an overpass option as well.

Haugen reported that one thing they are working with the State and Feds on is the one mile distance. He stated that most people identify that as one mile from the actual bridge, or the east/west roadway in this case, but it is actually at ramp access points.

Haugen stated that they also have some other issues with the campground, the golf course, and others things that they will be working with on whether, we will term 47th but that more than likely will be shifted south, but we will call it the 47th Avenue area.

Vein asked if the impacts of the 47th project relieve some traffic congestion on 32nd Avenue. Haugen responded that it would, based on past traffic scenarios, it would take 40% of the traffic off 32nd Avenue, however they will have to re-run all of that to see if that is still valid, or if it has improved, or if it has decreased.

7) Merrifield:

Haugen reported on Merrifield. He said that they are trying to work through the process, and are getting back to the question of whether it can be a stand-alone project, or does it have to be 100% tied to a future bridge over the Red River.

Haugen commented that the original interchange justification report that was done twelve years ago had it as a distinct separate project, but since then there has been an effort by the State to tie it to a bridge, so we are trying to go through the process to see if it still has to be married, and will only be considered if a bridge is done, or if it can be a stand-alone project.

Haugen stated that they are currently now going through our 2025 and 2040 projections; and to just briefly recap, they are looking at different scenarios to see if we did other improvements that are in the illustrative list, that are primarily helping north/south movements through Grand Forks, whether if those improvements were done, would they have a substantial impact on traffic flow of I-29 at these interchanges. He added that they are also looking at scenarios where if our major effort on the next agenda item on the Land Use, if we can achieve any reduction in trips being generated out in the network, if that has a rather substantial difference on the I-29 traffic or not, so that will be the next thing you will see on the study; our 2025 and 2040 traffic scenarios on the existing networks plus with that one network that has some of these illustrative projects in place to see if they improve traffic.

Haugen said, again, there is a lot more information on the existing analysis report, it is available on the website: <http://theforksmmpo.org/Pages/I29TrafficOperStudy.html> , and they are taking comments on it until Friday.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 16th, 2015**

MATTER OF UPDATE ON 2045 GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN

Haugen reported that, again, highlighting that MPO Staff is working with the City of Grand Forks Staff on their 2045 Land Use Plan. He stated that there is a website: www.grandforks2045.org, that we invite you to visit for additional information.

Haugen stated that included in the packet were a few snippets from two rather long Technical Memorandums, that are available on the website.

Haugen said that they have gone through and worked with the Land Use Subcommittee, and presented to the Planning Commission, and have out there some additional revisions to the goals and objectives in the current plan. He pointed out that this information is included in the packet for you to review.

Haugen commented that, probably of more interest, are the Growth Tier Boundaries, and how they might be modified, which would also result in how land use is maybe shifted around for future references.

Haugen stated that the land use scenarios, you will notice, are two; one with a future interchange at 47th Avenue being assumed, and the associated land uses that might be generated with or as a result of that interchange; and then there was one done assuming that for whatever reason the interchange doesn't happen in this horizon, how the City might grow differently.

Haugen reported that in the end, what they are hearing from City staff is that infrastructure is being installed, particularly on one side of the interstate, that regardless of the interchange or not, will most likely develop because the infrastructure will be there it needs to get the use and pavement and capture the values, so it is labeled here as a hybrid, and is sort of taking it with the interchange and without the interchange and saying that this will give you a land use regardless of what interchanges might or might not be on the southside of 32nd.

Vein asked if Merrifield were put in, would that not also have some impact. He said it is further away, but wouldn't it still be a benefit. Haugen responded that it would have a benefit, no doubt, and that is why it was able to be justified, back in 2002 as a stand-alone interchange. He added that you will notice that the City's Land Use Plan is not getting close to a mile of the interchange, as far as growth of the City, but the interchange would have traffic benefit.

Haugen commented that the last item of discussion is the three pilot sites they have asked the consultants to assist them in understanding this change in growth philosophy the City is proposing with this Land Use Plan. He explained that the philosophy is kind of trying to get more density and make the development more conducive to other modes of travel, so there were three sites that were identified that they will be working to help us take the language of text and show it in a concept drawing of how we change how the land is used.

Haugen stated that there is still a lot of work to do, it is still in the early stages, but there are some goals and objectives that have been put into print for reaction. He added that, again, there are these Tier Boundaries, and how they might be modified, and they are still iterations going on

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 16th, 2015**

with drawings, but hopefully in January they will be able to show what the Subcommittee thinks will be the draft version to be submitted for public comment.

MATTER OF DRAFT PERFORMANC REPORT

Viafara reported that you have received information on two new items: freight and streets and highways. He stated that those two items were analyzed according to three principles/goals: economic vitality, system preservation, and safety.

Viafara stated that in the interest of time, he would like to bring your attention to system preservation or streets and highway; and to safety.

Viafara commented that for streets and highways they did an analysis of the pavement condition, so on Page 62 of the document, you will find a table that gives you an idea of the condition of the pavement around the planning area from 2013 to 2015. He briefly went over the information shown in the table; pointing out that you will notice an increase in the pavement rated as good from 7% to 21% in the year 2015. He stated that there has also been an increase, particularly for the fair condition, from 4% in the year 2013 to 14% in the year 2015. He explained that he has been in touch with the Grand Forks Engineering Department, and they are also trying to assess more data to see if it is possible to decrease this rating because there is more pavement on the data base than the pavement, in their opinion, it was reviewed here in this exercise, so they are confident that this could be really improved.

Vein stated that it is no surprise that in those two year periods you have that level increase in pavement condition, so you went from good from 7% to 21%, correct. Viafara responded that it is because the analysis is done randomly in some of the areas, so that is why they are putting together more data, from other roads that could basically increase in terms of the quality than the one we have at the moment. Vein commented that he is just thinking, it looks like we don't do anything and our conditions are increasing, and that doesn't fit with what you would think with aging infrastructure, you would think it would decrease. Viafara agreed, adding that that is the reason.

Viafara commented that they also gave you an idea, also, to see what fair condition really, for a roadway, is. He referred to Page 63, and pointed out it shows the quality of roads rated as fair.

Viagara referred to Page 65, and pointed out that it lists new segments that have been recently repaired, and increased from fair to good or satisfactory conditions. He stated that this indicates that improvements of the overall quality of the pavement conditions in the planning area are taking place.

Vein stated that this is not just the quality of the pavement, right, because South 34th from 23rd Avenue South, just north of 24th Avenue South, all the way down to 32th, there have been some improvements south of 32nd, if he remembers correctly, but otherwise there have been very little improvement, that he knows of, in that section, that would have an increase. Viafara responded that sometimes what happens is, this is subjective, it is a perception, and then with the 3-D

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 16th, 2015**

analysis, and the quality of the type of pavement; one issue that happens here, according to his understanding is that in Grand Forks not all the pavements are the same quality because of the way of how the roadway was built. He said that one explanation is being given that there is one kind of treatment for different kinds of pavement, and when they repair them sometimes they repair just little segments, or little portions, and that allows the overall quality of the network to improve, so the problem may be kind of a spot of repairs in some areas, just a little bit here and a little bit there, that allows the road to maintain the quality of the remaining portion. Kouba added that the other part of the perception is ride quality versus distress of the actual pavement; and our analysis has not taken into effect, into account, the ride quality so it is the intention to start incorporating ride quality into our analysis, but it will have to wait until the next time around when we do our pavement analysis.

Viafara said that, finally, they have presented you, on Page 68, with the latest map indicating the conditions for the pavement in the planning area. He added that this will give you a better idea of where things are improving or where things need attention.

Viafara reported that the Engineering Department is working, feverishly, on putting together a plan to improve some of the ones deemed to be, at the moment, in poor quality, basically to repair them one way or another those segments.

Viafara stated that another very important concern is safety; safety of pedestrians, safety of bicyclists, and the reduction of crashes. He said that if we come to the overall idea, that has been in twice, is a consistent reduction of fatalities in the planning area, nevertheless there have been crash accidents that involve the loss of properties, and damages to the properties, so because of that we have decided to, on Page 85, to provide you with an idea of which locations have the highest number of crashes. He stated that this is based on the data base from North Dakota, and on the analysis of all the intersections in the State, the ones with the highest number of crashes.

Viafara reported that the overall outcome of this is very positive, in terms of fatal accidents; but we continue experiencing some problems due to road conditions, or things of that nature. He added that the most important thing for you to remember is that it is a behavioral issue that is driving these kinds of accidents; drinking and driving continues to be an issue, distracted driving, and seat belts, so those are the main issues for crashes that you will see.

Viafara referred to Page 75, and commented that you will see the locations of the crashes for East Grand Forks as well.

Vein commented that the DeMers and Washington intersection is the second highest ranked intersection for accidents in the State. He added that it has been that way for a number of years he would assume. Haugen responded that it fluctuates, but it has been in the top ten for many years. Vein stated that there was a grade separated alternative for this intersection discussed years ago, and he was wondering if that would be the only solution for it. Haugen responded that it isn't, that there is also something called a continuous flow intersection, which is half the cost and performs considerably better than a grade separation, and doesn't require property buyout.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 16th, 2015**

Viafara reported that they have also provided you with which one of the objectives is being met by the activities of the MPO, in order to perhaps to fulfil the requirements of the planning act, the seven factors or the eight factors that are right in the planning conditions, so if you go to page 96, the ones in yellow are highlighted in this particular report, and the ones that are in green the ones that have been taken from all the studies that are currently being finalized by the MPO.

Haugen summarized by saying that all of the data is trying to allow us to give you some hint as to what the performance trend is on the targets and measures that we have identified in our Long Range Transportation Plan. He stated that there are some that we are able to have data on and to show you that data; and there are others that they still need to get the data for in order to be able to give an idea of what is going on. Viafara added that they are expecting to bring to your attention kind of a finalized draft by the next meeting, so if all of the conditions are met, he would like the board to have an idea of how the MPO is performing in terms of meeting these planning obligations.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. 2015 AWP Project Update

Haugen reported that we do have a month report on where all the studies are, and their progress. He stated that you heard on many of them today, but this captures all of the MPO work program activities, and the status of the past months activities, so this is just for your review to identify and ask any questions you may have.

2. FAST

Haugen stated that FAST is on us now, and there will be some changes, however we still have to do some MAP-21 changes that are still being impacted, and now we will have a couple of additional things on top of MAP-21 that FAST will impose on us.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO ADJOURN THE DECEMBER 16TH, 2015, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 2:02 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Williams reported that the City's Electrician will go over and check the bridge tomorrow morning, with a lumen to measure the candle power per Mr. Powers' request.

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager