

# **2016 MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD MINUTES**

**January 20, 2016**

**February 17, 2016**

**March 16, 2016**

**April 20, 2016**

**May 18, 2016**

**June 15, 2016**

**June 24, 2016**

**July 15, 2016 – Cancelled!**

**August 17, 2016**

**September 21, 2016**

**October 20, 2016**

**November 16, 2016**

**December 21, 2016**

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE  
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mike Powers, Chairman, called the January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016 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: Ken Vein, Clarence Vetter, Gary Malm, Jeannie Mock, Warren Strandell, Steve Adams, Marc DeMers, and Mike Powers.

Absent: None.

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

Guest(s): Mike Yavarow, GF City Engineering; Joe McKinnon, MnDOT Project Manager; and Darren Laesch, MnDOT Planning Director.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Powers declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 16<sup>TH</sup>, 2015, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 16<sup>TH</sup>, 2015, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

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

***Voting No: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF UPDATED EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CONTRACT**

Powers reported that, as noted in the information in the packet, the MPO's employment/benefit policies mirror the City of Grand Forks'. He stated that Grand Forks recently updated several contracts for their contracted employees, and we need to do the same with Mr. Haugen's contract.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Powers explained that back in the early 2000s Grand Forks decided to convert their Department Heads from civil service protection to being contracted employees, and now he thinks they are switching back, but in any event Mr. Haugen's contract is no longer consistent with the standard ones being proposed and ratified in Grand Forks.

Powers referred to the contract and explained that Mr. Haugen and himself went over it in detail a couple of days ago. He then went over the proposed changes briefly, adding that the Grand Forks City Attorney may be making some additional changes, thus we may need to revisit this in the future.

***MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE UPDATES TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CONTRACT, AS PRESENTED.***

DeMers stated that he has two questions. He referred to #3 Benefits – 1(a) and 1(b), vacation hours, and asked if it was PTO that was to be used for holidays as well, or is there also holiday pay. Haugen responded that there is also holiday pay for the listed holidays.

DeMers asked, deferring to Mr. Vein and Ms. Mock, if this was in line with what is being done in Grand Forks. Vein responded that he doesn't know, adding that there are some things in this contract that he has not seen before. He explained that they talked about this, but for himself, although maybe Ms. Mock was more involved at a higher level, but he has not gotten into the details of any individual contract, and he doesn't know who Mr. Powers and Mr. Haugen talked to in Grand Forks, whether it was Mr. Hovland or administration, or someone else. Haugen responded that this was the language the Grand Forks City Council approved at a prior City Council meeting.

Vein asked if Human Resources reviewed this contract. Haugen responded that they haven't reviewed this particular one, but these are the same provisions taken from the City's contracts and inserted into this one. Vein stated that he doesn't remember the 10% that is going to the pension. DeMers said that that was his next question. Vein asked if this is in the other contracts as well. Haugen responded that that has always been in the contracts.

McNelis explained that when the contracts were first developed in Grand Forks the MPO created one for the Executive Director position, and mirrored the Grand Forks contracts exactly. She stated, however, that when the MPO Executive Policy Board approved the original contract they set the amount for the MPO's portion of the pension at 6% rather than the 10% set for the Grand Forks employees. She added that both the City of Grand Forks and the MPO pay 8.26% into the NDPERS Retirement Fund, thus the remaining 1.74% of the 10% will be put into a defined benefit fund such as is done for the Grand Forks employees whose go into an ICMA fund at this time.

DeMers commented that he just wants to make sure that the vacation, because we are talking about four and a half weeks of vacation plus, what is it twelve holidays, is correct. McNelis responded that Grand Forks has nine paid holidays, but added that the 184 hours is for vacation only, there is a separate amount for sick leave, so it isn't actually paid time off (PTO), it is just for vacation.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

McNelis explained that the contracted employees used to have unlimited accrual of vacation, but that was changed to the 552. Vetter stated that that is his question, does Mr. Haugen have \$2,000 - \$3,000 dollars of accrued vacation that we are now going to have pay by the end of the year, and if so do we have the money to do that. Haugen pointed out that the switch is, on vacation, was from unlimited accrual to a cap of 552; and the second clause is that by the end of 2017 he has to decide if he can use what he has in excess of the 552, or ask for reimbursement of those hours. He added that each year we set aside, and take from the grants and others, what the cost of vacation is for all employees, so there is an account set up should he decide to take a payment instead of trying to take the hours. He added that this fund is there so we have the monies should an employee terminate, be terminated, retire, etc., with a balance of vacation and sick leave.

DeMers stated that he doesn't necessarily understand NDPERS, he isn't familiar with their set-up, but he is wondering what the change on the contribution side does, if it is considered a defined benefit program, does that bump you to a different level or something, or, as we were talking about, it is actually 6% to the PERS system and then there is 4% that is actually a defined contribution, or what is going on with the 10%. McNelis responded that 8.26% is what the employer pays into the NDPERS Retirement system, so there would be 1.74% remaining that would go into another plan. DeMers asked where the additional 2.26% over the 6% in the original contract had come from. Haugen responded that back when the original contract was drafted the 6% was 2% higher than what NDPERS required. He stated that since then that requirement has increased to 8.26%, and while the contract was not updated to reflect those changes, payroll was updated as per the requirements of NDPERS.

DeMers said that he would suggest that the better language would be to have a separate item that would tie you to what the contribution needs to be, and then if we want to do some sort of defined contribution plan outside of that have it on its own separate line. He added that it doesn't help Mr. Haugen if over the course of the contract the contribution is affected by the State, and it isn't really clear in the contract. McNelis asked if it maybe should say up to 10%. DeMers responded that he just thinks there should be two separate items, lines, in the contract so 7 1(a) would state that the MPO would contribute the required amount of the employer's share to NDPERS, and 7 1(b) would state the remaining percent of the 10%, currently the 1.74% would go into a defined contribution plan.

Vein asked if there was any employee contribution to the NDPERS plan. Haugen responded that there is. He said that currently the MPO contributes 8.26%, as required by law, and the employee contributes 7%, as the max allowed by law. DeMers said, however, that that is a discretionary amount, you could do 0%, there is no match, so you could do 0% to 7%.

Vein commented that, in essence, this contract is following, pretty much verbatim what the Grand Forks contracted employees have in their contracts. Haugen responded that is true, with the exception of 1b, as there are a couple of the contracted employees that had way in excess of the 552 so their contracts are a little bit different than this 1b, and they have very individualized payouts, or usage timeframes. Vein said, then, that Mr. Haugen's vacation is in excess of the 552. Haugen responded it is. Vein said, however, that it obviously isn't way excessive. Haugen

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

responded that his balance is currently 688 hours. DeMers pointed out that the last line in 1b states “in excess of 522 hours shall be forfeited”, is that correct or should it be 552. McNelis responded that it should be 552, which is three times the 184 hours allocated each year.

Vein stated that he thinks we need to amend the motion to make the correction from 522 to 552 in 1(b). Haugen agreed, adding that you also mentioned adding a 7 1(a) and 1(b), as well. DeMers commented that it maybe could state that the MPO will contribute 10%, which helps cap the cost to the organization, of the employee’s annual salary to the NDPERS Plan, with any remaining percentage over the amount allowed by law to a defined benefit plan. He said that he thinks it should be left as a variable, not necessarily a percentage, a variable of whatever the State Legislature sets, and then he would say that if the Legislature would go over the 10% there would be an automatic increase to the new percent required. Vein stated that he would think that if the percentage changes it would come back to the Executive Policy Board for approval, because even if State Law changes we have a contract for this amount, so any time changes are required to the contract it will need to come back to the board for approval. Powers reiterated that the last sentence states that it is anticipated that sometime in 2016 the contract will need to be updated again, so we will probably be doing this again.

Vein said that he can go either way, he is comfortable the way it is. DeMers agreed that he is too, but sometimes he just likes to make sure that we are saying what we want to say in a contract, and not leave it for too much interpretation, but he understands that we have been able to make it work in the past, so he is fine with going forward with the typo change.

***MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE AMENDING THE ORIGINAL MOTION TO INCLUDE A CHANGE IN ITEM 3 1(B) FROM 522 TO 552.***

Vetter asked if we want to make any changes to 7, are we going to break it into two paragraphs. Vein responded that he is comfortable with the way it is as it will come back if there are any changes made. Vetter stated that he agrees with Mr. DeMers, he thinks that we should define that we are going to meet NDPERS’ requirements, and then in the second paragraph state that anything over and above that requirement, up to a maximum 10% contribution will go into another defined contribution plan, because NDPERS could actually come in two years from now, when the markets turn around, and lower the requirement, so, it is two different things and we want that clarified.

***ROLL CALL VOTE:***

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

***Voting No: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: None.***

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE CONTRACT, AS AMENDED, SUBJECT TO ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE FOR ITEM 7 BE DRAFTED AND BROUGHT BACK TO THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD FOR DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL AT THE FEBRUARY 17<sup>TH</sup>, 2016, MEETING.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

*Voting Yes: Adams, Vetter, Vein, Mock, Strandell, DeMers, and Powers.*  
*Voting No: Malm.*  
*Abstain: None.*  
*Absent: None.*

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

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that, as you are aware, the aesthetic lighting has been installed. He stated that, as you will recall, the initial viewpoint, particularly of the Grand Forks Historic Preservation Commission, was to keep it white as much as possible, however if you have noticed the lighting at night has not been white. He said that they have since agreed to a one year trial, and so, as you currently see it they have the winter blue theme going on with the lights, and they have also set up a holiday lighting schedule, and how the colors will be changed for each. He commented that there has also been a tentative agreement made among the committee that if a local sporting team were to win a championship they would allow a color change to that team's colors for a period of time.

Haugen stated that the final document is still being drafted, and once completed will be vetted through the two City Councils for adoption.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen commented that when discussions were held on the Sorlie lighting, an option was presented for the Kennedy that they could just use the same language used for the Sorlie but it was noted that the NEPA process for the Kennedy is different, so there may be a little more latitude offered for the Kennedy for its lighting themes than was given the Sorlie, so they are advising not to just take the Sorlie Light Plan, but instead to figure out the Kennedy Light Plan separately.

Vein asked if the NEPA process was different for the Kennedy because of a different classification of the roadway. Haugen responded that the Sorlie is on Historic Preservation Register, while the Kennedy is eligible, but not actually on it.

Haugen asked which NEPA process is the Kennedy going through. McKinnon responded that the Kennedy is going through a categorical exclusion, a non-problematic, little bit longer version of the NEPA process.

Haugen reported that, you will recall, a couple of months ago the MPO Executive Policy Board sent a letter about the bike/ped accommodations, and MnDOT sent a reply, after which this body asked that MnDOT come before the board for discussion on their response, and this was their first available date. He stated that Mr. McKinnon is the Project Manager on the Kennedy Bridge Project; and Mr. Laesch is the Planning Engineer for the District, so they are here to hold a discussion on the bike/ped accommodations, either as they stand on the Kennedy, or future potential of a separate structure.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

McKinnon explained that he is the Project Manager with the MnDOT District Office out of Bemidji, and is involved with the rehab of the Kennedy Bridge. He stated that they have hired a consulting firm, SRF, to assist them with the project; but, as the project got started of course, as just mentioned the Kennedy is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, so as they looked at what to do with the bridge they had to evaluate if a rehab was feasible and prudent, and that study was done and it was found that a rehab is feasible and prudent, and that it has to be done in a manner that is consistent with a historic bridge and with the Secretary of Interior Guidelines.

McKinnon reported that some of the big deficiencies they found was that the first pier on the North Dakota side is severely tipping; that the deck condition was very aged; and then mobility of bikes and peds across the bridge needed to be addressed. He said that these were some big needs or deficiencies.

McKinnon stated that as they worked to balance those needs, they came up with a cross-section, however he does not have a sketch of it at this time. He explained, however, that what it would show is that there will be four lanes of traffic, and those lanes will be 11-feet 6-inches wide, and there will be no concrete barrier in the center as there is today. He said that there will also be two four-foot three-inch wide side shoulders on each side; and a bike/ped facility added to the north side that it will be separated by a small concrete barrier, and that will be the same elevation as the deck of the driving surface of the bridge. He said that that trail will be eight-feet nine-inches wide, and follows all those dimensions that fall into their guidelines as they look at bridges.

McKinnon commented that the railings will be removed and new ones put on once the deck is completed. He said that those new railings will look just like the existing ones, as this was an important feature of the historic part of the bridge, so they will be constructed to look like the existing ones.

McKinnon reported that some structural items underneath the bridge will be worked on, and there will also be some pigeon abatement will be done to try to cover up some of the holes that pigeons occupy today, and there will be paving and lighting of the bridge structure. He added that there will also be a couple of things done off the bridge, especially on the Minnesota side. He explained that if they add that eight-foot nine-inch wide trail; there is no sidewalk at all on the Minnesota side, so they will be adding a sidewalk that will go down the on-ramp to the bottom; and on the North Dakota side there will just be a short area added to connect with the sidewalk.

McKinnon stated that they also looked at adding some signature features, and consulted with the local community to see what they would like to see; so a plaque, located in the middle of the bridge, and some stamping on the concrete trail are being proposed, and will be run by the historical authorities.

McKinnon said that the consultant prepared what they call a Rehab Report, and the final version was completed in October of 2015, and it explained in detail those items he just talked about

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

briefly; what is going to happen to the bridge and how they are preserving the historic character of the bridge. He stated that this went before the Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office, and on December 14<sup>th</sup>, they approved the plan, agreeing it is preserving the historic character of the bridge, and are following the guidelines of the Secretary of the Interior. He added that they also heard back from the Grand Forks Historic Preservation Commission, and they had some items of concern with the rehab that they will be following up on. He explained that they felt that the lighting needs to have an operation plan; and they want us to look more seriously at the interpretive plaque, if it is really proper, as they have a concern that it will become a maintenance issue and eyesore in the future; and then they want us to look once more at the barrier that is going to be between the driving lane and the bike/ped path, whether or not it will obscure the vision of the outside railing, so they want it evaluated thoroughly, which they will be working with the Grand Forks Historic Preservation Commission on these issues.

McKinnon stated that they are at the 30% stage of the plan, so the plan is about 30% done, they have quite a ways to go yet and their plan is to let it on September of 2016 so that the project can be underway right after that.

McKinnon reiterated that on the Minnesota side they will be building a sidewalk that will come off the end of the bridge, will go down the on-ramp to the bottom. He stated that this is all located on the Minnesota State Trunk Right-of-Way, but then as the Federal Highway Administration have been involved the concern they had was what the plan is for where that trail will go, where will it link up, so they want to engage with the City of East Grand Forks on how they can cooperate with them on linking it to the Greenway Trail. He pointed out that there are several options available to do this; and while it won't be included in the bridge project, they want to cooperate and work with the City on how it can be done in the future.

DeMers asked if he is correct that Grand Forks Historical Preservation Commission is opposed to having something potentially being an eyesore in the future, because that is a little ironic for them to oppose putting something up that may not look good in 50 years, or whatever. McKinnon responded that the need for an interpretive plaque in the middle of the bridge is being evaluated, and their staff person is concerned about the maintenance and durability of it. Powers asked how big the plaque would be. McKinnon responded that it would be something for pedestrians to observe as they are walking on the bridge. Powers asked if it would be similar to what is on the Sorlie. McKinnon responded that it would perhaps be similar to that, but it hasn't been designed yet, nor have they figured out how to attach it to the bridge.

DeMers asked, going back to the bike path connection; so if we take the connection part of it out of the project, are we vulnerable to losing funding, or is it that we wouldn't be funded and that is why we need to take it out, and there is a potential for some funding. McKinnon responded that if you did it with the Federal Highway's authority, they said that they can understand why you are doing it that way, keeping it on the right-of-way, but you need to engage in some discussion with the City as to how you are going to work with them in the future to get something so that you can connect to the Greenway Trail, they don't just want us to leave it, or leave it in the hands of the City, but perhaps we can cooperate together on something down the road, some short connection, but they didn't want to design it themselves, and with the trees that are there, and the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

change in grade, and there are some low areas, they didn't want to put something in there that might not be the best for that City property. DeMers commented, however, that you also don't want to be accused of creating a path to nowhere. McKinnon agreed, adding that that is what their Federal Office in St. Paul said, that it needs to be timely, and they would like to see something as they approve the environmental document, some correspondence that they are following up on. DeMers asked, though, if they think there is potential for state funding for something on that connect. McKinnon responded that there is. He explained that as he talked to their bridge and historic staff they have seen this done before.

Vein reiterated that, as he has said before, he has always had issues with the change of the cross section of this bridge to accommodate bicycle paths at the expense of the safety of drivers, that is just the bottom line he is coming from, and he finds it further kind of ironic that now we have a bike path it leads to nowhere, it doesn't even connect. McKinnon commented that it connects to the City street. Vein asked if he is saying that the bike path on the north side on the Minnesota side will connect to the street. McKinnon responded that it will. Vein said, then, that it connects to the street but it doesn't connect to a bike path. Vetter responded that it will. He added that East Grand Forks is pretty committed to having that connect. Vein stated, though, that it isn't a part of the bridge project. McKinnon responded that it is not a part of the bridge project.

Vein said that this is bothersome to him because, for the amount of usage he can see this path having, he just cannot understand why they have prioritized the path over the safety of drivers. Powers asked if his concern is with the lack of a barrier. Vein responded that his concern is with the narrowing of the lanes and the lack of a barrier in the middle of the bridge. Powers stated that he would agree with that 100%, adding that he sees no reason why we need to have an eight and a half foot wide bike path, when studies have shown that three people want to cross that bridge on a bicycle in the last six months, when this was looked at last summer.

Powers commented that it seems like every time you pick up the paper, as of late, you see an accident on the overpass, where the cars are going all over the place because there isn't anything to help keep them going straight, on their side of the road. He added that another question he has is why we are replacing the rails. McKinnon responded that if they take the deck off the rails have to come off. He said that they are removing 100% of the in-place concrete, and the deck and the railings are on top of that concrete, and you cannot remove one without the other. Powers stated that he was just curious because to him there isn't anything wrong with the existing rails.

Vein stated that he also has a question about the dip on the East Grand Forks side. McKinnon responded that they are going to raise the one lane five-tenths of a foot or six-tenths of a foot so it matches the other lane elevation. Vein commented that he was hoping that maybe we can make that into a corridor that can be used regardless of the floods, and the raising of that was probably the point of his biggest concern, because that what closes the bridge, those lower elevations. McKinnon agreed, adding that that is why they will bring that lane up so it matches the other lane elevation. Vein said that this will be an improvement, but it certainly doesn't solve the entire issue at all. McKinnon responded that that would be something beyond matching that elevation, it would require going higher and would be a separate project.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Vein commented that, when we talked about this before, he asked about the possibility of looking at what is happening on the Sorlie Bridge, what is happening on the Kennedy Bridge, and at the potential for a future bike/pedestrian bridge that would accommodate both, and maybe connect with something on both sides. He asked what the feasibility or potential is for something like that. McKinnon referred to Darren Laesch, MnDOT Planning Director, who would have input on future projects such as this. Vein commented that, knowing it isn't there, and knowing that there are some restrictions with where you are today, he can buy this project if there is something that we can plan for in the future. He pointed out that we used to have such a structure with the old Railroad Bridge, but it was removed after the 1997 flood, and now with these two bridge projects couldn't we be planning for something in the future.

Laesch reported that, in looking at federal funding sources, he thinks the only option that really jumps out to him would be the Transportation Alternatives Program, and in his District they have about \$400,000 a year that goes out to local entities for bike/ped improvements, so that would be eligible for such an improvement, but probably only half of the bridge would be eligible, so North Dakota would have to fund the other half. He stated that looking at other State funding options, as far as on the MnDOT side it would have to be on Trunk Highway Right-of-Way so you are almost looking at the Kennedy Bridge and the Sorlie Bridge making improvements on there first, and so that is kind of where they look at this because we can accommodate peds and bikes on the Kennedy Bridge, so that is why they focus on that to ensure they get a cross section to accomplish that. He added that the Sorlie Bridge would have had a similar process except that they discovered the structural integrity was there and that we can get another 20 years out of it, but when it comes due for a major rehab they will be looking at bike and ped facilities on that crossing as well.

Laesch stated that both these bridges are funded out of Minnesota's Chapter 152 Program, that is why they were programmed, and there was a clause in there that stated that all bridges in that program have to be upgraded to have ped and bike facilities. He explained that if they couldn't get the ped and bike facility on the bridge a separate ped and bike bridge would be eligible, but it would have to be within a quarter of a mile of the existing bridge, so that was something that probably more strongly considered with the Sorlie Bridge, but that would probably be your only option for State and Federal funds from the MnDOT side.

Vein asked if they had a rough idea of what a separate bridge would cost. Laesch responded that he did not look into the cost of a separate bridge. Vein stated that it was mentioned that one could cost up to \$600,000 within the District. Haugen commented that back when they did the Sorlie, when they were first looking at doing the bridges, they did an engineering report, and that report showed that a separate bike/ped bridge near the Sorlie would cost around \$3,000,000.

Haugen reported that, as the MPO has talked with Mr. Laesch, and as you heard last month, this year we are going to be updating our local bike/ped plan. He said that Mr. Viafara will be leading that task, and that will be an opportunity to engage both cities and both DOTs on trying to see if we still have that desire. He stated that our current Bike/Ped Plan says that we do want a third bike/ped bridge across the Red River, we have two now, and a third one has been planned

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

between the Sorlie and the Kennedy bridges. He added that MnDOT is updating their Statewide Bike/Ped Plan; and the District will be engaging in District bike planning, so this year we will have coordination and communication occurring as we update our plan.

Laesch commented that he thinks the best option would be looking more at the Sorlie Bridge and whether they can accommodate the peds and bikes from the Sorlie onto this separate bridge so that in the future when they do that project they wouldn't have to be accommodating peds and bikes on that bridge, but they would have to have a bridge located pretty darn close to the Sorlie. Vein stated that he disagrees with locating it closer to the Sorlie, he would rather see it closer to the Kennedy Bridge because in the future then they could maybe align the lanes the way they would like them to be because we would have a bridge within a quarter of a mile, or so, and it seems to him to make better planning sense.

Haugen reported that the biggest challenge will be accommodating the floodway with a new structure. He explained that in the past that is why they gravitated towards reusing the old railroad bridge pier because it didn't introduce a new obstruction to the floodway, but that doesn't get you closer to the Kennedy Bridge, so there will have to do follow-up studies, and there might be a restriction on CPG Planning funds where we might have to ask our State DOTs if they could help us figure out more of a hydraulic issue and location of new structure.

Vetter commented that he understands that we aren't going to have the barrier between the traffic lanes on the bridge, but right now we have the barrier lane on the approach on the Minnesota side, will we continue to have that barrier on the approach. McKinnon responded that most of it will be removed because of the need to shift, as your heading on the Minnesota side, to go across the bridge, you will need to shift the right-of-way so it comes out on the Minnesota side, so the concrete curb will be coming out. Vetter asked if they were going to replace it to match the new alignment. McKinnon responded that you really can't do that because you don't have the width, they don't have the ability to have that width across the bridge to have a concrete median. He stated that there may be a small stub of it right at the beginning of it way on the east side where it is very wide, but you can't go very far to the west as there isn't enough width to have it. Vetter said that he thinks most of the concern on the East Grand Forks side was coming on the on ramp, in the winter months, without that median there vehicles will slide across into traffic, right now they bump the median and correct themselves, but without it they will slide right into oncoming traffic.

Haugen asked if the project will modify the on-ramp. McKinnon responded that the grade will be modified slightly, but by no more than six inches to match the elevation. He added that he is aware that there is some crash history but nothing that stands out. Vetter responded that it is because the existing median saves them now and nothing gets reported, you bounce off the concrete and keep going, but now you're going to have all kinds of crashes when you take that median out. McKinnon stated that he will perhaps follow up a little more on this, but it wasn't found to be an issue when they looked at that location. Powers said, let the record show that there are a few of us here today that are telling you that it is going to be an issue, and he is one of them. McKinnon commented that the concern would be, why are they hitting that barrier. Powers responded it is due to winter driving conditions. Vetter added that it is due to driver

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

error, that is why they are hitting it, but again, they are hitting it and continuing on so there are no records of how many hits that are actually occurring. Powers asked, then, why they put it there in the first place. Vetter stated, again, if you don't have it there you are going to have all kinds of data, and two or three years from now we will be coming back to you saying, look at the crash data, you need to put in a barrier, and you should have done it three years ago when you did the bridge. McKinnon reiterated that he will follow up on this some more, but it didn't stand out during the study of the bridge.

DeMers asked, going back to the issue of modifications to the on-ramp, is there a way to make it so you have a longer entrance lane, because you have a 45 and you're right into traffic, there is no merge lane. McKinnon responded that it is just so tight there they don't have the ability to extend it because the bridge is right there. DeMers said, though, that at some point once you get close enough to where you will be leaving the bridge structure with the path, could you move that back to where it isn't impacting the structure anymore. McKinnon responded, again, there just isn't any room to do that, it is just so small, there just isn't any room to make any change there. Vein commented that you would have to redesign the on-ramp to do it, you can do it, it is just going to be more extensive.

Vetter commented that he just hopes the State is right, that they prove him wrong, he just doesn't think that will be the case. Laesch stated that the way he looks at this is, it is a four foot median, four inches high, so if a vehicle is out of control, it will fly over it, it gives you the illusion that you have a barrier between traffic, but it is not truly a barrier. He added that he doesn't know how slow a vehicle has to go to hit it and bounce off of it, but it would have to be pretty slow, anything significantly faster would not stop the vehicle. Vetter responded that the future will tell, and, again, he hopes he is proven wrong.

Information only.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF MINNESOTA FY2017-2020 T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS**

Haugen reported that last month we approved the North Dakota side FY2017-2020 T.I.P. Candidate Projects, this month we are approving the Minnesota side. He said that last month, particularly at the Technical Advisory Committee there were questions about the Recreational Trails Program on the North Dakota side, so he included that information in the packet today so you are aware of what recreational trail is and to give a little more detail. He explained that it is somewhat similar to the TAP or Transportation Alternative Program, but not exactly the same.

Haugen pointed out that on the North Dakota side there is a project cost minimum of \$10,000, and a maximum of \$200,000 set for projects submittal, and it does go through the MPO vetting process, with a due date that has already passed. He stated that applications are submitted to the Park and Rec Department. He said that on the Minnesota side it is slightly different, it does not run through the T.I.P./S.T.I.P. Programs, and the minimum is \$1,000 and the maximum is \$150,000, and the match ratio is 75/25 while the North Dakota ratio is 80/20.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request), and went over it briefly. Presentation ensued.

Haugen referred to a slide illustrating the project submittal area, and explained that anything in the shaded area that is regionally significant needs to be in our T.I.P. document; so not just those in the City limits, but those in the rural area as well.

Haugen commented that, again, as mentioned last month with FAST, there is still implementation that has to take place, and we aren't sure of all the impacts, so what we do today is subject to change.

Haugen stated that on the North Dakota side the only difference is that the expenses are at a 4% cost per year, and the Minnesota side is at a 5% cost per year, which is consistent with our planning document.

Haugen reported that for the Transportation Alternative Program only the City of East Grand Forks submitted a project to us, and it is implementation of a recommendation made on a recently approved Bygland Road Study, and that is for a bike lane on Bygland Road at a total project cost of \$484,392.00, and the federal request is \$344,436.00. He said that staff is recommending that it is consistent with our documents, and since it is the only project that it be given the highest priority ranking.

Haugen referred to a drawing that shows a bike lane on Bygland Road, and explained that there is an axillary bike route as well to create more of a network on the Point area besides just a bike lane down the roadway, that is what the application is requesting. Powers asked if the bikepath is on the south side of Bygland. Haugen responded that it is a bike lane so it is on both sides of the roadway. Haugen commented that parking will be maintained, most likely, on the westerly side of Bygland Road, and then there will be a bike lane for southbound, a driving lane for southbound, a driving lane for northbound, and a bike lane for northbound traffic, and that is all within the current concrete that is out there.

Haugen stated that there will also be some bike routing signage requested to show how to get back to the greenway trails.

Strandell asked how you get this up to a \$500,000 project cost. Haugen responded that it is due somewhat to the type of material they are using. He explained that the painting of the bike lanes, the striping, is a thermal plastic, retroreflective, grinded in material in order for longer wear. Vetter commented that it is his understanding that they are going to put the bike lanes on this summer, and this project is for the grinding and painting of the lanes, and they feel it will last a lot longer. Haugen responded that he isn't sure if this will be done this summer, but he has heard some talk that they would like to do it this summer.

DeMers asked about the axillary lanes, and if there will be striping or just signage, such as on 19<sup>th</sup> and Greenway to the bike lane. Haugen responded that that is correct. He referred to a drawing and pointed out that the red lined areas will have mostly signage.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen stated that the next review will be on the street side. He reported that there are currently three years that overlap in all of our T.I.P.s, so we look at the current three years to see if there are any changes occurring, adding that we weren't informed of any changes on the Minnesota side, however we have several changes on the North Dakota side.

Haugen commented that the new year is 2020. He explained that East Grand Forks is on an every fourth year cycle for the City Sub-Target Program, so 2018 is our current one. He stated that 2022 would be the next one, so there isn't any potential project in 2020.

Haugen stated that beyond 2020, MnDOT does a 10-Year Capital Program; and as noted there are two projects showing up in that 10-year plan proposal. He said that neither of those two projects occur in our Long Range Plan, and Mr. Laesch and himself are working out the process to amend the Long Range Transportation Plan to bring those two projects in.

Haugen explained that one of the projects; going back to the Kennedy Bridge issue with the on-ramp, is MnDOTs desire to replace the bridge over River Road and 4<sup>th</sup> Street. He said that he mentioned to them that the language that we will want to see is not something that is tied down to bridge replacement, but something that includes the potential of raising River Road/4<sup>th</sup> Street to at-grade so that the on-ramps and off-ramps are eliminated as it would be an at-grade intersection, but you can see that that bridge is being looked at for total replacement.

Haugen summarized that in the future you will see us bringing an amendment for the Long Range Transportation Plan to bring these two projects in; one is just a reconstruction of U.S. Highway 2, westbound from Fisher to East Grand Forks, but the second project is where they currently just identified replacing the bridge over River Road and 4<sup>th</sup> Street and we are asking them to modify it to make sure the cost estimate is enough to be able to bring it up to at-grade level and not replacing the bridge instead.

Haugen reported that there were no modifications to existing projects on the Minnesota side; the one TAP application is consistent with our planning documents; and there were no other projects to consider at this time. He added that he did highlight in an e-mail that the TAC did not have a quorum at their meeting last week, so the recommendation is only from staff to approve these projects as being consistent with the plan and to prioritize them as identified.

Vein asked for clarification on the Kennedy Bridge major rehab project. Haugen responded that it is currently programmed on the Minnesota side in 2017. He explained that they are going to bid it in September of 2016; and on the North Dakota side it is programmed as a 2016 project, with most of the work taking place in 2017.

Haugen commented that East Grand Forks has their fourth year cycle for City Sub-Target funds, and currently they have it in the T.I.P. to turn some gravel into concrete over by the Water and Light Department. He added that neither State or County has identified any projects within the four years of the T.I.P.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

DeMers asked what the process would be if the City would want to change the 2018 project to a different project, is it something that would have to come from the bottom up. Haugen responded that the City Council would have to present the change to the MPO as a consideration to amend the T.I.P. He added that he did give staff the timeline, and explained that the timing kind of depends on when they want to do the project. He stated that the State's Fiscal Year starts in July of 2017, so after July of 2017 you get into the 2018 Fiscal Year, and that is the year the City is programmed to receive the City Sub-Target monies. He said that they need to get their NEPA project developed prior to that, and you can't sign off on the project until it is in the T.I.P., so he has identified to City staff this process.

DeMers said, then, that if you want to do a project in the latter half of 2017, you could use the 2018 funding to do it, and start construction July 1<sup>st</sup> 2017. Haugen responded that he told staff that we can amend the current T.I.P. up to about July, but when we get to August we are then approving a new T.I.P. so we wouldn't want to amend the old T.I.P. at the same time, so depending on when you want to do the project you will need to back date when you want to have the T.I.P. amended. He said that if you want to do the project in 2018, you wouldn't necessarily have to amend the current T.I.P., we could address it in the fall when we adopt the new T.I.P., or next year we could amend the T.I.P. this time next year to bring it in.

***MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY MALM, 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.***

***ROLL CALL VOTE:***

***Voting Yes: Adams, Vetter, Vein, Mock, Malm, DeMers, and Powers.***

***Voting No: Strandell.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN UPDATE RFP**

Kouba reported that the Transit Development Plan is part of the MPO's Long Range Transportation Plan, and we are beginning the process of updating our Long Range Transportation, thus the need to update the Transit Development Plan as well.

Kouba stated that we are putting out an RFP to hire a consultant to assist us with the update process. She commented that there are several points that the local transit agency is requesting be looked at with this process as they want to ensure that they can have an efficient system, so one of the main things they want looked at the efficiency of the routes to make sure we get the most service out of the equipment we have.

Kouba commented that this will be a year-long project in which we will attempt to get as much information from the users, as well as the people who potentially could become users, and this is the proposal we are setting forth to accomplish this.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen reported that he would like to highlight the budget aspect of this project. He referred to the staff report, and pointed out that we currently have \$100,000 budgeted for a consultant; which was based on earlier conversations a year ago with transit operators to do a standard update to a Transit Development Plan, but we met with them last fall and at that point they indicated that the system needs to have a major revision done to it, so because of the additional work involved in doing a more thorough update we are seeking additional funds to get the budget up to \$150,000. He said that currently our intent is to try to get the State of Minnesota to fund, if not all of the \$50,000, a good chunk of it, and the City of East Grand Forks Transit Operator has been communicating with MnDOT, and has been given a favorable replies from MnDOT staff, but we have not been awarded the funds at this time, so we are asking this body to release the RFP with that dollar amount identified, knowing before we hire someone we will have resolved our budget issue, whether we can raise the budget or not. Haugen added that if MnDOT cannot fund the full \$50,000, there are some projects in our current budget that could be revised to free up the necessary monies to fund the additional work.

Vein asked, if you don't get the \$50,000, would you still do the study and would the RFP language change. Haugen responded that it would be part of the negotiation down to where our actual budget would be. Vein said, then, that the RFP can stay the same regardless of which dollar amount, but the scope of work will change. Haugen responded it would if we can't reach the \$150,000 budget. DeMers suggested that maybe we could start with \$100,000, and work up. He said that it seems like a lot of the time we end up with consultants that just have nickels to spare before they get to our budget number. He added that he knows the scope of work is probably closer to the \$150,000 budget amount, but it would be interesting to see what happens if you propose a lower amount and then got the additional money and do a change over to the RFP at that time. Haugen explained that the problem would be if we went another \$50,000 to \$100,000 that would be a 50% increase and it would be very difficult getting it through our State and Federal partners to amend the contract, as it would appear we didn't properly scope it out and give a fair playing field to all the potential proposers, so that is why we go to this end of the process where we identify what the potential budget would be if we get the proposals all bidding on the same basic project, select the best firm, open up their cost estimate and if it is way over budget then negotiate it to a project that they are willing to be compensated for and one that we are willing to accept.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE RELEASE OF THE TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN UPDATE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS, AS PRESENTED.***

***ROLL CALL VOTE:***

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

***Voting No: Malm.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: None.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE I-29 STUDY FOR ALERUS  
TRAFFIC ANALYSIS**

Haugen reported that in the packet was a copy of the proposed contract amendment for this study. He explained that, as you are aware, we are doing a study of the I-29 Corridor, and we did the existing conditions report and presented it last month; but in working with the Steering Committee the question was raised concerning whether the Alerus Center traffic, during major events, is reflected in that existing conditions document or not.

Haugen commented that as they worked through the Alerus plans, etc., they noticed that none of the I-29 ramps are part of any of the Alerus traffic plans, so the short answer is that we really don't know what a major event at the Alerus Center does to the I-29 operations, so an amendment was proposed to add an additional \$17,000 to the \$175,000 budgeted for this study.

Haugen stated that in looking at our budget, and knowing that we are trying to get \$150,000 for the Transit Development Plan, he mentioned that there really isn't any funds available from the MPO, there isn't \$17,000 available, so the City of Grand Forks said that they would be willing to fund 100% of the \$17,000, and that is what is being proposed today.

Vein commented that this actually went through the City Council at last night's meeting, to approve the \$17,000; but the question has been asked, it seems to him that it should have been in the scope of work in the first place, and he isn't pointing fingers at anybody, but it seems obvious that it should have been considered that if you're going to study I-29, the impacts an event would have on the corridor should have been included in the study. He added that his thinking is, why isn't that somehow an MPO issue and not just resting with the City of Grand Forks.

Vein stated that he heard that with the additional work we are going to do with the Transit Development Plan, where would the money come from, but on the same token it still should come through the MPO. He added that he understands that not everybody is going to get everything perfect, so as you look at the scope of work and you come back and see that something was missed, you add it back in, it needs to be done, the study needs to be done, all of that is good, it is just that he is having issues with is why the additional funding would solely be coming from Grand Forks when it should be part of the whole MPO funding.

Haugen reported that in our current work program all of the dollars are allocated to different activities. He stated that for this study we did our maximum budget for it, so if we are going to add \$17,000 to the budget, we would need to take \$17,000 from another program. Vein asked what possibilities there are to do that. Haugen referred to the current MPO Work Program, and pointed out the different activities and the amount funded for each; and explained that in looking at it earlier we do have \$15,000 set aside for technical assistance, which are funds that are available for things that come up, little spot studies for our member jurisdictions and such that we don't have to have specifically listed in the work program, that could be moved to cover a portion of the \$17,000, otherwise we would be taking monies that have been allocated to these other activities and reducing them down, and our budget is tight.

Discussion on potential funding options ensued.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Vein commented that he thinks we need to approve the \$17,000, but he would like to see, at some point, if there is a way to find where those funds could come from, or are there no changes allowed once we approve the \$17,000 from the City to get it from another fund down the road. Haugen responded that he thinks that if you make the motion language to state that it should be sufficient.

***MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE AN AMENDMENT TO THE I-29 TRAFFIC OPERATIONS STUDY FOR AN ALERUS TRAFFIC ANALYSIS, AT A COST OF \$17,000.00 TO BE PAID FOR BY THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS, SUBJECT TO A REQUEST THAT MPO STAFF ATTEMPT TO SECURE THE FUNDS NECESSARY TO REFUND THE \$17,000.00 BACK TO THE CITY OF GRAND FORKS.***

Haugen reiterated that we have the ability to go up to \$15,000.00 of the \$17,000.00, so if you would like to make that a part of the motion you would have \$15,000.00 covered, thus the City would only possibly be responsible for \$2,000.00. Vein commented that if they could get \$15,000.00, he would feel fine with that.

DeMers asked for an example of what some of those dollars were spent on last year. Haugen responded that off the top of his head he can't. DeMers asked if there was typically a balance left in that item. Haugen responded that last year the Technical Assistance actually rolled into the Glasston Railroad Crossing Study, along with the monies saved from not having a Senior Planner for half of the year; that is how we funded the Glasston Study.

DeMers stated that he would agree with Mr. Vein; if they are going to do the analysis, but as the budget progresses, or at the end have some sort of reconciliation done to see what we can do to cover the \$17,000.00. Vein responded that he has no problem with either scenario; when it comes to either one he just wants us to take a look to see if there are funds available because he thinks it is perfect part of that project, and a significant part of the study, so if do that we can just leave what he originally said, and take a look at funding options at the end of the year.

Vetter asked where we got the funding for the original study. Haugen responded that it is our annual allocation of consolidated planning grant funds. Malm asked what it wasn't included in the first place. Haugen responded that, as Mr. Vein mentioned, a lot of eyes looked at the scope of work, but it was still missed.

Vetter asked if they hadn't already made some recommendations for corrections to the onramp and the lights so that the traffic won't back up on I-29 anyway, does this study really need to be done. Haugen responded that the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Signal Coordination Study you just saw last month does have this information for the northbound on-ramp, a recommendation of a video detection pre-emption, but it is just for the one ramp; it didn't look at the other three ramps. He added that it will look at all three interchanges; 32<sup>nd</sup>, DeMers, and Gateway Drive, those three interchanges. He explained what the study will actually entail.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

***ROLL CALL VOTE:***

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

***Voting No:*** Malm.

***Abstain:*** None.

***Absent:*** None.

**MATTER OF DRAFT 2045 EGF LAND USE PLAN UPDATE**

Kouba reported that there is a public meeting scheduled for this evening to present the highlights of the draft plan; which is what is available for public comments and input. She added that this was also presented to the East Grand Forks Planning Commission as well.

Kouba commented that they are gathering input on the draft itself; and basically they have the updated goals, future land use, how they are going to phase in the future land use, three area concepts that are for future usage, and an implementation plan or listing of the goals of how they are going to implement these goals, what they need to do, and who needs to be in charge as well as who is supporting that entity that is in charge.

Kouba stated that they have two new categories of land use; they are both mixed uses, a mixed use of commercial and residential and a mixed use of industrial and commercial. She said that there is a lot of commercial type businesses that are heavily related to industrial, so having them close together and being able to complement each other is highly valued; and then there is the commercial and residential usages, much like the apartment/commercial space down the street.

Kouba reported that this is just introducing those new concepts, and letting people give their input on them and how they think they will work for this area. She stated that the report is available on-line if anyone would like to give a thorough reading of the document, and comments will be received until February 1<sup>st</sup>.

Vein asked if they get a lot of comments from the public when you have something like this. Kouba responded that it depends upon on what is being brought forward. She stated that for something like this they might not get as much as they would like. Vein commented that he is just wondering who is even looking at it to comment. Kouba responded that they do have their federal and state partners who do look at, and comment, and then we make sure to track those comments as well as what has been done in response to them. Powers commented that there were a lot of people at the public meetings for the Bygland Road Study.

**MATTER OF DRAFT PERFORMANCE MATRIX REPORT**

Haugen commented that, instead of the approach they have been using for this item in the past, he asked Mr. Viafara to highlight, and put together a power point presentation. He stated that only half of the information will be given today, and the other half at our next meeting.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

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

Presentation ensued.

Vein stated that, in general, where we saw traffic volume increases, but we are seeing pavement quality decrease, is that a correct generalization. Haugen responded that it is. DeMers added that this is true on the State system, but the local roadways seem like they are improving. Haugen commented that the local system has more new streets on it, where the State system is older. Viafara added that considering the local, you have to remember that some roads were in place before the Flood of 1997, and they suffered really drastically after that.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

1. 2016 AWP Project Update

Haugen reported that this is just a recap, annually on the items that we are working on, the progress of those reports, and we are progressing along as the work program identified we would be.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO ADJOURN THE JANUARY 20<sup>TH</sup>, 2016,  
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:56 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE  
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, February 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mike Powers, Chairman, called the February 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016 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: Clarence Vetter, Gary Malm, Warren Strandell, Steve Adams, Marc DeMers, and Mike Powers.

Absent: Ken Vein and Jeanne Mock.

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

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 20<sup>TH</sup>, 2016, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 20<sup>TH</sup>, 2016, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Yes: Malm, Adams, Vetter, Strandell, DeMers, and Powers.***

***Voting No: None.***

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

Haugen reported that there aren't any updates on either bridge at this time.

**MATTER OF 2016 SPRING FLOOD OUTLOOK**

Haugen reported that this is something we annually do at this time of year just to give everyone the latest information available on the outlook of the spring, but more importantly the last page is

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

a contact list for both sides of the river in the event we do have to do some major flood fighting, these are the names of the contact people for the various flood event entities and their phone numbers.

Haugen commented that at this time the probability of a severe flood event is very minimal, with the worst thing that may happen is that the underpass at River Road and 4<sup>th</sup> may close, but all three bridges should remain open, based on the flood profiles that are being predicted to date, of course this is subject to change.

Haugen stated that this information will be on the next agenda with any additional updated information, as well as any changes needed to the list of contacts. He said that the Technical Advisory Committee is looking the list over at this time and will inform us if any adjustments are necessary.

Powers said that this may not be the correct time to ask this, but he is wondering if when we redo 4<sup>th</sup> Street overpass, is there any possibility that we could do something to eliminate flooding in the park. Haugen responded that last month they had discussion about raising it up to an at-grade intersection; and so they will be looking at doing this within the next couple of years.

Haugen stated that the MnDOT program is still looking at doing this project in 2025, so unless there is a reason to move that project forward, there is time for us to investigate this and try to determine if there is a way to do this.

Malm asked about the bikepath, the bike bridge, are we ever going to get it. Haugen responded that, yes, he thinks at some point it will happen, but when is the question.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2016 T.I.P. AMENDMENTS**

Haugen reported that there are two new projects within our MPO study area that are being awarded funds and need to be amended into the T.I.P. in order to ensure the funds are indeed eligible for these projects.

Haugen stated that the first one is a County of Grand Forks project. He referred to a map illustrating the location of the project, and explained that it is located in the southern edge of our study area, or the southern edge of Grand Forks, near the Country Club. He said that the County is going to convert a one mile stretch of County Road 6 between Grand Forks County Road 81 and Grand Forks County Road 8 from gravel to asphalt. He added that this is also on top of the flood protection project so he knows the County Engineer is communicating with the Corps of Engineers, and the City of Grand Forks on the flood protection point of view on the project.

Haugen commented that the second amendment is to bring in some railroad crossing funds. He referred to a copy of the City of Grand Forks' Staff Report that was included in the packet, and pointed out that it identifies what is being installed where with these funds, including a map and letter approving the project.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen reported that the Technical Advisory Committee did hold a public hearing last week at their meeting, and we did have one individual present that voiced support for the paving of County Road 6. He stated that both staff and the Technical Advisory Committee recommend that these projects are consistent with the Long Range Transportation Plan, and due to the fact that they were awarded funds that are new to our T.I.P. they don't have a negative fiscal impact to the T.I.P., therefore it maintains fiscal constraint, so we recommend this body approve these amendments as submitted.

DeMers asked if the County project would be just a paving project, or will they be widening the roadway as well. Haugen responded that he doesn't know those details, but it is the cross-section that is going there. He added that with it being on top of the dike, it is already a pretty wide road versus what a regular township road would be.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENTS TO THE FY2016 ANNUAL T.I.P. ELEMENT, AS PRESENTED.***

***ROLL CALL VOTE:***

***Voting Yes: Malm, Adams, Vetter, Strandell, DeMers, and Powers.***

***Voting No: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Vein and Mock.***

**MATTER OF PROPOSED SCOPE OF WORK FOR THE BIKE/PED PLAN UPDATE**

Viafara reported that he included information on the Proposed Bike/Ped Plan Update. He stated that two activities are being proposed; one is to advance a training seminar, and the second is to proceed with the bicycle and pedestrian plan update.

Viafara commented that at the moment staff is seeking proposals from several agencies that are interested or at least provide these kind of services for us to produce a matrix that will allow the MPO to approve these proposed updates.

Viafara stated that there are some pending comments coming from the Engineering Department that he would like to bring to your attention, and then to discuss issues that are relevant to the Engineering Department and they would like us to proceed to clarify, so for the next time, and whenever you see the final document, it will be already discussed all the particulars with the Engineering Department.

Viafara referred to the document, and pointed out that it includes the schedule of proposed activities. He added that they are envisioning that they will be working on this for the next ten months to complete the updates.

Viafara reported that for the training program, they are working towards having the training at least conducted by the end of March.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

DeMers asked if the scope of this update includes the entire MPO Study Area. Haugen explained it goes out to the Airport to the West; to Highway 220, the Mallory Bridge area to the East; the North Washington Interchange to the North; and Merrifield Road (Polk County 235) to the South. He stated that that is the area we are planning on including, but most of the outer ring area won't need much done.

DeMers asked if this is for recreation as well as utilitarian use of bikes and peds. Viafara responded that is not only for those, but also for transportation purposes and economic development. He stated that all of the elements will be considered.

Viafara explained that this is all very important because people are now trying to move from one mode of transportation to another, which means transitioning vehicle transportation into bicycle transportation activities. DeMers added that he thinks the recreation ties in with economic development probably tighter than the transportation to economic development because this could be used as a destination place.

**MATTER OF SOLICITATION OF ND FTA 5310 PROJECTS**

Kouba reported that they are currently in the process of solicitation, which means we are just gathering projects that are backed by agencies, as well as the City of Grand Forks, and are working with the NDDOT as well since they are in charge of the funds right now and actually approving where they go, so we are working with them and are gathering those projects up for eventual approval, but this is just mostly information that the funds are available.

Kouba stated that she knows that the City of Grand Forks is working on something, and they have had questions from other agencies as well.

Powers asked if he was correct that March 8<sup>th</sup> is the deadline. Kouba responded that that is correct.

Haugen stated that he just wants to alert everyone that next month you may have more than one applicant coming before you. He explained that in the past six or more years it has only been the Cities Area Transit that has submitted applications for our review, however, as Ms. Kouba mentioned, there are a couple of other agencies that are very interested in pursuing these funds, so at your next meeting you will have a recommendation as to how the projects rank in priority, but just so you are aware there may be some competing interest for these funds for the first time ever in this MPO area.

Powers asked for an example of which agencies might be interested. Haugen responded that a nursing home wants to replace one of their vehicles, and they are eligible for these monies. Vetter asked, if we approve the nursing homes application and bought a vehicle, would they have to make that vehicle available to other agencies that are getting these types of funds then. Haugen responded that, technically the answer is yes, but operationally there isn't a hammer to force the coordination. He added that they have asked the people that we have already worked

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

with, Cities Area Transit, to see if what the City is already providing can't do the trip purposes that they are trying to get their vehicles for. He said that they will have a conversation, and they will probably say they can't meet exactly our needs and will try to get their vehicle replaced.

**MATTER OF TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN RFP UPDATE**

Haugen reported that the agenda item is probably mistitled as you have already approved the release of the RFP for the Transit Development Plan, but if you will recall, and the minutes should reflect it, we said that we were asking for the release of the RFP, but that our current work program only shows \$100,000 budgeted for consultant work, however the two transit operators had asked us to do a more in-depth review and possible complete restructuring of the route structures so we agreed that we would try to increase the budget to \$150,000. He added that we also mentioned that MnDOT, at the time, seemed quite confident that they would find \$50,000 for us to augment our \$100,000, but as of today they have not given a definitive answer, and they made one thing clear, that from MnDOT's point of view if we were ever to be eligible for \$50,000 they couldn't give it to us while the RFP was out on the street.

Haugen stated that MnDOT asked us if we would consider pulling the RFP, and we asked them if we pull it would they guarantee us the \$50,000, and if the answer is yes then could they give us an idea of when they would give it to us, but they haven't responded to those questions yet, although they have alluded that we are no longer a high priority for them to fund a transit development plan, and that their process probably would take months to get us to the \$50,000, so as of now staff is recommending that we just maintain the course, the RFP proposals are due Friday.

Haugen referred to the packet, and pointed out that he did identify a project that we could delay, and shift those monies to the Transit Development Plan. He stated that that project is looking at the intersection of Gateway Drive and US #2 and Mill Road to see if there is a way to improve the site lines and operations at these intersections. He said that one of the things that is still kind of a major roadblock with this project is whether or not the Mill Spur will have rail activity crossing Gateway Drive any longer, or how frequent it would occur, and the State Mill and BNSF are still negotiating back and forth about rates for the unloading facility that might be on the Glasston Subdivision, so it seems like this could be delayed.

Haugen stated, then, that next month staff will be requiring action either on the \$50,000 from MnDOT, or if on a recommendation to delay the intersection project and shift the monies to the Transit Development Plan Update.

Haugen reported that while this hasn't gone as smoothly as we hoped, he thinks there is a way for us to still achieve the Transit Development Plan that is necessary for us to do this year and not harm our work program and other studies that would be ongoing, but right now he doesn't believe we have a recommendation for you for any action. He explained that this was actually put on the agenda in case there was a need for us to pull the actual RFP that is out on the streets, but it doesn't sound like that would do us any good, and we still have the ability to receive the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

RFP proposals, but not take any formal action on them other than to turn them back to the proposers, and therefore we wouldn't have this issue of having an RFP out on the street that MnDOT is concerned about, which might give us a small window of opportunity for MnDOT to still fund us the \$50,000 by next month, but he kind of gets the impression that there really isn't a will anymore on MnDOT's part to assist us with this Transit Development Plan, so no action is recommended today.

Haugen stated that next month we will most likely have a need for action to delay this project and shift the monies up to the Transit Development Plan. He added that while this study is a good study to do at some point, he thinks it is just not right for doing this year, and our transit operations is higher priority for us to get squared away and improved for the long term than doing this study.

DeMers asked, if the potential thought is to delay the Mill/Gateway Study to generate the extra \$50,000 to do the Transit Development Plan, we hope that either we don't need the original study of the Gateway/Mill or we can do it at a later time, can you back-pay from the funds from MnDOT. He added that he would just imagine that having the MnDOT funds back the Mill/Gateway Study would be less likely to happen, correct. Haugen responded that the MnDOT \$50,000 that we are talking about is from their Office of Transit, and so they would not be involved at all in the Mill/Gateway Study. DeMers said, then, that they are two separate actions, you can't do both, you can't delay one and then backfill it with these funds. Haugen responded that that would be correct.

**MATTER OF DRAFT PERFORMANCE MATRIX REPORT**

Viafara stated that this is a continuation of the previous presentation done at the last MPO Executive Policy Board meeting and will discuss our activities concerning Goals: 2) Security; 4) Environmental/Energy/Quality of Life; 5) Integration and Connectivity; and 7) System Preservation.

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

Presentation ensued.

DeMers referred to Goal 7 System Preservation, the bridges, and asked if they were going to add the Minnesota Bridges as well. Haugen responded that there are two different slides, and the map shows both North Dakota and Minnesota Bridges. DeMers stated, however, that there are some Minnesota Bridges missing, there are two on Bygland that are missing, the one on 10<sup>th</sup> Street is missing, the underpass trestle bridge are all missing and are all classified as functional bridges. Viafara said that this is the one they got from MnDOT, but they can request they be added to the list. DeMers commented that, just in talking to their engineers there is all those bridges, again there are the two on Bygland that aren't on the map.

Haugen referred to the map and, as Mr. DeMers listed the missing bridges, pointed out where they are located.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Powers commented that in regard to the Sorlie Bridge, it appears the last inspection was done in June so he would assume that what was done to the bridge this past summer isn't reflected in the information shown in the report. Viafara responded that that would be correct. Powers said then, that next year the little red dot will be gone, correct. Viafara responded that that would be correct.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

a. 2016 UPWP Project Update

Haugen reported that this is a schedule that shows all of the work activities that we had scheduled to be done in 2015, and you will notice five of the projects have been completed, and the others, the two land use plans, have been carried over into 2016 as was expected. He stated that this was the case with the I-29 Study as well.

b. Distribution Of 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Signal Coordination Plan Report

Haugen stated that he has paper copies of the Final 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Signal Coordination Plan Report if anyone is interested, please let him know and he will get one to you.

c. 2045 Grand Forks Land Use Plan Engagement Activities

Haugen reported that last week they held several engagement activities on the 2045 Grand Forks Land Use Plan.

Powers asked if these activities were well attended. Haugen responded that some were and some weren't, depending on the site. He explained that the one on Monday, February 8<sup>th</sup>, was to look at Guy Useldinger's development where the Discovery School was built, where one of the pilot sites the consultant is assisting the City of Grand Forks on. He stated that they held the event at the South Middle School, and if you will remember the weather was kind of iffy that day, but it had cleared somewhat by evening so they went ahead and held the meeting, so they had about a dozen to a dozen and a half people there, with Mr. Useldinger being one of them, so they had a nice discussion about how greenfields are turned into housing and commercial developments in Grand Forks. He said that the event with the largest attendance was the one that was held at the Grand Cities Mall site, with around fifty or so people attending. He added that the biggest draw with this site was the possibility of locating the new library there. He stated that the last event was held at Grand Forks City Hall to discuss what should be done with the current Water Treatment Plan when it gets decommissioned in about 2020, and had the lowest attendance with about a ten to twelve people attending.

Haugen commented that Hope Covenant Church, the owner of the Grand Cities Mall, has some pretty big plans, whether the Library is there or not, they have envisioned a lot of community activities taking place within their site. He said that they also see a lot of green on the site, trying to incorporate some of the more innovative stormwater management techniques, and trying to somehow bring indoor/outdoor activities together on the site.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen reported that they had six tables set up, and the attendees were given an aerial photo of the site, along with a bunch of different materials to use to represent different land uses, and asked to come up with some ideas of what they would like to see done to the site. He added that they weren't informed what Hope was trying to envision for the site, they were given more of a blank slate, and they all came up with similar concepts of trying to green-up the site, bring water to the site, and all six tables wanted the Library located there. He said that a lot of them also wanted to see buildings "in front of the sea of asphalt", which was the term used to describe putting store frontage up and down that section of Washington, and possibly some senior housing on the site, either attached or not attached to the mall. He added that the other activity was to ask them three questions, which is what the post-its were for: 1) what excites you with the site; 2) what do you see as negatives with the site; and 3) what would you hope to see done with the site. He said that there were a lot of ideas and concepts posted.

Powers asked where the library would be located on this site. Haugen responded that most people had the library going where the old steakhouse building or American Tire buildings are located, or where the hot tub building is located.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO ADJOURN THE FEBRUARY 17<sup>TH</sup>,  
2016, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:49 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

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

**Wednesday, March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mike Powers, Chairman, called the March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016 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: Clarence Vetter, Gary Malm, Warren Strandell, Steve Adams, Ken Vein, Mike Powers and Jeannie Mock.

Absent: Marc DeMers.

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

Guest(s): Mike Yavarow, GF City Engineering; Suzanne Bjornstad, Valley Memorial Homes; and Jennifer Schultz, Valley Memorial Homes.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Powers declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 17<sup>TH</sup>, 2016, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 17<sup>TH</sup>, 2016, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

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

***Voting No: None.***

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

**Sorlie Bridge**

Haugen reported that the main thing still outstanding is that the final lighting plan has not yet been drafted. He explained that back in December you saw the draft plan, and NDDOT, as the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

lead agency, still has not produced a final document that, at some point, both City Council's will be asked to review and comment on.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that there are two things that he would like to bring to your attention:

- 1) He explained that at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting last week, MnDOT informed us that, as shown in the picture in the staff report, because there will be a shared use trail located within the truss system now, they were going to test their local maintenance equipment to see if it is able to span the new trail, and provide complete inspection coverage of the bridge, or if they would need to find some other type of equipment to do the inspections.
- 2) He stated that, as indicated in the staff report, MnDOT originally planned to do one half of the bridge at a time, and keep the other half open for traffic, but, because of the concrete load they are now thinking that there could be issues with sequencing it that way, and feel that they may need to use an alternative method, one which they term Checkerboard. He added that with this method there may be times that complete closure of the Kennedy Bridge is necessary, however they will try to minimize that as much as possible. He stated that, though, that as they work through the design process, they want to let the public know that it could be closed, and that they will keep them informed of what will be occurring.

Vetter said, then, that brief periods could actually be days at a time to allow for the concrete to cure. Haugen responded that there could be that potential. Vein commented, though, that you can use higher density concrete, and you can have it strengthen within hours versus days. Haugen agreed, adding that they are just now approaching those details to analyze and come up with a plan of action, they are just informing us early and often of the possibility of what might occur; so while the previous game plan was to work on one half and keep the other half open, they are indicating there is a likelihood that there will be more closures than initially discussed.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2045 EAST GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN**

Kouba reported that this is the final step in the approval process for the 2045 East Grand Forks Land Use Plan. She added that the City of East Grand Forks City Council has approved adopting it, and now staff is seeking the board's approval as well.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE ADOPTION OF THE 2045 EAST GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN, AS SUBMITTED.***

***ROLL CALL VOTE:***

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

***Voting No: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: DeMers.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF ND FTA 5310 APPLICATION**

Kouba reported that back in February we released a solicitation for projects for the 5310 FTA Program. She said that at the time we weren't clear as to how much funding would be available, but since then it has been announced that the amount of funding available is \$375,000 for the urban areas out of a total amount of \$5.2 million Statewide.

Kouba stated that the deadline for submittal of applications to the MPO was March 3<sup>rd</sup>, and we did receive two applications; one from the Cities Area Transit, and one from Valley Memorial Homes. She explained that since the applications were from two separate entities we did convene our Human Services Traffic Coordination Committee to review and prioritize the projects for the MPO area. She stated that they came up with a project listing of: 1) Mobility Manger; 2) Replacement Vehicle for the Valley Memorial Homes; and 3) Two replacement vehicles for Cities Area Transit.

Kouba commented that all of these projects fall within the guidelines of our Transit Development Plan, thus staff is seeking approval of the projects and prioritization as submitted.

Malm asked if the Mobility Manager is a new hire. Kouba responded that it is not. She explained that this funding has been requested for the past five years, and the position is already filled.

***MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE ND FTA 5310 PROJECT APPLICATIONS, AND TO PRIORITIZE THEM AS REQUESTED.***

***ROLL CALL VOTE:***

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

***Voting No: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: DeMers.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT #1 TO THE UPWP**

Haugen reminded the board that as we were doing the Transit Development Plan, and trying to find additional funds for it, we did indicate that at some point we would have to amend our work program to account for the increased cost estimate for the Transit Development Plan. He added that in addition, since that time things have been unclear about our ability to carry-over funds from prior years, so he would refer to this table to walk you through where we are standing in terms of the funds available to us for 2016.

Haugen stated that in the past we also discussed that in North Dakota the three MPOs do have a balance of funds to do planning that is, in the eyes of our Federal Partners, too high; and as we discussed we have been trying to work out ways to distribute and utilize those funds. He

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

explained that, as you will recall, about a year ago Fargo/Moorhead had to forward us \$300,000 to help their situation, and in 2010 Bismarck/Mandan had to forward us \$400,000 for the same reason.

Haugen commented that last fall the NDDOT announced to the three MPOs that they made a decision that they were essentially going to freeze the 2015 funds available to the State of North Dakota. He explained that what they are doing is converting those planning dollars to concrete, so the funds are still shown on a paper bank account, but the contractual authority Congress grants them has been transferred over to the concrete side. He added that the NDDOT will tell us that we can still access those funds, but in order to access them they have to decide to move them back into planning funds and give up some of their concrete authority, so while it is possible to do it is logistically troublesome to do.

Haugen reported that what this means for us going forward is; first you see the CPG, our annual estimate which is \$500,000, and which we received; then you will notice it is labeled FY2016, that is current fiscal year. He explained that in previous years we would have at least that \$500,000 available, plus whatever we still had previous to that, so because of the gift we got from Fargo, which was actually 2014 dollars, that is the \$182,000 we are carrying over into 2016, so instead of having the extra \$500,000 to operate from, you can sense that we have a tight budget coming forward.

Haugen commented that the other funds we show here are standard Minnesota funding, plus North Dakota's commitment to fund 10% of the I-29 Study cost. He said that in order to make up the difference between the revenue and the obligations we have currently, and what we will undertake in 2016, the MPO accessed what we labeled as a "savings account", which is really comprised of two things; a big chunk of it is monies we receive when we bill out our staff hours to our federal funds as we bill using an inflated rate to cover sick and vacation leave, and the other is monies we have received over the years as profit for the sale of documents, maps, etc.; but the bulk was there in an account prior to either Ms. McNelis or myself being employed with the MPO, so while we aren't really sure what the source of it was, it was used way back when to assist us with month to month cash flow, and it may have been established to eliminate the need for a line of credit we once had with one of the local banks. He added that in any event, in order to balance our work program we are saying that we will have to access the \$67,500 from this account, however it will still leave the necessary funds to cover total reclamation of all sick leave, vacation leave, etc., as well as a few dollars for anything else that may come up.

Haugen referred to a table, and explained that out of the total \$922,000 budget, it shows how the monies have been allocated to specific activities. He pointed out that you will notice that we are meeting all of our main core function requirements, and also that with the Transit Development Plan we are funding it at the level we need to in 2016 to get the project done at the level that the two transit agencies are telling us needs to be done; but you will also notice that we are zeroing out some things: 1) equipment – we believe we can go these twelve months without a need to purchase any major equipment; 2) corridor preservation – we had a small dollar amount here to assist both cities by reviewing their subdivision plats, etc., but we feel we can still provide the service without having to have a specific line item in our budget to account for it; and 3)

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

technical assistance – this was a small budget item that was kept in reserve for short studies that come up over the course of a year, to assist with them if needed. He added that we also zeroed out our intern program as well.

Haugen summarized that by zeroing out some items, bringing in from the local funding source the \$67,500, we are able to show that we have revenues to cover the expenditures we are obligated to do in 2016, so we are still able to complete the Transit Development Plan, we are still able to complete the Land Use Plan, we are still able to complete the I-29 Traffic Operation Study we have underway, we are still able to maintain full time staff levels that we have, and also meet all the rest of our obligations.

Haugen stated that another thing he would like to point out on this table is previously, and we have discussed this in the past, where we now have the Communications Plan, that used to be the study of the skewed intersection at Washington and Gateway Drive. He said that we talked about using some of those funds to help with the Transit Development Plan, so you will notice that instead of completely zeroing that out we are calling for what is termed “Communications Plan” be done. He explained that this is a Federal Highway requirement that came to us in December, and with performance based planning we sort of need to monitor and communicate from the beginning planning portion of a project all the way through the construction portion of a project, and keep monitoring, updating, and communicating about the levels of performance as it goes through these various stages. He stated that what ND/Federal Highway is asking us to do is, although we have a fairly decent communication going on at the planning and programming stage, to develop a plan that carries a project through and across the implementation or project development stage.

Haugen commented that, you’re familiar with a lot of the planning diagrams where when you start with a plan you always have the feedback, and performance based planning is really getting back and driving home the fact that you have to monitor performance to show that we are progressing towards our goals and our performance targets, and that is the piece that Federal Highway wants us to spend resources on this year to develop, so it is an effort to make sure that we are, not only identify the performance measures and targets, but are also showing how we are monitoring and ensuring that at the end what we program will get done, and will assist us in achieving those targets that we have identified, and if there is a need to change, the feedback is meant to have us go back to our measures and make sure we are measuring correctly, and identify our targets to make sure they are achievable, and if they aren’t we can adjust as we go along, so instead of every five years trying to come up with these things, it is an annual process, and that is partly what you will hear when Mr. Viafara talks about performance measures that we have been presenting to you these past several months.

Haugen stated that the last thing he would add is, in the staff report he highlights that we are having recent discussions with the NDDOT, and are meeting with them next month, the other two MPOs and himself. He explained that when they told us that they were freezing the 2015 dollars, in reality all they did was to freeze the Federal Highway side, the Federal Transit side still remains available to us, and they are indicating that at our March meeting they will inform

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

us what those dollar values are, so later this year we can revisit our work program as there will be more federal revenue to bring back in to the program, and we can perhaps replenish the tasks we zeroed out, or tackle something new, but for a short time we are on a very tight fiscal squeeze, but we will be getting some relief soon and hopefully will have better knowledge of what that will be next week so that we might be able to refund some of the things that we are zeroing out today with your approval.

Haugen reported that this has been reviewed by our State and Federal Partners, it was reviewed by the Technical Advisory Committee at their meeting last week, and all are recommending this body adopt this amendment to the 2016 Work Program.

Mock said that, you mentioned with the Communications Plan, a feedback group. She asked if that is intended for public comment so that people can comment on specific project, or needs in general. Haugen responded that it is going to include that public input component, but he will say that it is probably meant to be more for communication among staff, at staff level. Mock asked if he means between the City and the MPO. Haugen responded it would be between the feds, the State, the two Cities, and the MPO, but as with everything we do we do need to have the public opportunity for comment.

Malm asked what would be done should the State of North Dakota make more cuts to funding. Haugen responded that the only thing that we receive funding for directly from the State of North Dakota, in direct State aid, is the contract that we have with them on the I-29 Traffic Operations Study, and that is only their commitment to cost share 10% of the total cost of that study, otherwise the rest of what we have there is not state fund involvement. He added that part of our discussion next week would be whether the State wants to convert those transit dollars for 2015 into something concrete wise or not. He said that there is a provision in law that allows them to do that, but it is an onerous process so he thinks that is probably why they didn't directly do it in the first place.

***MOVED BY ADAMS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE AMENDMENT #1 TO THE FY2016 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM, SUBJECT TO PARTNER AGENCY REVIEW.***

***ROLL CALL VOTE:***

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

***Voting No: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: DeMers.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE TDP CONSULTANT SELECTION**

Kouba reported that back in January this body approved an RFP for a consultant for our Transit Development Plan. She stated that they received three proposals: 1) SRF; 2) LSC Transportation Consultants; and 3) KLJ. She said that they held interviews on March 2<sup>nd</sup>, and the Selection Committee selected KLJ.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Kouba stated that included in the packet is the scope of work for the project. She explained that the Selection Committee was very focused in on KLJ's new and innovative methods shown in their Scope of Work for transit and transit related projects and such, so that is one of the reasons they chose KLJ. She added that they are looking at getting started as soon as possible, thus staff is looking for approval.

Vein stated that he is assuming this would involve qualification based selection, not based on price. Kouba responded that that would be correct, but added that they were under budget as well. Vein said, though that they first selected them on qualifications, then opened the price to see that they were under budget. Kouba responded that that is correct. She explained that if they wouldn't have been at or under budget, then we would have negotiated with them to get them there. Haugen added that the NDDOT is requiring a new process, as part of a Federal Review, and we are doing the same qualification based consultant selection that Grand Forks is now doing, and all the local government agencies are doing in North Dakota, so everything now is funneled through the NDDOT and put on their website to notify all potential consultants of the opportunity and it is all qualification based off this.

Vein asked if there was criteria included in the qualifications for the Selection Committee to use, a point system or whatever that is then identified by which criteria is used. Haugen responded that both State and Federal law identify the criteria that can be considered for consultant selection, and off the top of his head he believes there are seven criteria, and in our RFP we identify those seven, we identify the points that are assigned, the weighting that's different and how some of them are equally weighted in the point process.

Powers commented that, as he recalls, there were three firms, and we asked them these seven questions and then rated them, and they were all under budget, some barely, but they were all good, but in the end we chose the best one. Vein stated that, again, if you chose based on qualifications, not based on price, the qualifications are the first thing. Powers agreed. Kouba added that nobody saw any of the prices until we had already selected the consultant.

***MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE EXECUTION OF A CONTRACT WITH KLJ TO PERFORM THE TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN UPDATE AT A COST NOT TO EXCEED \$150,000.***

***ROLL CALL VOTE:***

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

***Voting No: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: DeMers.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FY2016 T.I.P. AMENDMENT**

Haugen reported that this is a pretty straight-forward item, however due to timing issues we had to publish the public hearing for this meeting, therefore he would ask that the Chairman please open the public hearing.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

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

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

***Voting No: None.***

There was no one present for discussion.

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

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

***Voting No: None.***

Haugen stated that it was also advertised that we would receive written comments up until 11:00 a.m. this morning, however we did not receive any.

Haugen said, again, that this is a fairly straight forward T.I.P. amendment, as far as T.I.P. amendments go, it is not bringing in any new dollars, it isn't changing any current programmed dollars, it is essentially just changing the termini or the end points of the project on DeMers Avenue that is going to be done. He explained that originally it was described as being from the Interstate system to Washington Street, they are extending that east termini to 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue ramps, just before you get to the overpass and railroad, so they are extending the project length a little bit, and he did highlight that in yellow on the table included in the packet.

Haugen commented that they are also including a little bit more to the scope of work that will be done. He explained that we had requested last December, when we solicited for projects both new to the T.I.P. or changes to the current program, and the District and the City also requested that they take this opportunity to upgrade the signal system along DeMers Avenue so that we can get the video detection going on, and we could update those signals so that we get transit priority there, so that is now being scoped in the project.

Haugen reported, however, that there are also some things that we asked for that aren't being scoped in. He stated that back in December we asked for them to consider doing construction engineering for the shared use trail that Grand Forks got TAP funds for, along DeMers Avenue from 42<sup>nd</sup> Street west to 48<sup>th</sup> Street underneath the Interstate, that construction engineering of the District was thinking that these two projects are so close in proximity and overlap each other that perhaps they could take on that engineering from this project instead of it being attached to the TAP, but that isn't being done with this project.

Haugen said that another thing is that there was talk, discussion or interest in possible traffic signalization of the east/west ramps to Columbia Road off of DeMers, either there or at 31<sup>st</sup>, which is the back door entrance into Altru. He added that the request wasn't, perhaps, so much hard and fast that we had to install a signal, but to, as part of the traffic operation study that is done on this project, to see if there a need to signalize that intersection, that is not included in

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

this scope change, so if that needs to be done it will have to be done with another source of funding. Powers asked for clarification of the location of this intersection. Haugen responded that it is on DeMers Avenue, it is the west ramp to get onto Columbia Road, that intersection, directly across from the new apartment building, or right to the west of that, 31<sup>st</sup> Street, is the roadway that gets you by Valley Bone and Joint. Vein asked if this is or isn't going to be in the study. Haugen responded it is not. Vein commented that it needs to be in the study. Haugen stated that this T.I.P. amendment, and the way it was framed in the project description that we forwarded on to the DOT, it was our request to have it included, but their decision was to not include it in this project. Vein asked why they would make that decision. Haugen responded that he would have to defer to Mr. Yavarow. He added that this project is a bit abnormal, as it typically would be a District led project, however this particular project is being led by local government in Bismarck, and he isn't sure why the transfer of responsibility occurred, but we will try to follow up for you for those answers.

Vein stated that it would be nice to do a complete study, and he would like to know what it would take to get it included. He said that he knows that that when we made the request before they said no, but is there anything further that we could do to change their stance because it seems to be important. He added that we have an issue with pedestrians, as he has seen people coming off the ramp and actually going around the right-in/right-out to go through, and there are some safety issues there that need to be identified and addressed, so he would like to know what alternatives we might have to get this done. Haugen responded that if it is not going to be included in this study, or this project; and of course when they do the project development they do a traffic operation analysis, etc., so if it isn't going to be done then it would have to be as a stand-alone separate study. He suggested that we can make a request to the District to see if they have funds available to do that study, but having just told you that in a week or so from now we would have some information that will tell us that there are more federal funds available, it may be something that we could put into our work program if, in fact that's what we decide to do, and we could do a little traffic operation study for that stretch of DeMers.

Vein said that he thinks it is important that we extend this project all the way over to 4<sup>th</sup>, as it should have been done, because we did the bridge, and then we did the area right after the bridge, and he is appreciative that that happened, he thinks that's very important and it seems like that is probably a far bigger cost than this little piece of intersection. Haugen commented that he isn't sure about the amount of work because after the overpass was done there was also a project to do the extensions on either end, and on the west side it was to go all the way to Washington and on the east side it was to 6<sup>th</sup>, so they did do a follow-up project after the overpass to fix the focus to the overpass, and this project, because the that other project stopped at Washington, this project stopped at Washington, so now they decided to push this all the way back to 4<sup>th</sup>.

Haugen summarized, then, that while we are adding things into the scope of work that will be done, a traffic signal upgrade, etc., the total estimated cost didn't change from before. He stated that the only other thing is, you will notice that it was originally planned to occur in 2016, now it is being let in 2016 but the physical work will be done in 2017, so the funding is still 2016 dollars, but the actual work won't happen until 2017. Powers asked if he is saying this could change in that timeframe. Haugen responded that some of these are always subject to change,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

but for right now the plan of action is to wait until the fall to let the project, and do the work in the spring.

Haugen commented that there is a term called “advanced construction”, where you do the work one year and then pay it with federal funds the following year, this is the reverse of that, you’re paying for it out of the federal funds one year, but you’re actually doing the work the next year, it is just a bit of an accounting exercise.

Haugen stated that this is the amendment they are asking us to do to the T.I.P. so that they can get their federal approvals and get the project into the project development stage.

Vein commented that he thinks we have to approve it, he thinks it is good, but his concern is that we didn’t go far enough with the other signalization that we have, so he would approve the amendment with the caveat that additional consideration be given for the signals on the north side of Columbia Road.

***MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE FY2016 ANNUAL T.I.P. ELEMENT, SUBJECT TO THE CAVEAT THAT ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATION BE GIVEN FOR THE SIGNALS ON THE NORTH SIDE OF COLUMBIA ROAD.***

***ROLL CALL VOTE:***

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

***Voting No: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: DeMers.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE BIKE/PED PLAN UPDATE SCOPE OF WORK**

Viafara reported that we are asking for approval of the Proposed Bicycle and Pedestrian Training Seminar. He said that, at the moment the MPO is advancing a Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Update. He explained that this activity is composed of two items: 1) Training Seminar and 2) Bicycle and Pedestrian Update.

Viafara stated that concerning the Bicycle and Pedestrian Update, later we will ask, if possible to review and approve of the update, but at the moment we would like to let you know that we are asking for your consideration of comments that were brought to our attention by the Engineering Department. He explained that those comments are included in the document.

Viafara said that one of the comments that we were asked to address was regarding where the members for the roster for the Steering Committee would come from, which organizations, agencies, etc. He stated that in response we added a list of agencies, local governments, state and federal agencies, and community members to whom we believe may be interested in

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

participating. He commented that so far we have extended invitations to some of them, and also particularly the community members and other agencies that are the ones cognizant of the situation of the Bicycle and Pedestrian activity in the city.

Viafara stated that today we would like to ask you to please review the proposal for the training program. He pointed out that at the end of the document you have all the activities that we have undertaken so far, adding that we contacted the National Highway Institute asking them for quotes, availability, and the capacity for those proposed training seminars that they offer. He said that they received two quotes from them, at a cost of \$700.00 per participant. He added that they did this same thing with Safe Routes to School, at the national level they offer services similar to the one we are seeking, so we contacted another company, Sprinkle Consulting from Tampa, which is a very well established agency across the nation, in terms of Bicycle and Pedestrian Activities.

Viafara commented that the final quote we received, the one that is highlighted, was from Toole Design from Seattle, and as you can see there is quite an outstanding difference in terms of prices or costs of the event that they were selected to provide. He said, then, that we are asking you to please consider providing approval to the Training Seminar so that we can continue in our schedule advancing this particular event. He added that both staff and the Technical Advisory Committee recommend approval.

Vein in regard to the request, the Training Seminar, he knows that Mr. Grasser talked about Engineering Staff proposing to participate on the Steering Committee with training, is that what it would accomplish. Viafara responded that we are seeking public involvement, as well as agency involvement, and the letter sent by Mr. Grasser kindly suggests that, yes we may count on his staff to be members of this particular steering committee, and the interest for them is to be on top of what is happening on the training, particularly, because the training involves some city standards and engineering procedures that he would like to certainly make sure are discussed and brought to the community. Vein commented that he had a very short conversation with Mr. Grasser, and he didn't get into a lot of depth on the issue, but he knows of the issue and knows that Mr. Grasser want to make sure that the issue of bike lanes on University Avenue, which is kind of a political issue when it comes to the City Council, is somehow made to work smoother, but he doesn't know if this will accomplish that. Viafara responded that the first stage is for us to become familiar with all the procedures pertaining to the bicycle and pedestrian mobility, the procedures in terms of engineering designers and how whoever participates can become a positive force in that endeavor in a manner that is satisfactory for the MPO and for the different agencies that at the end would be the ones responsible for the implementation of the accommodations coming from the proposed improvements in the Plan.

Vein asked Mr. Yavarow if this would work for what the Engineering Department is wanting from this. Yavarow responded that he only had a quick introduction to this issue prior to today's meeting, as Mr. Kuharenko was supposed to have attended but was unable to at the last minute, so what he was told was that at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting it was mentioned not to proceed with the proposals at this time. Viafara commented that it stated in the staff report that members of the Technical Advisory Committee decided to support the implementation of the proposed Bicycle and Pedestrian Training Seminar and to table the scope for the plan update.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Viafara reported that the reason for tabling the scope of the plan is simple; Engineering made comments in writing, which he did include in the packet, and for the last two weeks they have been trying to address those comments. He added that yesterday he was able to meet with Mr. Kuharenko to work on, and write out responses to those comments, so now they are waiting to see if there are any additional concerns and/or comments on those responses.

Viafara stated that, for the record, the MPO has graciously taken all the comments made by Engineering, however, it is very important that you realize that the MPO also has contractual agreements with other agencies in terms of production of the materials and procedures we need to complete. Vein said that he understands that you have policies and procedures, it is just that what he doesn't want to do is create conflict, and instead wants us to be unified, and he thinks that may involve the need for some discussion with the MPO and City Staff, and he would be glad to be a part of that to make sure that we don't do this thing too quickly or inappropriately. Viafara said that is will of the MPO, of the type of planning that we do, which is collaborative.

Haugen commented that in our discussion at the Technical Advisory Committee level last week, it was clear that we were moving forward, and we got the committee members to recommend to this body to move forward with the training session. He said that where we are holding back is on the final language of the scope-of-work, and going through the rest of the actual update to the Bike and Ped section, so it was clear that we were moving forward with the training, at least at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting a week ago, and that is what we are proposing to you, to move forward with the training. He explained that the training is intended to get us all at a common ground level on the practice of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, via an educational training seminar, which is why we are inviting a wide base of participants to that training.

Vetter stated that about three years ago a group of us went down to Fargo/Moorhead for some bike/ped training, is this similar to that. Haugen responded that that session was more hands-on training, this is more classroom training. Vetter pointed out that he noticed that in their "tools proposal" they have a workshop on how to develop a pedestrian and bicycle action plan, and that it is more for local officials, is that one of the items we are looking at with Toole. Haugen responded that it is, and added that the total cost is roughly \$8,500.00, and includes all of those items listed in the proposal. Vetter said that that was a great workshop, and he knows that we talked about trying to do something like that up here too, so he feels it is beneficial for local politicians and stakeholders to attend these seminars, it was an eye-opener for him.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED  
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN TRAINING SEMINAR, AS PRESENTED.***

Malm stated that he is confused. He said that he is looking through this, and you're talking about one thing, and in looking at the document, which portion are you talking about, you only want one part of it. Vetter responded that he wants the whole thing. Malm said, though, that he keeps hearing from the next group, and the City here that they want, you have to get them on board or you're spending \$8,700.00 for nothing, except for an argument, is that what we are going to get out of it. He commented that he sat on too many of these bicycle things and everybody has a different point of view, and they can never come to an agreement. Vein stated that, what he is thinking, is that that is what the training session will do, is to try to get everybody on the same

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

page, is that correct. Malm asked who would go to the training session, how do you get people to go to that training session.

Vetter commented that he thinks the whole point here is that people are going to be invited. Malm said that that is the thing, you can invite a lot of people, but they don't show up. Vetter agreed, but added that none of them are, they are all staff, so if it is part of your job you go. He pointed out that the list includes planning staff, engineering staff, public works staff; the agencies, you aren't going to have any problem getting them to do, they are more than willing to send people to this, so if you can get city staff on board, then we can all be on the same page, that is what we need. Vein added that we probably should have two council people on the list as well. Vetter agreed that that wouldn't hurt.

Vein said that another thing to remember is that it was the recommendation of the Technical Advisory Committee to do this, correct. Viafara responded it was. Vein stated, then, that he thinks that it is very important that if the Technical Advisory Committee is telling us to do this, then there isn't a good reason not to. Viafara added that by advancing this component we can stay on schedule. He explained that if we do the training seminar, and then, with the participation of the Engineering Department, the issues dealing with the scope of work could be clearly refined to the satisfaction of all parties, then we can proceed with all the other activities that are coming.

***ROLL CALL VOTE:***

***Voting Yes:*** Vetter, Strandell, Vein, Powers, Mock, and Adams.

***Voting No:*** Malm.

***Abstain:*** None.

***Absent:*** DeMers.

**MATTER OF DRAFT PERFORMANCE MATRIX REPORT**

Viafara reminded the board that for the last eight months staff has been providing you with updates on the analyses of the different goals and elements that are the components of the Long Range Transportation Plan for the MPO area. He said that so far you have reviewed the first six goals, and today we will review Goal #7 – System Preservation.

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

Viafara reported that System Preservation entails the condition of pavement, that we have already reviewed with you, particularly local roads and the roads that are on National System, and today we are updating you on the condition of bridges and decks that are in the planning area.

Presentation ensued.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Viafara stated that with this information in mind, the MPO staff has a review of the overview of the transportation system, and we expecting that next time we convene, we will be giving you either the final report or a summary final report of all the analyses of the Transportation Plan.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

a. I-29 Traffic Operations Study New Material Posted On Website

Haugen reported that we do highlight that on the website we have links to all of the Technical Memorandums that were done. He referred to a three page summary that is also on the website, and pointed out that where we are at with the I-29 Study is; previously you saw the Existing Conditions Report for today's traffic, and now we have the Future Conditions, Environmental Conditions, and the Alerus Center Event Conditions reports as well.

Haugen commented that as part of this study, and this is our first attempt at this, is to do the linking planning and the environmental, so part of the study is identifying the purpose and need, but it is also identifying some of the environmental limitations we have to address with this study as well.

Haugen stated that he just wanted to let you know that this information is available on the website. He added that because of the length of today's agenda staff didn't want to take up more time, but we want you to be aware that it is available for you to review. He said that he doesn't think that it is something we didn't already know, we know there are issues with our three existing interchanges today, and although we aren't planning on having anything done, by 2045 those issues will be even more compounded, and that is what the first thing is telling us. He commented that in terms of the Alerus Event Center we are finding out that the events that we have on a more regular basis don't create too much of a traffic issue for us, but when we have an event occurring at our peak travel times we do see issues, and the third is environmental stuff.

Haugen said that he just wanted to highlight that this information is available in detail on our website.

b. 2016 UPWP Project Update

Haugen reported that this is just a progress report of our current work; what has been completed, what is still being done, and what is still going to be done.

c. Performance Based Planning

Haugen reiterated that part of our meeting today has been talking about performance based planning, we are doing a communications plan, and Mr. Viafara's report is on performance; and the feds are now rolling out their final rules on performance measures and performance targets, and yesterday the first set of rules that came out had to do with safety, so now we will be working with the State and ultimately we will be asking you to adopt performance measures and targets related to safety, and there will be five things now that we will be looking at; fatalities –

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

the number and rate of frequency; serious injuries – the number and rate of frequency; and a fifth one they added, that wasn't in their original proposed rules is that we will now have to keep track of bike/ped accidents.

Haugen stated that we are now just starting to get these final performance measures and targets. He said that since MAP-21 we have been trying to keep you abreast as to the changing system to a performance based planning process, programming process, so the next couple of years we will be finalizing what all those measures and targets are, and then depending on whether or not Congress changes the system on us again, that will be our method of planning for the forthcoming decades. He added that, just as with everything, it is new, so we are learning, you're learning, and things that we used to do we will no longer do in the future, so bear with us as we make these changes to the process.

d. MPO Executive Director Contract

Vetter commented that Mr. DeMers asked that he bring up the issue of the MPO Executive Director's Contract; specifically whether or not the issues that were brought up when approving the contract concerning wording on pension/retirement, etc., have been addressed, and if so when the updated contract would be brought before the board. He stated that they just don't want to lose sight of this, so is it still being worked on, and will it be brought back to us at some point. Haugen responded that this is still being worked on. He added that staff also informed the board that there would most likely be some additional changes made by the City of Grand Forks with their employee contracts that may affect his contract as well, so we were waiting for that package to come back to you, so it isn't lost, but are other changes being done to the contracts. Vetter asked if he had a timeline. Haugen responded that he did not.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO ADJOURN THE MARCH 16<sup>TH</sup>, 2016,  
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:21 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

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

**Wednesday, April 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Steve Adams, in Chairman Mike Powers' absence, called the April 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016 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: Clarence Vetter, Gary Malm, Warren Strandell, Steve Adams, Ken Vein, Marc DeMers, and Jeannie Mock.

Absent: Mike Powers.

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

Guest(s): Mike Yavarow, GF City Engineering; David Kuharenko, GF City Engineering; and Dean Braseth, GF. Library Foundation.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Adams declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 16<sup>TH</sup>, 2016, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE MARCH 20<sup>TH</sup>, 2016, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Yes: Vetter, Strandell, Vein, DeMers, Mock, Malm, and Adams.***

***Voting No: None.***

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

**Sorlie Bridge**

Haugen reported that on the Sorlie, as announced in the media, there are some issues with the controller that controls the aesthetic lighting on the bridge and they are testing and replacing equipment as needed.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, April 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen commented that it was noted to MnDOT that when they do the work on the Kennedy Bridge, they look into getting a simpler controller system for the lighting than what they have for the Sorlie.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reminded the board that last month they talked about MnDOT testing their Snooper equipment in relationship to the new multi-use trail inside the truss, and whether they would be able to access a complete inspection of the bridge. He reported that, unfortunately, they discovered that their current equipment doesn't fit within the confines, so as part of the Kennedy project they will be investigating whether or not there are other means, or other equipment that will allow them to be able to continue inspecting the bridge.

Haugen commented that we also discussed the possibility that they may need to do complete closure of the bridge at times during the rehabilitation project; and it now seems fairly certain that there will be periods of complete closure during the project. He stated that right now they are suggesting six periods of time when they will need to close down traffic across the Kennedy Bridge completely for about a 48 hour period. He explained that this is due to how they have to pour the new deck.

Haugen stated that there will be more input and more information forthcoming about the detour planning, etc., that will be circulating through the community, but as we progress right now, while it was originally hoped that they wouldn't have to close the bridge at all, the reality is that there will be the potential that it will happen at least six times, for 48 hours each time.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF BIKE/PED PLAN SCOPE OF WORK**

Viafara reported that a copy of the complete scope of work was included in the packets. He explained that this document reflects the comments received from the City of Grand Forks' Engineering Department. He stated that the MPO, in conjunction with engineering staff, worked very closely trying to fine tune this document.

Viafara said that he would like to convey our appreciation for the support to the training program that took place two weeks ago over a three day period, April 5, 6, and 7. He reported that the training pertained to pedestrian and bicycle issues, as well as complete streets. He added that anyone that requested a copy of the materials from the training program should have received them, but if there is anyone else that would like them please let him know.

Viafara reported that the attendance for this training seminar, in their opinion, was positive with about ten to twelve people attending.

Viafara said that the Technical Advisory Committee, and MPO Staff, ask that you consider approving the Bike/Ped Plan Scope of Work, as presented.

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE BIKE/PED PLAN SCOPE OF WORK, AS PRESENTED.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, April 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

***ROLL CALL VOTE:***

***Voting Yes: Vetter, Strandell, Vein, DeMers, Mock, Malm, and Adams.***

***Voting No: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Powers.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT MINNESOTA SIDE 2017-2020 T.I.P.**

Haugen reported that we are dealing with just the Minnesota side draft T.I.P. today, but we hope that at your next meeting we will be able to address the North Dakota side as well, however there is a bit of a delay on the North Dakota side due to some questions on funding availability.

Haugen stated that in the packet, for the Minnesota side, there are very few projects contained within the T.I.P, and really the only addition is the end where we add in projects for FY2020. He said that you will see that in FY2020 we are basically continuing the regular transit programs that are in there every year of the T.I.P.

Haugen referred to the project tables and pointed out what the annual amounts are per year. He stated, that, of course, FY2017, with the Kennedy Bridge project, is an atypical funding year, but the other three years are more typical of what we see in the T.I.P. on the Minnesota side, unfortunately not much investment is going on. He commented that every fourth year East Grand Forks receives the City Sub-target program funds, and in this T.I.P. cycle they receive it during FY2018 and they do have a project programmed, currently that project is on 10<sup>th</sup> Street, but there is some discussion with the East Grand Forks City Council of amending that project to implement some of the Bygland Road Study recommendations that we just approved.

Haugen stated that as part of the T.I.P. process we give a progress report on where the projects that are currently programmed are at within the stature of implementation. He pointed out that the first page covers the transit programs; the first one being the fixed route operation, the second is the demand response services, both of which are out in operation and are ongoing, and the last one is the purchase of a transit vehicle. He commented that MnDOT has a state procurement process that is currently in some kind of bureaucratic hiatus while they iron out some issues, so the purchase of this replacement vehicle is delayed until that has been resolved. He said that there is also a second set of vehicles that were purchased through the transit state-wide procurement, but that too is on delay.

Haugen reported that there is a Safe Routes to School project that is trying to do education and encouragement of walking to school in East Grand Forks. He said that that project also includes the purchase of bike racks and signage, and it is still in project development and a technical memorandum needs to be drafted to get clearance from Federal Highway to purchase those items.

Haugen stated that the last project is in relationship to a lift station that is being replaced at 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 10<sup>th</sup> Street, whereby they are going to lower the former railroad crossing on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue with state funds. He added that construction on this project is about to begin soon.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, April 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen commented that we did advertise that a public hearing would take place at our Technical Advisory Committee meeting last Wednesday, and that written comments would be accepted until noon that day. He said that no one attended the public hearing, nor were any written comments submitted, and the Technical Advisory Committee and MPO Staff recommend approval of the Draft Minnesota Side 2017-2020 T.I.P., as presented.

Haugen said that he would just like to note that, again in FY2018, with the City Sub-Target, that we do show a federal amount here of \$787,000; however recent decisions within MnDOT Headquarters will allow this amount to be increased to \$850,000. He explained that what happened at the sub-target level was, previously MnDOT required that both the counties and cities that share this sub-target have to purchase transit vehicles for the district area as well, but a couple of weeks ago the Central Office decided that they were going to purchase all of the vehicles for the next couple of years using State dollars, thus not having to transfer out highway dollars, so this meant that for those two years the City Sub-Target would be able to absorb what used to go out for transit capital purchases. He stated that the ATP has not yet taken formal action on this decision, so that is why we need to still show the old value, but he does want you to be aware that when we get to Final T.I.P. approval it will show a different value for federal participation. DeMers asked, with the change in federal dollars, will there be an increase in the local match as well, or is that a fixed amount. Haugen responded that you will always have to provide the 20% local match. DeMers said, then, that the local match amount will increase as well. Haugen responded it would.

DeMers asked if it would be better to hold off on amending this change into the T.I.P. or should we do it now, are there any time constraints on either option. Haugen responded that he is pretty sure that the ATP is just about done finalizing their decision, and, in-fact Mr. Strandell sits on the ATP as well, and they are doing an e-mail vote on it right now, correct. Strandell commented that he hasn't seen anything that opposes it. Haugen said that he thinks it is a de-facto, done deal that you will get the increase, but, getting back to the question, when do you need to start gaining the federal approvals of the project, so depending on what those timelines are, we should either wait until the new T.I.P is drafted, or make an amendment to the existing T.I.P., so it is kind of in your engineer's court as to when they can start delivering the project, and getting approvals to make the necessary T.I.P. change. DeMers asked, again, is it better to wait until next month to have the City go through with changing this project in this T.I.P. schedule, or... Haugen responded that we can leave it as it is for now as this document is a draft, and there may be other changes or new projects added or some projects removed between now and August when we take final action, but, again, if the City needs to, or wants to do a different project sooner than waiting for the August approval, we can amend the T.I.P. between now and then.

***MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT  
MINNESOTA SIDE 2017-2010 T.I.P., AS PRESENTED.***

***ROLL CALL VOTE:***

***Voting Yes: Vetter, Strandell, Vein, DeMers, Mock, Malm, and Adams.***

***Voting No: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Powers.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, April 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON I-29 TRAFFIC OPERATIONS STUDY**

Haugen reported that there is two bits of information; the first is something that we are requesting action on, and the second it just to update you where we are at with the process.

a. Contract Extensions

Haugen stated that we need to do a contract extension. He explained that there are no financial modifications to the existing contract, but the completion date needs to be moved back due to some delays that occurred as we have been going through this project, so we are asking you to amend the contract with KLJ to extend the completion date to the end of FY2016.

Haugen said that we also have a subsequent contract with the NDDOT to provide 10% of the local match, thus we need to amend that contract to show this new completion date as well.

***MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE CONTRACT AMENDMENTS WITH KLJ AND THE NDDOT TO EXTEND THE COMPLETION DATE OF THE I-29 TRAFFIC OPERATIONS STUDY TO THE END OF FY2016.***

***ROLL CALL VOTE:***

***Voting Yes: Vetter, Strandell, Vein, DeMers, Mock, Malm, and Adams.***

***Voting No: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Powers.***

b. Study Update

Haugen stated that copies of executive summary pages from three documents that are available on the MPO website were included in the packet. He added that there is also information from a public open house that was held at the Alerus Center last Thursday evening. He said that he would like to give a brief presentation using a condensed version of the presentation that was given at that open house, focusing primarily on future conditions along the I-29 Corridor.

Haugen commented that they had about 6-8 people attend, the bulk of which were associated with the Merrifield Interchange area, and staff from City and State.

Haugen reported that where we are at in the process is that we have identified our needs and opportunities; we have assessed the existing conditions; and have looked to the future and what we think, if everything were to remain as it is today, the future traffic conditions would be like. He stated that the next time you see a report on this it will be talking about testing different alternatives to see what they do to the corridor, and which of those alternatives we wish to pursue, how much will they cost, and how can we afford them, etc.

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

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, April 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Gateway Drive

DeMers asked how this information merges with the Railroad Study we did, does this take into account any of those changes. Haugen responded that it does. He explained that they are indicating that, with the potential for the Fertilizer Plant and the State Mill, traffic backup at railroad crossings will be a more frequent occurrence.

Vein commented that there was an individual at City Council that mentioned an agreement many years ago about trying to move some of those tracks either north or south of town, have you heard of such a thing. Haugen responded that the only discussion that he is aware of was one that occurred after the flood of 1997, where there was a brief discussion about relocating the railroad yard south of town. He added that others have talked about relocating the tracks west of the interstate, if the State Mill and the Fertilizer Plant come to be, that perhaps the railroad corridor could be shifted west of the Interstate. He added that the Fertilizer Plant would want it west of the interstate but the State Mill would want it to be east of the interstate.

Vein asked where the ADTs would start reducing as you go further west. Haugen responded that they start reducing a little at 69<sup>th</sup>, but not much, but the real change would be when you get out to the airport. Vein said that you will need a north/south route someplace. Haugen agreed, adding that we would still have a conflict with Gateway Drive unless you grade separate. He said that in our current study, which Mr. DeMers brought up, our recommendation is to do a grade separation. He commented, too, that with the U.S. #2 Study, the recommendation is to add this north/east loop to solve some of the backage on the ramp here, the northbound to westbound traffic, and again we are revisiting those things, but we think they are good solutions.

DeMers Avenue

Vein asked, could, or might one of the outcomes of the study be to expand the I-29 Bridge. Haugen responded that it could. He added that if we can't find alternatives that divert traffic away from here, then we would be looking at trying to find space to get four lanes.

Haugen stated that we do know that the City of Grand Forks has been working with the DOT and Feds to try to come up with a grade separation, but we also know that in the analysis of this configuration in 2040 these intersections have a failing level of service, so part of our study will, again, not just look underneath the interstate, but also see what we can do at these intersections to improve the capacity operations.

Vein said that he knows that there has been some discussion about trying to just sink that intersection, to try to stay away from the 4F plans, will that be addressed at all during this, or are you just going to use the existing layout. Haugen responded that he would have to get back to him on this, but he thinks the assumption is that this has been identified as sort of a, not official, but preferred layout. Vein stated that he knows that there has been a lot of misdirection for that, obviously it is confined so there isn't an easy solution, but some kind of sunken intersection would keep some level of normalcy, although you would still have an issue with snow. Haugen

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, April 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

responded that, just to backtrack on his previous answer; yes because they will have to evaluate these intersections because as they are recommended in this layout they don't give us the level of service we are looking for so we will have to look at them again, and dropping down to the same grade might be one alternative they will look at.

17<sup>th</sup> Avenue

Haugen stated that there aren't really any issues with the existing interchange, and looking to the future, as long as we don't have any new structures, it appears there aren't any in the future either. He added that when we look at the area near 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue there is a plan for some growth, but it isn't a location where there is a high level of growth occurring.

32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue

Haugen commented that not until around 2040 do we see any capacity issues at 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. He added, however, that at two interchanges, Gateway Drive and DeMers, we see capacity issues in 2025.

Haugen reported that one unique thing about this corridor versus the others is the seasonality of the traffic and also the daily variation. He said that we start to see a different pattern here on Saturdays than we do the other corridors, and then with event traffic as well.

Haugen stated that we do have a recommendation, in previous plans, to modify the interchange, so that is one of the things that they will be looking at to see if it is still doable. He added that another big issue is that this isn't being driven from a capacity standpoint, it is the crash history that is occurring out there today, and as volumes increase the crashes are assumed to increase as well and we will be looking into it further.

Haugen commented that in a couple of weeks there is actually going to be a 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Safety Audit conducted, and there will be multiple agencies reviewing past studies, and they will actually walk the corridor to take a look at all the main intersections to try to come up with some sort of response to improve safety along the corridor.

47<sup>th</sup> Avenue

Haugen reported that the City of Grand Forks hired SRF to do some work at this location, however some preliminary work, some draft work that hasn't been formally adopted, does show that an interchange would, from the analysis, provide a diversion of traffic off of 32<sup>nd</sup> that would help the four additional minutes of delay there, as well as the level of service.

Haugen commented that the one thing our study is doing is, as you introduce interchanges you attract traffic to and from other interchanges, so we will analyze why we are doing the whole corridor study instead of just a single two interchange locations.

Haugen said that the other thing we are dealing with, beside the campground, is the desire of Federal Highway to keep the ramps a mile apart. He explained that we think of the overpass

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, April 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

bridges being a mile apart, but the actual desire is that the end of a ramp to the end of a ramp be a mile apart as well.

Merrifield Road

Haugen stated that they are looking at Merrifield both with and without a bridge, and are trying to account for the possibility that one could occur without the other, and how it impacts the volumes on the roadway.

Alerus Event Traffic Study

Haugen reported that they did the Alerus Event Traffic Study during the Jason Aldean concert, which had about 70% of event maximum attendance, so it was a pretty well attended event, and found that under 2015 conditions there were no deficiencies along the corridor, nor in and around it, and the primary reason for that is because the event started at 7:30 p.m., so most of the weekday pm peak traffic is done by then.

Haugen stated that they also looked at a similar event occurring in 2040, and found that there wouldn't be any issues then either.

Haugen said that they also looked at what is being termed "maximum congestion", and if we had 100% capacity of the event center occurring during the actual pm peak period, our busiest time, then we would have issues at these intersections.

Haugen stated that this study is more unique than any other we have done in that we are trying to better link the planning and the environmental documentation, so one of the things we hope to do, in this report, is to actually weed out alternatives that no longer have to be pursued or studied in future project development.

Haugen reported that, going back to the U.S. #2 Study, even though we did come up with a recommendation of alternatives, because we didn't do this type of report linkage, whenever an individual project goes through project development we have to reopen that kind of analysis and revisit all those issues again, and we can't really weed out any alternatives right from the start, so with this study we hope to bring it much further into the project development stage so that some of alternatives can be weeded out and not pursued any longer. He said that this will help us with our fiscal constraint requirement because as we start weeding out alternatives, we start getting a better picture of what the financial impact will be and what our financial ability is to do the alternatives.

Malm asked if Mr. Haugen was aware that the Merrifield Interchange group is trying to reignite the bridge question. Haugen responded that he is aware of that, and added that they think there may be an opportunity with the Minnesota Legislature convening to try to do a transportation package, to move forward with a bridge, but with what the Nielsville Bridge is experiencing, one state might have revenue available and the other may not. Strandell reported that there will

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, April 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

be an effort made to obtain a TIGER Grant that would virtually pay for the entire Nielsville project if awarded, including some improvements to the roadway on the North Dakota side as well.

Malm asked what a TIGER Grant is. Haugen responded that it is a national competitive process in which Congress has set aside a couple hundred million dollars for projects to compete against. He said that there are typically requests for fifty times the amount that is available, and the success rate for any application is less than 2%. He added that the NDDOT is submitting a request for the Pembina Crossing Station improvements project too, and he knows the City is probably going to submit one for their bus barn project as well.

**MATTER OF SAFETY PLANS AND PERFORMANCE**

Haugen reported that April 14<sup>th</sup> our final rules went into effective for how we address safety in our performance planning and performance measures and targets. He stated that included in the packet is information regarding these rules, adding that he will go over it briefly.

Haugen said that there are actually two parts to these rules: 1) first is what is known as the Highway Safety Improvement Program, and 2) second reflects the performance measures and targets.

Haugen explained that this is setting the stage, now, for all the rest of the performance measures and targets that we are required to do under FAST. He stated that MAP-21 is really achieving data driven performance, but it also requires the States and MPOs be more collaborative in the processes of developing those targets.

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

Haugen commented that the Highway Safety final rule requires that every five years we revisit the Strategic Highway Safety Plan, and also incorporated a roadway element requirement, so this is something that has local staff a little excited because it is going to require a national data base of all the elements of each roadway segment regardless of jurisdiction, so all local roads will also be inventoried and have certain data elements that have to be included into this national data base.

Haugen said that for the Performance Measures, initially they proposed only four, but they subsequently decided on five. He added that one of the things that it is also doing is, there has not been a national definition of what a serious injury is, so now they are coming up with a national definition and the implementation schedule for it.

Haugen referred to a slide, and pointed out that it lists the five performance measures: 1) number of fatalities; 2) rate of fatalities per 100 million VMT; 3) number of serious injuries; 4) rate of serious injuries per 100 million VMP; and then the new one 5) number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries. He added that these are all based on five year rolling averages so every year, just like we do with our T.I.P. every year, we will have to do a performance target every year using the rolling 5 year average.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, April 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen commented that one of the things that is may be unique to North Dakota is the requirement that it also be identical to another document called the Highway Safety Plan, and these last three elements have to be exactly identical to what is in the Highway Safety Plan. He says it is unique because the Highway Safety Plan folks, which are the NHTSA, don't like to see any type of targets that are reflecting any actual increases, and in North Dakota, unfortunately our serious injuries and deaths have been on the increase primarily because of the increased activity in the western part of our state, so as North Dakota has been trying to develop these measures and future targets, they have been told they can't have a target that doesn't show a decrease in fatalities, and for North Dakota it doesn't seem possible given what is going on out west.

Haugen reported that North Dakota and NHTSA have had discussions; in particular with Federal Highway involvement, on this final rule, and there is now some movement on the NHTSA side where they say that if your data is really driving towards saying that you can't achieve even maintenance, then that is what the data is driving this towards.

Haugen stated that, getting back to the targets, at a State level they can decide to do an urbanized or non-urbanized area, they aren't required to and they can come up with just one set of numbers, but the important thing to note is that they are using the term "urbanized", so that is a separate or different geography than an MPO study area, so obviously the State and the MPO should be working very closely with whether there should be urbanized rates that are different than if an MPO decides to do their rate because the geography is going to be different, and there will be different numbers.

Haugen commented that, because we are a bi-state MPO, we have the double the options available to us. He explained that of the five measures we can agree to support all five of them that the State develops, or we can agree to do one of the five, two of the five, three of the five, etc. He added that another thing to note is if the MPO does their own targets, and this is something that we will probably see with all the other performance measures as well, what they do for targets doesn't officially get part of the performance evaluations by the feds to see if they are making progress, and it doesn't impact the penalty clause, so again it is saying that probably now more than ever, because of how these targets and the impacts there will be more coordination between the States and the MPO.

Haugen stated that, again, to get at sort of that penalty clause, there are five performance targets that have to be identified annually, and they are saying if you meet four out of the five, or if your performance is better than the previous year, you are okay. He referred to a slide illustrating this and went over it briefly. He pointed out that the penalty clause is a little softer than was anticipated and basically says something like – Congress gives \$100,000,000 to your State for all of the five core programs, safety being one of those five, and they also say that they are only going to allow you to obligate 90% of the money, under current law the State could decide to program zero dollars out of safety and spend everything else out of the other programs, and still meet their 90% total funding commitment, so this penalty clause says that if you don't meet the targets for safety, you have to spend 100% of your safety obligation, and if you want to spend more in another program you would have to take it from a different program than safety.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, April 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen commented that the fear was that they would actually be taking dollars from other programs and then pushing them into safety, so all they are saying is that you have to spend safety dollars.

Haugen went over the schedule briefly. He said that August 31<sup>st</sup> is when the State has to submit their targets, and obviously that means they will have to work with us to decide what type of targets, and what they will be by that date, and then the MPO has until February 17<sup>th</sup> to figure out if we want to support the States targets entirely, or if we want to manage our own targets. He commented that the first time that the penalty clause comes into effect is in 2020. He stated that the last date, 2026, is when the get back to those data elements, and that has to be fully operational.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

a. 2016 UPWP Project Update

Haugen reported that this is just a progress report of our current work for your consideration.

b. Performance Based Planning

Haugen reported that earlier today he sent an email regarding the Minnesota Statewide Planning and Highway Investment Process, and he just wants to reiterate that if you are interested you can go to the [www.minnesotago.org](http://www.minnesotago.org) website and participate in some future stakeholder forums they have scheduled, or some webinars, or online surveys if you want.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO ADJOURN THE APRIL 20<sup>TH</sup>, 2016, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:55 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE  
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mike Powers, Chairman, called the May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016 meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:02 p.m.

**PRESENTATION OF LETTER OF APPRECIATION AND PLAQUE TO STEVE ADAMS**

Powers reported that Steve Adams has decided not to remain on the Grand Forks Planning Commission, and because he is the Planning Commission's representative on the MPO Policy Board, today will be his last meeting and a new representative will be appointed.

Powers then thanked Mr. Adams for serving the communities of Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, both as a Grand Forks Planning Commissioner, and as a Board Member on the MPO Executive Policy Board for four two year terms.

Powers read and presented a Letter of Appreciation, and a plaque for Years of Service to the MPO and the Cities of Grand Forks and East Grand Forks to Mr. Adams.

**CALL OF ROLL**

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

Absent: None.

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

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

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Powers declared a quorum was present.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 20<sup>TH</sup>, 2016, MINUTES OF THE MPO  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY ADAMS, TO APPROVE THE APRIL 20<sup>TH</sup>, 2016,  
MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

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

***Voting No: None.***

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

Haugen referred to the staff report, and pointed out that it states that staff is unaware of any updates at this time. He asked if anyone present had anything to update on either of the bridges.

Yavarow stated that he was notified that the historic groups had a conference call on May 11<sup>th</sup> on the Kennedy Bridge and they provided a 60% plan review. He said, though, that they have yet to see those plans.

Information only.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FY2016 ANNUAL ELEMENT T.I.P. AMENDMENT**

Haugen reported that this is a fairly straight-forward amendment to our T.I.P. He explained that back in October, when we adopted the current T.I.P. document, solicitation for this program had not even been done yet so in our T.I.P. we indicated that we anticipated one fixed route vehicle replacement being applied for, but in November we actually vetted through our process a request from the Cities Area Transit for four replacement vehicles, however in February, as shown in the attached letter North Dakota notified Cities Area Transit that they were awarded funds for three replacement vehicles so we need to amend our T.I.P. to show this, as well as that the federal investment is \$484,000 towards the total cost of \$605,000.

Haugen commented that a public hearing was advertised to occur at last Wednesday's Technical Advisory Committee meeting. He stated that there was no one present at the meeting for discussion on this item, nor were any written comments submitted, thus both the Technical Advisory Committee and MPO staff are recommending approval of the amendment as presented.

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY VEIN, TO APPROVE THE FY2016 ANNUAL  
ELEMENT T.I.P. AMENDMENT, AS PRESENTED.***

***ROLL CALL VOTE:***

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

***Voting No: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: None.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT NORTH DAKOTA SIDE 2017-2020 T.I.P.**

Haugen reported that included in the packet is the full document. He said that he also has a power point presentation that he would like to give as well.

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

Haugen explained that back in December we submitted these projects as tentative in the 2017-2020 T.I.P. document, so this presentation is a recap of what the MPOs responsibilities are, what our area is that need to have projects identified in order to get federal approval, not just the gray area but it also encompasses what you see in the tan area as well.

Haugen commented that, way back when, the T.I.P. process was maybe a six month process, but now it is a year-long process that we annually have to take care of. He said that we still have some unknowns, so what we actually do today is subject to change as they implement FAST.

Haugen reported that there are a couple of new things occurring in this document from our past T.I.P.s. He explained that we have always had to address Year of Expenditure, both on the expense side, and that remains the same at 4% per year, but due to FAST we are actually seeing a forecasted increase in federal revenue, although small, from 1.2% to 2%. He stated that the Long Range Transportation Plan does not reflect that change yet, and some of the projects you will see later on aren't really reflecting, that they are aware of, that 2% increase per year. He explained that this is partly due to the fact that FAST filtered some of those increasing funds into certain programs that have yet to be vetted out.

Haugen referred to slides illustrating the projects for discussion, and went over them briefly.

Haugen stated that our regular 5307 Program is to operate the system, and currently they aren't aware of FAST doing that 2% increase on the transit side as it only pertains to the highway side, so they are still maintaining as is for the federal participation on the transit side, so for now the T.I.P. document states that we are maintaining the current services as is, but are also doing the Transit Development Plan update so it is subject to change.

Haugen commented that there are the two regular Capital programs. He reiterated that we just amended into the T.I.P. the change from the last agenda item, but are also assuming in this draft that in the next cycle there will be a request for one fixed route replacement vehicle.

Haugen stated that back in April we submitted, to the State, for their consideration these projects out of the 5310 Program, but have not heard of anything being awarded yet, so this draft document still shows that these are still in the process of being determined.

Haugen commented that although transportation alternatives is no longer the name of the program, the project was solicited under that program. He said that they do have one project, but have not heard yet whether or not it has been awarded funding. He explained that it is located out on 55<sup>th</sup> Street, adding that if it is awarded funding, a future request or future project that would be funded somehow, would make a connection.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen reported that there are also some Highway Safety Improvement projects, referred to as HSIP, and are funded using a 90/10 formula whereas most other projects are funded using an 80/20 formula.

Haugen stated that there are three projects, but, again they aren't aware of whether or not they have been awarded funding at this time.

Haugen said that the next sequence of slides address street projects. He pointed out that the first ones talk about the fact that we have three years in our T.I.P. document that roll over into our next T.I.P. document, so we are addressing changes in the current T.I.P. of that three year period.

Haugen reported that on the Urban Program, in North Dakota, in 2017 the City had identified a traffic signal being constructed on 42<sup>nd</sup> Street and Gardenview, but that is being relocated to South Washington and 44<sup>th</sup> Avenue. He added that the cost estimate did not change.

Haugen stated that on the Regional side there were a couple of things that we asked for, in addition to what is already programmed including traffic signals at two locations, to be done in 2017, and we were informed that they would be funded. He explained that one will be located at Gateway and 55<sup>th</sup>, and will be funded in 2020; and one on DeMers Avenue in front of the Boden Apartments, potentially will be funded in 2019 and will be located at either the intersection of the West Ramp and DeMers or at 30<sup>th</sup> Street. He said that a study will still need to be done to determine if either of these two intersections should be signalized.

Haugen commented that another request was to do ramp detection at the northbound off-ramps at 32<sup>nd</sup> and Gateway Drive interchanges, but those were not awarded funds in this cycle.

Haugen stated that another major project that is still waiting for decisions to be made on it is just on the west edge of Gateway Drive. He said that in our current T.I.P. we listed it as pending 2018 funds, but construction was still going to take place in 2019. He added that we also show that it is a full reconstruction at a cost of \$22,000,000 or more, but there is still a study being done to determine whether or not it should be a total reconstruct of the westbound lane out to the Airforce Base, or just a pavement treatment. He said that since we haven't been informed differently, we are carrying that project as it current is in the T.I.P., however he is alerting this body of the fact that it may drop down to something more minor than what a full reconstruction project would entail.

Haugen reported that the new year is 2020, and the City did submit a mill and overlay on University Avenue. He explained that this project was also requested last year, but was not awarded funds, however it is being awarded funds in this T.I.P. cycle, and they did adjust the cost for that extra year.

Haugen stated that on the Regional side, the big project they were trying to get funded was the reconstruction of the underpass on Washington Street. He said that, unfortunately, it was not awarded funding, however we were awarded funding for pavement work on North Washington Street between 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue North and 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue North.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen commented that North Dakota always wants one extra year of projects included, which is 2021, and because we are doing work, hopefully, in the vicinity of the Underpass, the project is to do some pavement work to make the pavement smoother, he would anticipate that our 2021 project will be the Underpass again since it wasn't awarded funding this time.

Haugen stated that the last thing is Appendix 1, our current 2016 projects. He referred to the tables and went over them briefly. He did point out that most of our transit replacement vehicles are being purchased through the Minnesota State Contract, however because of some bureaucratic hiccups occurring with the contract, they are being delayed until that is resolved.

Haugen continued going over the status of the 2016 projects, commenting that on the construction side there are some dynamic message signs that were showing up in 2016, however they were actually delivered last year, and they are already in place. He stated that the Kennedy Bridge is obviously programmed on the North Dakota side, fiscally in 2016, but obviously most of the work will be done in 2017.

Haugen said that Columbia Road, in front of the hospital, is under construction; and DeMers Avenue is showing up as a 2016 project, however the bid will be let later this fall and most of the work will be done in 2017. Vein asked what the parameters are for this project. Haugen responded that it is essentially from the Fire Station out to the I-29, so the traffic signal that we are studying, that we will have funding for in 2019, will be delayed a couple of years unless the State advances some things.

Haugen reported that last week they discussed this at the Technical Advisory Committee; and you will notice in the 2017 year the project for a multi-use trail on DeMers Avenue from 42<sup>nd</sup> Street to 48<sup>th</sup> Street, which was originally scheduled to be done this year, is now going to be done next year. He added that there are a couple of things to note; we labeled it as being on the north side of DeMers, but it is most likely now going to shift to the south side of DeMers; and the total cost was \$809,000, but it will probably be lowered, so when the final T.I.P. comes before you this year that slight change will be made in this document. Vein commented that he had a little conversation regarding this bikepath, and he thinks the issue of having it on the north side, which is where he would prefer it be, is the issue of railroad right-of-way, and because of the complexities and the timeframe of when that would ever be built leaves us with the only option of putting it on the south side, but he thinks there is some desire, in long-range they know that they are probably going to have to put in additional lanes, should a bridge be built or whatever, at that time they may want to consider something on the north side as well, but for now it looks like the only way to proceed is to have something on the south side.

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT NORTH DAKOTA SIDE FY2017-2020 T.I.P., AS PRESENTED.***

***ROLL CALL VOTE:***

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

***Voting No: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: None.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE TRAVEL DEMAND MODEL IMPROVEMENT  
SCOPE OF WORK**

Haugen reported that this activity is in our work program for initiation of this year, and it is really a product, or tool that helps us with our Street and Highway Plan, and most of the work will occur in the next two years, and will give us a good starting point.

Haugen commented that the three North Dakota MPOs and the NDDOT all use Advance Traffic Analysis Center out of NDSU to do our Travel Demand Modeling, and this is a scope of work that we worked out together to update our Travel Demand Model.

Haugen stated that there are three things to highlight this go around that will be updates to our current 2010 Base Year.

Haugen said that the first thing is that our traffic generation is done via socio-economic data, and typically that is the number of housing units, and some very generalized employment data; but this time around we are going to stratify that information into more detailed specific types of housing with specific types of income, automobile ownership, other data on the characteristics of residents; and on the employment side we will also stratify employment to more different types of employment. He explained that we currently have retail, other, and industrial; so we will broaden those out to a broader range so that our traffic generation then accounts for a more unique characteristic of the work being done in those neighborhoods.

Haugen commented that the second item is that at the encouragement of prior communication from the State and our federal friends, now, because FAST has actually created a separate freight program, we are introducing a freight modeling mode into our traffic demand model, so besides just trying to model passenger vehicles, essentially, we are also going to incorporate the modeling of truck traffic.

Haugen stated that the third item is, in the past some of you may have been stopped at one of our three bridges during one day of travel whereby you were asked where you were coming from and where you were going, as well as the purpose of your trip; now with GPS so common with all of our smart phones and other things, there are private companies out there that routinely have that data collected, and we are going to work with the other two MPOs in the State, and with NDDOT, to purchase some of this GPS based data.

Haugen reported that ATAC is using a specific vendor, Air Sage, but we will have to do a request without specifying a specific vendor, but essentially it will be the same in that all of the trips that are being generated in Grand Forks and East Grand Forks attract, and you can specify a specific period of time, ATAC is suggesting over a month period, so that we know fairly well where vehicles are coming and going in the metro area over one month's time, and that will help us get our model better calibrated and validated.

Vein asked how the GPS tracking works. Haugen responded that most people don't bother to turn off, or they actually want their locator on on their phones, and that information is gathered

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

and there are private firms that drill into that data set from whoever your provider is, and then they sell the data for various reasons, and one of those reasons is for transportation purposes.

Discussion on GPS and data collection issues ensued.

Haugen commented that the total cost with ATAC for them to bring our 2010 model up to 2015 is \$36,678.00, and will bridge both this year and next year, and we did budget the funds to do it, so both the Technical Advisory Committee and staff are recommending the MPO Executive Policy Board approve the agreement with ATAC to upgrade our Travel Demand Model.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE CONTRACT AGREEMENT WITH ATAC TO UPDATE OUR 2015 TRAVEL DEMAND MODEL, AS PRESENTED.***

***ROLL CALL VOTE:***

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

***Voting No: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: None.***

**MATTER OF MnSHIP AND MnSWTP**

Haugen distributed a questionnaire and explained that MnDOT is requesting the board members fill consider filling it out and return it to him, or mail it to MnDOT.

Haugen reported that the Statewide Multi-Modal Transportation Plan is one of MnDOTs family of plans that addresses the relationship between transportation and the environment, economy and people in the State of Minnesota. He added that the other item is the Minnesota State Highway Investment Plan, which is really what the sheets before you are geared towards.

Haugen reminded the board that we did discuss these approaches previously; how the funding is distributed among the investment categories. He said that in the past something they have not shown in their investment plans, they are now investing in, and one of them he will highlight because it will have an impact in our metro area, and that is highway ownership. He explained that that means jurisdictional transfer, and US Business 2 is one on the list of potential transfer from being a US Highway Business 2 owned and operated by MnDOT to being owned and operated by either the county or the state.

Strandell commented that if they are trying to put that into the turnback program, there is only so much money in it, so the more roads you put in the less there is for each of them. He stated that it takes the costs and responsibilities off of the State's shoulders, but puts it on the gas tax and the counties. Haugen responded that it isn't funded, currently, but jurisdictional transfer that can happen any time, unfortunately there has never been any money in the pot, now they are saying that they want to set aside this investment level, so much of a percent of their total program, depending on which approach they chose, so that they can do these transfers. He added that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

there is a small number of transfers that might go the other way where a city or county roadway would be given over to MnDOT as well.

Powers asked what this would do to the county's budget. Strandell responded that it wouldn't affect the County's budget, but this money come from the gas tax, and there is only so much money going into the program, so the more roads you put into the program, the less there is to maintain what you have. DeMers said, though, that the County has been doing that to the City as well, because you have taken county roads out of the City. Strandell responded that he isn't aware of any county roads being taken out of the City, but if it was taken out of the City it was probably just assigned somewhere else. DeMers clarified that Bygland was taken out of the County program and put into the City's program. Strandel said that he is not aware of that happening.

Haugen referred to the sheet with the three approaches being considered, and Approach A and Approach C do not show any funding for jurisdictional transfer, so it would remain as it currently exists as it is today. He added that there is a program that exists on paper, but there is no money behind it, so in fact it is not done.

Haugen commented that MnDOT went around, and this body did participate last fall, to identify which approach is preferred, and the one that came out on top was Approach B. He pointed out that on one of your handouts they further refined Approach B, and it does fund jurisdictional transfers. He added that also, as there is always trade-off, they decided that they want to fund transfers, but, and you will see this in the report, to do so they will drop the safety program by one-third in order to fund some of the other programs. He said that another one they are dropping will be bicycling by three quarters.

Haugen said, then, that the exercise they are requesting you do today is to inform them of whether you agree with the pie-chart distribution, if not what would you change.

Haugen reported that the second sheet he distributed is, MnDOT wants to try to be prepared in case the Legislature does come up, by the end of the week, with a new transportation program, which they are hoping means increased revenue, so they have asked you to inform them, if we did get more money, where would you prioritize the investment of those monies.

DeMers said, they want to increase revenue, which he thought was supposed to meet the gap between the projected need and what the current revenue is; and now they are going back and saying that there is going to be extra revenue how do you want us to spend it, he thought that was already determined. Haugen responded that there is a \$20,000,000,000 gap to cover what their needs are, but what they are doing is arming themselves to the Legislature to be able to say, this is where people want it invested, not just here, but also elsewhere as well.

Vein asked for clarification. He pointed out that there is a dollar amount, a description, and a percentage shown on the chart for each one. He asked what the dollar amount indicates. Haugen responded that it is the dollar amount that would be available to fund that program. Vein asked,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

then, how he would know if that is a good amount if he doesn't know what the need is in that area. Haugen responded that they do provide you with some idea of how that meets their current performance measures. Vein asked, when you talk about the reduction, does it also say in there what would be needed in that category. Haugen responded that they do have additional documentation available if you are interested. Vein responded that he doesn't want to go there, he doesn't have time to go through all the information, he is just saying, isn't there data that would support where your priorities should be, and how much you should do, because a lot of that is based on need, and he means need not just want, and then that is where we would put it, but this type of format is kind of a guessing game, and he doesn't want to vote for something that may ultimately be negative to what we are trying to accomplish. Haugen stated that this is where the fiscal constraint comes in, there is only so much in the pie, and they have some obligations that they have to divide the monies to, they can't spend it all on one category, so they have done some analysis, and even at this funding level for pavement management, they aren't going to meet their targets, but they know that they can't spend everything on that, so they are doing the best they feel they can with the resources they have. He added that some of the things they took money from in order to make up things, like jurisdictional transfer, they probably took from either bicycling or safety in order to free up money to do jurisdictional transfers.

Vein stated that he wonders about this method of investing funds as he thinks bridges are kind of important, so he would put more into that program, but then again he doesn't know how much Minnesota needs to have in bridges. Haugen commented that this would fit under Approach A that was presented last fall, but you will see with that approach there are also a lot of programs that have zero percent funding added. Mock said that she thinks Mr. Vein's point is, though, that without actually knowing where the need is, it becomes almost a political shellgame, I know somebody that likes to bike so I want more to go into bicycling versus I don't want a bridge to collapse. DeMers agreed, adding that he thinks that the dollars aren't as important as the percentages, and how do you relate that without knowing how much goes into it.

Mock said that it is pretty easy for someone to say they shouldn't put money into the highway transfer program unless you are on the county and have to deal with it, but for a lot of people, they are going to say don't put any money in that. Malm commented that that is why he circled the option that says that this doesn't really affect him because he doesn't know what they need in Minnesota, and he doesn't know where the money is generated from. He asked if this was based on somebody's idea of what is going to be in the transportation bill, because they might not even get this because they adjourn on Friday, don't they. Haugen responded that this is not based on what the Legislature might be doing this week, it is based on what has historically happened in the State of Minnesota, and principally they do have some mechanism in place, so by the end of the week if a new bill isn't approved, there will still be gas tax revenue collected, and tab fees, so transportation revenue will still flow, just not at a higher rate, so that is what this assuming, what currently is in place. He added that they are asking, if they get more funding, how would you change this pie-chart.

Vein stated that from his perspective he commends MnDOT for asking these questions, he just doesn't know how you can answer it without a question.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

**MATTER OF COMMUTE DATA FOR PERFORMANCE MATRIX**

Viafara reported that to-date we have covered information on Functional Classification, Pavement Condition, Traffic Volumes, Traffic Counts, and Fatalities and Serious Injuries. He stated that this is in response to a number of goals that have been set for the MPO to follow when doing performance based planning.

Viafara stated that we are now discussing Goal #3 – Accessibility and Mobility, and in order to do that we want to review commuting share by mode, or Journey to Work.

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

Presentation ensued.

Viafara commented that you have been given an analysis that entails the population, the tools, and the objectives.

Viafara explained that population for the commute to work is compiled of anyone in the United States that is 16 years of age or older; that is actively involved in the labor force including members of the U.S. Military; and that are or have been working in the week previous to the survey.

Viafara stated that for this analysis we used information from the U.S. Census from the Year 2000; and something called estimates, which were five year groups of estimates for the year 2005 and the year 2010.

Viafara reported that the idea is to find out where the person, at the moment they are being interviewed, is working. He said that this is a very important issue because in the United States a large number of workers need to cross jurisdictional boundaries in order to find places of employment, and that poses some challenges for the transportation system, that is the reason for doing this analysis.

Viafara commented that, as you can see, a number of questions are being asked, the most important is the one on the top – Where did you work last week. He said that a number of questions then ask about the mode of transportation used to get to work, the time the person left home for work, how long was the commute, etc.

Viafara stated that challenges for us, as he discovered, is for us to establish a relationship between the land use and the places where people work. He said that there is also a need for us to analyze how the system, in terms of capacity, is working; what the level of service is, and what the level of congestion is.

Viafara said that another thing we want to do is to establish a connection between the distance traveled and the location of people's jobs; so, overall, here in the United States you can see the different modes of transportation being used by community members to get to work.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Viafara referred to a graphic that highlights commuting in the United States from 2000 to 2012; and stated that you can see the behavior of the different modes. He pointed out that most of the growth came from cars, people driving by themselves to work. He added that it also shows that there was a decline for carpooling; and there was also a steady reduction on the miles drive annually by the people going to work.

Viafara stated that there are also graphics that illustrate the behavior at a national level for walking and bicycling. He pointed out that walking has been steadily declining, although it is trying to slowly recover, showing a slight increase between 2000 and 2010, but still remained below the levels of 1980. He said, however, that bicycling has been slightly increasing.

Viafara commented that he would like to mention, however, that, as he indicated before we are using estimates, and some scholars complain that those estimates sometimes neglect to actually provide a full picture of the reality in that particular locality, so with that in mind we will take this information, but also realize that it is possible that the reality could be actually quite different so, bear this in mind.

Viafara said that one mode that is also growing, is the work at home mode. He explained that in the 1990s we had a small number of people working at home, but in 2010 this number increased, showing that another 2 million people are working at home. He stated that this would assume that they would have no use for the roadway system, but some people, in order to communicate with them, actually have to do that

Viafara stated that at the national level there are some “trends” that seem to be happening; one is that the decline in transit use has been reversed with a modest rebound since 2000 so we can expect more slowly increases in ridership across the nation. He said that another is that there is a continuing but low decline in walking to work, and there is a trend of increases in working at home.

Viafara commented that in our area, specifically for Grand Forks it shows an increase in workers by 12.3%, the number of people commuting by car remained stable, the number of workers per vehicle remains stable, the share of walking to work remained stable, but the share of biking to work increased as did the number of people working at home (by 48%).

Viafara reported that it was found that 93% of workers in the county remained within the county; that the number of Grand Forks people working at home increased by 35%; that people are leaving for work around 7:30 to 8:30 a.m.; their journeys take about 12 minutes; and 30% or more of the workers actually have more than three vehicles available to go to work.

Vein stated that the question he has, especially concerning the numbers of people working at home, those are pretty high percentages, but you go from five to ten is a significant increase percentage wise, but it doesn't mean the numbers are very high. Viafara responded that that is true. He added that another issue is that this 35% is divided into decades, basically based from the Year 2000 to the Year 2014, so the increases are actually around 1.7% per year, so what you see is for the entire decade, but every year there is a 1% to 2% increase in the number of people working at home, and that number is based on the number of active workers.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Viafara said that we also have information for East Grand Forks. He stated that, again we see that the number of workers increase by 16%; the number of people driving alone increased; the number of carpoolers decreased; transit share increased from the Year 2000 to the Year 2006, but has remained flat since; commuting by bike has remained stable; and walking to work decreased.

Viafara commented that it is important for us to realize that 67% of all the workers that live in East Grand Forks need to cross boundaries somewhere as they find work outside of East Grand Forks. He said that those workers have to leave home between 7:30 and 8:00 a.m., and their travel time takes about 14.6 minutes, which is about 2 minutes longer than the commute for people in Grand Forks. He added that they continue having 1.6 people per vehicle, and 45.6% have two vehicles available to get to work.

Viafara referred to a table, and pointed out that it shows the estimated daytime population and employment residence ratios for 2006-2010. He explained that it shows information for Grand Forks, East Grand Forks and the Grand Forks Air Force Base. He stated that you can see that East Grand Forks shows a loss of daytime population of 7.5 percent, the Air Force Base shows an increase of 13.5 percent, and Grand Forks shows an increase of 7.5 percent.

Viafara that the next table shows that people living in Grand Forks County tend to remain working in Grand Forks; but people living in Polk County tend to work outside of Polk County. He referred to the table and pointed out that it shows that the number of workers in Grand Fork County is estimated at 37,564. He added that it also shows that 91% of workers residing in Grand Forks County stay in Grand Forks County. He stated that the employment to resident ratio in East Grand Forks is 1 to 0.86 percent, and at least 2/3 of the workers commute from Grand Forks to East Grand Forks.

Haugen commented that he found it interesting that, as you would expect, most Grand Forks residents work in Grand Forks, 2/3 of East Grand Forks residents go to Grand Forks to work, so there are roughly 6,000 jobs in East Grand Forks, and there are 6,000 workers in East Grand Forks, 2/3 of them go to Grand Forks to work, but the equivalent number of people come back over from Grand Forks to East Grand Forks to fill those jobs, so it is an odd community in that they have the jobs here in the community, but it isn't necessarily the people living in the community fill those jobs.

Strandell asked if the bridge survey didn't show that there is almost an equal number of vehicles going one way as going the other. Haugen responded that it did. He added that our bridge traffic does show that at times it is 50/50 or 55/45 split. Vein added that he wonders how many live in Grand Forks and work in Fargo, and vice/versa, but that is going to smaller, and these are the top three. Viafara agreed, adding that it is increasing, and most of the people on this side tend to remain on this side. Haugen pointed out that this table is at the County level, and because the Air Force Base is included in the County we will get some unique foreign countries where people say they commute to work.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON THE 2045 GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN**

Haugen reported that this is an update on where we are at with the 2045 Grand Forks Land Use Plan update.

Haugen stated that, as you will recall, we do have three consultants assisting us; WSB is the primary consultant, along with their subs, Nelson Nygard and Community Design Group.

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

Haugen pointed out that we just completed the public engagement, livability and pilot area phase of the project timeline. He stated that we will be discussion the pilot areas and engagement responses we received today.

Haugen stated that we had a survey that was both web-based, as well as presented to the community at different events to get feedback on what the main thing is they want to see with the Grand Forks Land Use Plan update. He said that there were three main themes that came from that information.

Haugen commented that the first thing the public wishes to see is affordable housing, secondly they want to improve and expand multi-modal infrastructure and facilities such as bike and pedestrian trails, and third they want to more engagement of the public in long range planning.

Vein asked how the survey was presented. Haugen responded that there were three basic ways they presented the survey: 1) web-based; 2) public engagement locations such as the french fry feed; and 3) at the pilot site meetings. Vein said, though, that it wasn't a scientific survey, but there was a somewhat targeted audience that answered the survey, so it doesn't surprise him that you got these results, but he isn't sure how that is indicative of the whole population. Haugen commented that, again, this gives you some idea of three different engagement times, the responses we got, and how they rated the things, so the question was they were able to list the top three or top five priorities for the future, and these were the ones that came out on top.

Haugen stated that some other top priorities that were determined via the survey were: 1) where should housing be – downtown was the top response; 2) top five industries – any high paying job was the top response; 3) what should Grand Forks' transportation goals be – become more pedestrian friendly and walkable was the top response.

Haugen reported that most of the people that participated in the survey said that they have resided in Grand Forks more than five years. He added that they were also asked how long they have been living in the current location, and you can see that even though most have been there five years, many have moved within the last five years to their current location. He pointed out that the age groups that participated were well distributed, and a good range of income as well.

Haugen stated that the next slides talk about the three pilot sites. He explained that the intent of the pilot sites was to take the text of the plans goals and objectives and try to get a visualization

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

of what the text is trying to inform us. He said that the three sites chosen were: 1) Grand Cities Mall; 2) South Columbia (JR's Development) ; and 3) Water Treatment Plant.

Haugen commented that the next few slides actually show each individual site, and the participation that occurred at the event. He briefly went over the results obtained from each site.

Haugen then went over the remaining project timeline, explaining that they will be using a sub-committee of the Grand Forks Planning and Zoning Commission. He stated that they have been provided with these two documents and are scheduled to meet Thursday, May 25<sup>th</sup> at noon to discuss these things. He pointed out that there is a big break between May and September, when we actually start to finalize the plan, that was built into the system to allow for the election process and for new members to be appointed to the various committees and commissions, so there is a big gap but it was built into the contract scope of work.

Information only.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

a. 2016 UPWP Project Update

Haugen reported that this, again is the monthly update of all of our activities. He pointed out that included, per a request from the Technical Advisory Committee, is a percent completed column and the Fiscal Year the project was identified to be done in.

b. 2016 Bike Map

Haugen reported that we do have a new bike map for 2016. A paper copy was included in the packet.

c. Transit Development Plan Meetings

d. Bike/Ped Plan Meetings

e. Televising MPO Meetings

Haugen stated that he did forward an e-mail that talked about future MPO meeting locations from President Dana Sande in Grand Forks. He said that he responded to him that we do have some restrictions in that we are required to go out and engage the community so not everything can be done at one spot, but we are willing, and he suggested to him that, on a quarterly basis, the MPO could be placed on the City Councils' agendas as an informational item.

Haugen commented that the second part of Mr. Sande's request is that, because the Grand Forks City Hall has the capability of televising meetings, we consider holding our meetings there to be televised, so that is something for this board to discuss. He explained that, traditionally how this board has operated is that the chair is the one that determines where the board meets, with the consensus of the group. He stated that lately the last several chairs have liked the availability of

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

this space, with the ample parking, and have kept it here, but prior to that every two years we were meeting at a different facility.

Powers asked Mr. Vetter and Mr. DeMers, East Grand Forks City Council members, where the City of East Grand Forks is at in regard to getting the equipment installed to be able to televise meetings in East Grand Forks City Hall as well. DeMers responded that he knows that they will be discussing this at next week's work session, where they will be getting the proposal to move forward with a \$25,000 plan, which is the full grant funding to do televising here, both upstairs and downstairs, so he would imagine if that goes forward it will be voted on at the next regular City Council meeting, thus it would most likely be mid-summer before we would potentially have something installed, however it wouldn't be a full broadcast setup to begin with.

Powers asked Mr. Vein where he wants to meet next year as he will be assuming the Chair then. Vein responded that he sees the issue as not as much where we meet, he thinks the idea is can you make them public so people can be made aware of what is happening. He said that he does have a tendency to like this location because parking is easy, to be honest with you, and it is pretty easy to get in and out, but he would like to hear back from the other council members too, but for him the location is fine as he has to drive wherever we meet.

DeMers clarified that he thinks the plan is, if they go forward with the bare bones model at this time, the goal would be to sometime after the beginning of the year be able to have some sort of broadcast on Midcon or whatever, but nothing has been passed yet.

Haugen commented that prior to this issue being brought up, we have now started recording our open houses, such as the I-29 meeting we held at the Alerus Center can be found on the I-29 website to view.

Hauge stated that another thing, since this has been brought up, last week we had our State and Federal Partners visit us and one of the things we are now being required to do is to ensure that all of our meetings are taking place at ADA compliant facilities, so some of the things that we have gone out to do doesn't prohibit us from doing that, but we also, at the same time, have to make sure that there is a place that is fully ADA compliant to engage the public as well, so we are now asking both City Halls to give us a statement that they are ADA compliant, and Mr. Viafara is currently out looking for locations to hold meetings for the Bike/Ped update, and will be asking those locations for similar statements as well. He added that he suspects that we will start to receive some unwillingness from some of those locations to sign a statement to that effect just because most of us lack real detailed knowledge of whether we can sign such a statement or not, but the last thing we want to do would be to try to make a judgement as to whether or not a location is ADA compliant.

Haugen said, then, that what he is hearing is that Grand Forks does have the capability of recording meetings, while East Grand Forks currently doesn't, so we will have to revisit whether or not we want to relocate our meetings to a place that has that capability. DeMers commented that he thinks that is a value that we all want, but does it need to be tomorrow, or a month or two

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

from now, what is the timeline. Haugen added that you do have the capability of audio recording, as you do that currently in East Grand Forks. Vein stated that he would like to visit further about this with Mr. Sande before any decisions are made about moving the meetings. He added that he doesn't remember having more than a very few from the public attend our meetings, and he doesn't care where they are held, where at City Council meetings you do get a fair amount of public attending them, and in any event the meetings would most likely be re-broadcast because live at noon not too many people are going to be watching. Powers said, too, that most people that would come to our meetings wouldn't know what we were talking about, if you say T.I.P. amendment, they would say what the heck is that.

Haugen reported that most of the things that this body is taking action on, the appropriate City Council has taken action on already, and have provided you with their recommendation on what action they would like you to take.

f. Red Lake River Paddle Event

DeMers stated that just as a note of interest, the Red Lake River Corridor Commission has recently been reconstituted, and part of what they are doing is to hold a paddle event on June 10<sup>th</sup> from 4:00 to 7:00 p.m. down at Lafayette Park if anyone is interested in attending. He said that they have these giant canoes that they can fit twenty people in and paddle up and down the river, so he would invite everyone to come and take a look.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO ADJOURN THE MAY 18<sup>TH</sup>, 2016,  
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:26 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE  
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mike Powers, Chairman, called the June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016 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, Clarence Vetter, Warren Strandell, Ken Vein, Marc DeMers, and Jeannie Mock.

Absent: Gary Malm.

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

Guest(s): Patty Olsen, Safe Kids Grand Forks.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Powers declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MAY 18<sup>TH</sup>, 2016, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY STRANDELL, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE MAY 18<sup>TH</sup>, 2016, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Yes: Strandell, Vetter, Powers, Vein, DeMers, and Mock.***

***Voting No: None.***

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

Haugen referred to the staff report, and pointed out that it includes some informational items.

**Sorlie Bridge**

Haugen reported that they are still trying to work things out with the aesthetic lighting. He added that once that is done they will be able to close out the Sorlie Bridge project.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen referred to the staff report and pointed out that it includes information concerning the fact that the bid letting for the project will likely slip at least one month, and possibly more, which means more activity will take place in 2017.

Strandell asked what the date for the bid letting are. Haugen responded that it was scheduled to occur in September, but it looks like possibly November. He explained that MnDOT was giving a very soft delay because they are 60% done with the design right now.

Haugen commented that detour routes are still being determined because they are still finalizing how often they actually may have to close down the bridge completely, as well as how long it will be closed. He stated that their last estimate was that it would be closed at minimum of six times, but they are trying to find a way to reduce that number. He explained that the reason for complete closure is due to how they pour the concrete and how long it takes to cure; and how they have to stage the concrete so that they keep an even distribution of weight.

Haugen stated that, again, 60% of the design has been signed off on by the Historic Preservation Commission, so that is a good step. He added that they are also trying to meet with East Grand Forks interests on making the trail connection from the bridge down to the Greenway Trail System, trying to figure out how to make that connection.

Information only.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF NORTH DAKOTA SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL NON-  
INFRASTRUCTURE CANDIDATE PROJECTS**

Viafara reported that this is based on a report presented by Safe Kids North Dakota. He explained that there was a joining of efforts to submit a request for this grant.

Viafara commented that the grant entails support for a number of projects; including pedestrian and wheeled sports coordination, support for expansion of safety on wheels program, support for the community education resources, and support for the pedestrian safety items. He added that also included is a project requested by the MPO to more or less have a comprehensive view of what is happening with the Safe Routes to School around our planning area.

Viafara stated that so far the proposal is still being tweaked to include all the items and information needed, so this is just a draft, and the final request will be completed soon and submitted for consideration.

Haugen explained that we were only notified of this program the first of June, and Safe Kids Grand Forks didn't receive notification until late May; and we were told that we needed to process something during June.

Haugen reported that the Technical Advisory Committee was shown a table that had one cost estimate; then based on more information, in your packet was a cost estimate that was slightly

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

lower, and now we are presenting to you today a revised document that has a higher cost estimate, so there is some ?? going on here, but the essence of what we are trying to accomplish is not all that different, as they went through the draft and the cost changes, it is just identifying and finding out what North Dakota is providing versus what we have to provide ourselves, and that is why some of those cost revisions are occurring.

Haugen commented that typically North Dakota and Minnesota allow each community to uniquely design and purchase promotional and educational material and ?? program; but here North Dakota is saying that they are going to have all those things, you just tell us the number and quantity you want via your application, so that is causing an adjustment.

Haugen stated that we do need to take action today, but you do have the ability to defer it to your Finance Committee if you want them to meet later this month to give final approval, or we can have a special meeting of the Executive Policy Board, but in any event by the end of June, we, as an MPO, have to forward something on to the NDDOT.

Patty Olsen, Safe Kids Grand Forks, stated that she is the one that wrote the grants, and worked the numbers. She said that they really appreciate their partnership with the MPO because it makes a huge difference, and they can't work in isolation, and this is the partnership between the City of Grand Forks, the MPO, Grand Forks Public Schools, Police, and any entity involved with transportation and safety in Grand Forks.

Olsen reported that this application is 100% federally funded through the State of North Dakota so they aren't going to be asking for funds from the City of Grand Forks. Haugen added that Safe Kids has done a lot of these activities in the past in Grand Forks, and are continuing some of them through other funding sources, and are also doing things in East Grand Forks with Safe Routes to School money from the Minnesota side, so this isn't something that is brand new, it is a continuation, and this is a new funding source, which allows for some things to be re-vamped up that were done under previous North Dakota Safe Routes to School grants.

Vein asked if these projects have been through Safety and Service, and do you have concurrence from all the organizations involved. Olsen responded that they do. She explained that they have worked together with all entities on projects funded by both Safe Routes to School and Safe Kids world-wide for over ten years. She added that the trick here was; for five years they have been without Safe Routes to School funding, and they have tried do as much as they could with other funding, so they are really going to try, with this grant, is to determine what is actually new so we aren't saying, well Altru Safe Kids has been paying for this stuff anyway, why should we fund it, so they are really trying to say this is how we want to expand.

Vein said, again, these are non-infrastructure projects, correct. Olsen responded that that is correct. She stated that one of the things that called to ask about was funding more of the speed radar signs like those on 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and they aren't being considered because they are permanently placed, thus they are considered infrastructure, so she cannot request those in this application.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Vein asked if there was any relation with the Grand Forks Traffic Engineer, as that is all compatible. Olsen responded that she works with Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineer. She said that Ms. Williams is on one of their sub-committees, and some of the ideas in this application actually came from her, plus they have someone from City Planning, Stephanie Erickson, as well. She added that she will go back to the office and send this out.

Powers asked, again, what the options for acting on this item were. Haugen responded that you can take action on it today; you can authorize the Finance Committee to take action when the final document is complete, or you can reconvene a special meeting of the whole Executive Policy Board later this month. He explained that we are hovering right around a \$55,000 total application cost, and he wouldn't anticipate that going up, and in-fact it should only go down. He added that it is just a matter of massaging the wording in the application, as this is a work in progress. He said, again, this is because we all got squeezed by the State and their processes, not because we sat on our hands for a month or two, so this is all a matter of comfort level you have on approving the only grant request we have coming out of our area, 100% federally funded, and it is an organization that has a strong connection to the community, so he doesn't see any reason not to approve it.

Vein commented that he would be inclined to approve this today. He added, though, that that is why he asked about the coordination with the other entities; if we get those people to coordinate, he would very much want to follow their recommendation anyway.

Mock asked if this has to go ??? Olsen responded that she doesn't believe so. Olsen responded that when she gets back to the office today she will send this rough draft to Jody Thompson, Jane Williams, someone at the Police Department, and Mark Aubol to make sure they are aware of where we are at. Vein said, then, that they haven't seen this rough draft yet. Olsen responded that they haven't, adding that she only sent it to Mr. Haugen and Mr. Viafara to look at first, but it isn't vastly different from anything they have done in the past, or aren't already doing or what should be expanded on, so she doesn't think there will be any problem. She added that when they talk about wanting to do signage and sidewalk painting and things like that most of it is on school property so in terms of Mark Aubol's work it won't involve a ton of work on their part, but she will go ahead and get it out to everyone, but the three of them have been staying in touch on this through this process.

Mock asked if, when you write this grant in this way, do you break it out by school or do you write it for the community at large. Olsen responded that they write it for the community at large. She added, though, that what she has learned over the last five to six years in working with the schools is that each school is a little bit different, depending on the principal and the demographics of that school. She explained that you have schools where 90% of the kids do live in a walkable and bikeable distance; and then you have schools like Lake Agassiz where you have kids that live across the interstate, so they have learned to customize it and not try to deliver the same program to each school, and work with the principal. She stated that most important thing they learned is that unless the school takes ownership of the safety, as well as the parents, teachers, and kids, Safe Kids can't come in at the end of the year and ?? safety unless the school itself is committee to it.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Vein said that not all of the principals have seen this application though correct. Olsen responded that they haven't but that it will just go to Mr. Thompson at this point. Vein stated that he understands; so you have made some assumptions based on past experience, and you feel that they would most likely approve of it. Olsen responded that that is correct. Vein said, then, the schools haven't seen it, Ms. Williams hasn't seen it, the Police haven't seen it. Olsen responded that they have not seen this draft yet. Haugen commented that some of those people have seen the table, it has been iterated through the individual items and the cost estimates to get to a grand total, it has been shopped around.

Vein commented that if there was strong resistance, at least by somebody, how would that be handled. Olsen responded that they would take that into consideration, especially in delivery. She explained that what they do is, when they put this together they said, this is what we want to do system wide, but the schools aren't obligated to do anything unless they are directed by Mr. Thompson. She said that there isn't anything that says that schools absolutely have to have a crossing guard, or safety patrol programs, so none of this is etched in stone, but what she finds is that principals are pretty excited to be able to have crossing guards, and other safety measures put into place. She added that they did do a principal survey so they are aware that they are applying for this, and about a third of them replied back, so she did get input from some of them as to what they want, and none of them said they don't want any of it.

***MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE NORTH DAKOTA SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL NON-INFRASTRUCTURE CANDIDATE PROJECTS, AS PRESENTED.***

***ROLL CALL VOTE:***

***Voting Yes: Strandell, Vetter, Powers, Vein, DeMers, and Mock.***

***Voting No: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Malm.***

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

Haugen reported that included in the packet were the boards that were presented during the recent public engagement activities held last week, as well as information on when and where those activities were held.

Haugen referred to the information in the packet, and stated that last Wednesday the Focus Groups met with interests such as the Human Service Agencies; Economic Development; Business Interests, etc., and then they went and held open houses at three different locations to get input from not only users of the system, but others who have access to the system as well. He commented that they didn't get great participation, but Ms. Kouba did prepare a write up on the results of those activities.

Haugen referred to the information on the individual routes and went over it. He said this gives us a sense of how these routes compare to each other.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen stated that the last graphic is the two systems, on a whole, with fixed routes on the left. He said that you can see that it roughly costs \$2.3 million to operate the fixed route system and roughly \$800,000 to operate the Demand Response, which includes the Senior Rider and Dial-A-Ride programs. He commented that these are the costs to operate the system as a whole, and combine Grand Forks and East Grand Forks efforts.

Haugen pointed out that ridership on the fixed route system shows that the most recent trend is a decrease per year; and on the demand response system there is a slight increase. He said that of the two systems the demand response is the more costly system to run per ride, so we are trying to get people to use the fixed route system more and that is why we have the Mobility Manager funded.

Haugen commented that in looking at the individual routes you can see some top performers and some troubling routes. He said that this isn't something new, as we have known that some of our routes run with hour headways, which means it takes you an hour before the next bus comes to pick you up, and those are the ones that tend to have less performance than those that operate with a 30-minute headway. He added that it costs roughly around \$310,000 to run a fixed route system, running it the same days and hours we currently run it.

Haugen said that one route to really point out that is probably most subject to change is Route 12/13, which operates connecting the southwest end of Grand Forks with the southeast end of Grand Forks, from the Alerus Center to the Wellness Center. He explained that it was funded separately through a special grant program under SAFETEA-LU, but that program was eliminated in MAP-21, so this route is most likely to be modified significantly, and we can see from the statistics that it has a really out-of-range cost per ride.

Haugen reported that what they have heard from respondents thus far in our engagement process are things that we already knew going into the service; that most of the people that use the system say they want more frequent service, having night service in East Grand Forks available, having Sunday service available, and then the most common want is for bus stops to be closer together as they are currently too far apart and it is too far for people to get to a bus stop to get on a bus.

Haugen stated that they are still in the data gathering stage of the Transit Development Plan Update. He added that there is a survey that is out, and you can encourage people to access it on our website.

DeMers commented that at the Steering Committee meetings the option of "blowing" the whole system up and starting over was mentioned, is that still a viable option. Haugen responded that it is still a viable option. DeMers stated that one of the thoughts was that if you look at these routes they almost seem like they are a location to location type route system instead of a grid based system, and what some of the people on the committee said is that it might be better and more efficient, and encourage more ridership to have a grid based system that allows more transfer options that are more predictable than the current system, which is confusing to the novice rider. He said that he was encouraged that you are looking at that option because to him it seems that if he were going to use transit, and he has used transit in larger cities, the more predictable and more like how you would drive it yourself, the more sense it makes. He added

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

that he can't imagine not knowing these maps or routes and trying to navigate our system, it is kind of intimidating.

Haugen reported that he didn't mean to suggest that they are only looking at Route 12/13 for modifications, he was just highlighting that route as an example.

Information only.

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PLAN**

Viafara reported that the purpose of today's presentation is to keep you up-to-date on the recent activities advanced by the MPO in relation to the Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan Update.

Viafara said that so far Task #1, which was to identify the Stakeholders and establish a Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee has been completed. He added that it is working, and they have certainly provided their assistance.

Viafara stated that Task #2 is the one that we are embarking on at the moment, and it involves building public support for plan development.

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

Viafara commented that the purpose of the plan is to foster accessibility and mobility, improve quality of life, foster bicyclist and pedestrian safety, and emphasize the preservation of the existing bicycle and pedestrian transportation system.

Viafara referred to a slide listing the national and local goals and performance measures, and explained that they are based on the current factor that we are adhering to at this time to ?? the ones that are still coming from what we call MAP-21. He briefly went over the information on the slide briefly.

Viafara reported that we have been getting guidance and support from the Advisory Committee have assisted us in doing the visioning, setting up the goals and to set up the outreach activities; and later they will help us to define and refine the performance measures and targets for the plan.

Viafara stated that the next thing is to do an assessment of what is happening, what can we see, what are the trends and then we will proceed to evaluate those needs for the system. He said that it is important for us to identify the strategies and deal with the problems and the funding that may occur as a result of our addressing the needs we have at the moment.

Viafara commented that, as stated before, Task 2 involves building public support for the plan development. He said that they have been doing a series of activities, one of them was a presentation before the Grand Forks Planning and Zoning Commission on June 9<sup>th</sup>, and another before the East Grand Forks Planning and Zoning Commission, and they also had a presentation at the community level on June 7<sup>th</sup> at Holy Family Church.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Vein asked if there was much reaction from the Planning and Zoning Commission. Viafara responded that to one extent it was positive because they gained a couple of new member to the Advisory Committee, so on the one hand that is positive, but on the other hand it still is a little bit challenging because apparently people are reluctant to really attend. He said that he doesn't know if it was the time, the location, or what the issue was, but to avoid that, and this is in anticipation of these problems, he is organizing a couple of participation events, one at the ??? center, and another on June 25<sup>th</sup> on the Greenway, so they will be coming to the community rather than waiting for them to come to us.

Viafara pointed out that he also prepared a questionnaire, and you all received one in your packet, and he would ask that you please complete it and return it to him as soon as possible.

Viafara stated that the next meeting is scheduled for July 13<sup>th</sup>, here in the Training Conference Room at 7:00 p.m. He said that the purpose will be to assess existing conditions and trends that we can see on these two networks.

Viafara referred to the questionnaire and went over it briefly, pointing out that Question #9 is probably the most important one for us because it allows us to really track where people find issues they would like to see addressed.

Information only.

**MATTER OF DISCUSSION ON DRAFT COMMUNICATION PLAN**

Haugen reiterated that Federal Highway directed us to develop this communications document. He explained that the primary purpose behind it is, if you recall our last Long Range Transportation Plan had a delay occur, and we had our T.I.P. frozen because of it, so they are trying to make sure we have a documented process in place so that this doesn't happen in the future. He said that the other reason is that we are trying to make a stronger connection between what we have in our plans versus what gets built out on the ground, so that was another purpose for this communications document, to help identify resolutions as to what is consistent with the plan versus what can be built.

Haugen stated that he did send a power point based slide show to you a while back, and he has taken the opportunity to use this as a way to introduce how performance management is going to change, how we are used to interaction between the MPO and its partners, because it is going to cause a change, so instead of us thinking of how things have always been in the past, we need to think or react to how we need to react to changes that are coming down the pike in the future.

Haugen reported that he has been meeting with individual TAC members, and partnering agencies to discuss the issue with them. He pointed out that included in the packet is the write-up that is a result of those meetings. He said that you will see some familiar items from the power point, but in any event the communication document itself is kind of split into two sections; the first is basically setting up the organizational set-up of an MPO, first and foremost our communication is with the public and is something that we always keep in mind. He stated that we then have the structure of the MPO Board and the Technical Advisory Committee, and their responsibilities.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen commented that our basic decision format, as you heard in the Bike/Ped and Transit Development Plans, as well as in all the studies we do, is that we always have a Steering Committee or a Focus Group, or something that is local to the issue; and they advise us throughout the process, keeping the TAC informed, who in turn keeps the Executive Policy Board informed, so that when it comes time to make decisions we think we have a well vetted issued from a local perspective to guide a bi-state MPO through the process.

Haugen stated that the next section addresses that it has always been the intent that when we do a plan, throughout the programming and project development, we always ask the question – is it consistent with the plan. He said that sometimes in the past that has gotten a little diluted, now with performance measures and performance targets we aren't just planning, but are also making sure that our outcomes are addressing what we are planning for. He reported that Congress has taken several options each time they reauthorize transportation to make a stronger connection between the plans and the project development stage.

Haugen said that the last section deals with disputes, which we hope don't occur, but in the event they do occur, how we process them. He stated that, again, we hope not to have disputes, so we try to work through meeting structures not to have them occur, but when they do occur we use the process shown in the pyramid as a way to handle them at the staff or local level.

Haugen explained that in the event we cannot resolve a dispute at the staff/local level we would then take it to the broader group of the Technical Advisory Committee, and if they can't provide resolution, then the Executive Policy Board would make a decision for the MPO situation. He added that if we do have decisions or disputes that have to rise up to the State level, in the past North Dakota was always our lead agency so they were the agency we went to for that direction, but with performance based management, and the way that targets are coming where we have to adopt a target specific to each State, we can't rely on just one State always for the guidance needed, we have to engage both States so the issues happens to cross both State boundaries, but, again the process is basically in this COG flow so that in order for it to work all three of those COGS have to be turning to get a resolution, so it is a cooperative, collaborative agreement process.

Haugen stated that, finally, if we do have to rise to the federal level, which a few may rise to that level, we know what the process is that is coming through.

Haugen reported that at our Technical Advisory Committee meeting last week, there wasn't so much discussion about this specific document. He said that, as indicated in the staff report, the Technical Advisory Committee members were discussing more about how they interact with the Executive Policy Board members on issues, and how the bodies that you represent, whether they are as best informed as they can be about the issues and the outcomes of what is being presented to them.

Haugen said that in the end, and again this is just here for discussion, the Technical Advisory Committee is asking to have a special meeting at the end of June to discuss this a little bit more and see if there are some things that should be added to the document, or if they need to set the stage for other agreements that have to be renewed because of performance based management.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Vein commented that he thinks it is great that you are going to have a meeting with the Technical Advisory Committee and get their feedback because, he, personally rely on the Technical Advisory Committee for a lot of the technical things, and he expects that there is a level of cooperation and coordination agreement, per say, as we move things forward. He added that, again, in general he would like to see how the Technical Advisory Committee members respond to this, and you can come back with something that he thinks everybody is on board with.

Haugen stated that the draft you have here is a reflection of all the input we received from Technical Advisory Committee members already. He added that when we started this process the feds just said do it, and they didn't give us templates or examples of what they were looking for, but he is pleased to report that they are satisfied with the document so far.

Vein said that this will be coming back to us again, correct. Haugen responded that it would, adding that he isn't asking for any action today, but hopefully they will be asking for final approval in July.

Information only.

**MATTER OF DISCUSSION ON FINAL PLANNING RULE**

Haugen reported that we know that with MAP-21, that is when they introduced the requirement for performance based planning and programming. He said that the recent FAST Act did some minor tweaks to it, and he will address those, but for the most part the stage was set with MAP-21, and the Feds then proposed some rules to implement MAP-21. He added that there is an interplay now between these planning rules of how we process things, with the rules that come up with each individual measure and target that we have, so this slide is just identifying that we know some things are final, we know the safety things are final, we know now that the planning rule is final, but there are some other things here yet that are still to be finalized so we don't have all the answers, but we still have to implement some things now prior to waiting for everything to be tied up in a bow and given to us.

Haugen explained that the things that we do know, and can share with you, is that they are using the terms transformational change to transportation planning with the ?? performance based. He said that it is also very focused on coordination and collaboration among all the partners in the planning process.

Haugen stated that, although we know these timelines are ??, and the State has one year to develop a target and we have 180 days, the feds are emphasizing that if you really are collaborating or cooperating to the maximum extent practicable, their view is that there shouldn't be a need to have that 180 days additional MPO time to do a target setting, so they feel that we should be able to set our targets at the exact same time as the State.

Haugen commented that there is a question about who has the ultimate authority, and again they stress that it is this collaborative, cooperative process, and they are indicating that there is no one agency that has ultimate authority, the State can have its performance measures and targets, and we can have ours, and they can be as different as they need to be, or they can be exactly the same as they need to be, but there is not one that basically trumps the other.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen reported that some of the additional things now that we have to do as an MPO, that we never had to do in the past, are that we have to start talking about our intercity bus, and we are doing that with our Transit scope-of-work. He added that we have these things, these phrases to take into consideration and they aren't defined well, so we will be getting more guidance down the road as to what they mean; but in the next breath they talk about it, about including the word liability and strong water impacts, so they are getting at whether or not we have weather related incidences that we have to manage better at our transportation facilities. He said that the last one is to enhance travel and tourism.

Haugen stated that a new agreement that will have to be developed is just how, from the feds view they are extreme major partners; the States, MPO and our Public Transportation Operators, and we have to come up with agreements as to how we are going to go about gathering data, setting targets, performing targets, etc.

Haugen said that we have some known dates now, but some other dates we don't know about yet, so they are giving us a two year transition period to make sure that our Long Range Transportation Plan is compliant with the performance based planning and programming; or, because all targets will have probably been finalized by the end of two years from now, they are saying whichever is later, when the last targets final rule is done, then that starts a two year window, so for some things, like safety, we now know that in a minimum of two years from now we have to have that safety performance included into our Long Range Transportation Plan, and then into all of our T.I.P. documents, etc., but some of the other targets we might not have to have them in two years from now, it might be two years and six months from now, so the short answer is that we certainly are on track to update our Long Range Transportation Plan by the end of 2018, but as soon as we adopt something expect to have some amendments to it several times in the future as these individual target dates get placed upon that timeframe.

Haugen went over the possible targets and dates briefly.

Haugen stated that there isn't a consequence financially if we for some reason can't comply with these requirements and regulations, but the one thing they can do, and have done, to us is to tack action on our T.I.P.; and that is what they did when we weren't getting a timely adopted new Long Range Transportation Plan. He said that the incentive they gave us was, we will freeze your projects until you finalize it, so they can't take things away from us in terms of financially, but they can freeze things to give us an incentive to get things done in a quicker fashion.

Haugen summarized that this is a work in progress, there are some answers now that we know of, but there are still a lot of questions that don't have answers, and won't have answers for some time, and we will be working our way through these processes, so it will be a fun ride for the next several years.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

**OTHER BUSINESS**

- a. 2016 UPWP Project Update

Haugen reported that this is just our monthly progress report we put together to keep you, and others, informed of where we are at with our projects.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO ADJOURN THE JUNE 15<sup>TH</sup>,  
2016, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:55 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

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

**Friday, June 24<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

**E-Mail/Phone Poll**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager, called all members of the MPO Executive Policy Board in order to determine whether each member felt a meeting should be held to further discuss an Amendment to the I-29 Study, or if they felt comfortable approving the amendment via a phone poll.

**CALL OF ROLL**

The following members were polled via e-mail and/or phone: Gary Malm (via e-mail), Marc DeMers, Ken Vein, Mike Powers, and Jeannie Mock.

Messages were left for Clarence Vetter and Warren Strandell.

Currently, the Grand Forks Planning and Zoning Commission position is vacant.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Having reached five members a quorum was declared.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT #2 TO THE I-29 TRAFFIC OPERATIONS STUDY**

Earl Haugen e-mailed information to the MPO Executive Policy Board on June 23<sup>rd</sup> concerning Amendment #2 to the I-29 Traffic Operations Study to do an analysis of additional interchange scenarios, including additional grade separations and interchanges and their impact to existing interchange and mainline I-29 operations. The need for the added work was due to comments made by FHWA-ND and NDDOT at the most recent Steering Committee for the I-29 Study. Attached to the email was the drafted scope of services from KLJ. Haugen indicated a time sensitive nature of the added scope and delay of waiting for the next regular Board meeting would be harmful to the study. He asked if any of the members felt a special meeting was necessary for additional discussion or if they were comfortable giving approval without a meeting.

Malm responded via e-mail that he was comfortable giving his approval without a meeting, however no other members responded to the email.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Friday, June 24<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen asked that Ms. McNelis do a phone poll to the remaining members on Friday, June 24<sup>th</sup> to see if any of them felt a meeting was necessary, or if they were comfortable giving their approval as well.

McNelis contacted Marc DeMers, Ken Vein, Mike Powers, and Jeannie Mock and all gave approval of the amendment over the phone. She was unable to reach Clarence Vetter or Warren Strandell.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Not Applicable.

Respectfully submitted by,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE  
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mike Powers, Chairman, called the August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016 meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:03 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

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

Absent: Jeannie Mock and Steve Wasvick.

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

Guest(s): Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering; Wayne Gregoire, Bert's Trucking; and Trent Peabody, Lumber Mart.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Powers declared a quorum was present.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**Scheduled Activities**

Haugen reported that these are some activities being schedule by our State partners.

He stated that, so you are aware, for the next several months there are opportunities, and some things that are optional for you to attend. He said that the first one is MnDOT is seeking feedback on their Multi-modal Transportation Plan, their Highway Investment Plan, and their 20-Year Greater Minnesota Investment Plan, and so they have some webinars scheduled next month, and if you are interested in participating MPO staff will be viewing them so you can come over to our office if you wish, or if you want we can give you the link so you can do it at your leisure.

Haugen stated that the second one is next month the NDDOT Director has asked to be able to be in attendance and have a discussion with you so we decided that we will complete our normal

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

business at our meeting, and then when we are done we will have discussion with the NDDOT Director. He said that he also invited the MnDOT District Engineer to come also, if he is interested, so there can be a kind of balance between North Dakota and Minnesota, so please try to schedule some extra time for our September 21<sup>st</sup> meeting.

Vein asked if there was an agenda of what is planned on being discussed, and is it correct that he is asking for two hours for this meeting. Haugen responded that he has asked for up to two hours of your time, and his agenda is being worked on. He explained that this is being done around the State, and there is a generic agenda with the first two topics are what projects they are going to do in the community over the next two years, and since we are the MPO we kind of already know what is going on over the next four years because of our T.I.P. document. He said that he also wants to talk a little about funding, again because we are different than say Valley City or Beulah, which don't have interaction with the DOT staff on a regular basis, so we are working the agenda to be more pertinent to what the MPO wants to talk about.

Haugen reported that the third item is, if you recall we had our financial audit last year, and one of the requirements of the Federal Highway finding, and again it was an audit of not just our MPO, but the other two MPOs and the NDDOT as well, and one of the findings is that MPO staff has to attend training on administering planning grants. He added that they asked that we extend an invitation to our board members as well, so if you are interested the dates are October 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup>, and it is in Bismarck and is scheduled to take place the afternoon of the 18<sup>th</sup> and the morning of the 19<sup>th</sup> so there will be an overnight stay, and, again, if anyone is interested please let us know and we will make the arrangements for you to attend.

Haugen explained that the training is about what is eligible to be in our work program, what is eligible for reimbursement from the feds, etc., so it will be a fairly technical, bureaucratic training, but they are offering it to you as well if you are interested.

Vein asked that Mr. Haugen send an e-mail with all of these events to the board. Haugen responded he would do that.

Information only.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 15<sup>TH</sup> AND JUNE 24<sup>TH</sup>, 2016, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE JUNE 15<sup>TH</sup> AND JUNE 24<sup>TH</sup>, 2016, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

***Voting Yes: Vein, Strandell, Malm, DeMers, Vetter, and Powers.***

***Voting No: None.***

**MATTER OF 2015 MPO AUDIT**

Haugen reported that Janelle Mulroy, Brady Martz, is here to present the findings of the 2015 MPO Audit. He stated that, as the staff report indicted, typically we would have this in the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

spring, but there were a couple of things that caused it to be delayed, and they are noted in the staff report.

Mulroy referred to the 2015 MPO Audit Report, and explained that she would just be going through some of the highlights of the report.

Presentation ensued.

Mulroy referred to Page 2, and pointed out that there is an opinion paragraph, and that is where they give their clean, unmodified opinion based on their audit of the financial statements. She said that they are also reporting the fact that this year the MPO was required to implement a new accounting standard regarding the accounting and financial reporting for pensions, which will significantly change the financial statements, and she will point that out as we go the report.

Mulroy referred to the Management's Discussion Analysis section, and said that on Pages 5 and 6 there is comparative information presented here, but the financial statements themselves are not comparative, so you can compare the 2014 and 2015 calendar years at a pretty high summary level.

Mulroy referred to Page 5 and pointed out that under the 2015 column you are showing an "unrestricted net position" of a negative \$45,000, and that is the result of implementing that new standard on pensions. She explained that there is now a net pension liability on the books of \$176,000 at the end of the year and so that factors into the net position going forward. She stated that you actually did show income for the year, but with that change it rolled into the negative position.

Mulroy referred to Page 6, and reported that again there is summary level information for revenues and expenses, and you can see there is a change in net position or net income for the year 2015 of \$12,836, so as she mentioned you did show income, but when you implement that new standard and include the pension liability it puts it into a negative position at the end of the year.

Mulroy reported that the financial statements begin on Page 9, with the balance sheet and statement of net position, and pointed out that there are three columns on Page 9; the General Fund, Adjustments, and Statement of Net Position. She explained that the General Fund numbers are presented more on the short-term focus basis, more on how you budget for the operations; and the adjustment columns show, in your case, liabilities for the net pension liability and compensated absences that aren't required to be reported in the General Fund column. She stated that the last column, Statement of Net Position, which shows total assets at the end of 2015 of \$347,000, total liabilities of \$379,000, and then the total net position works out to be a negative \$45,000 at the end of 2015. She explained that there is that net pension liability reported under the long term liability section of \$176,000. She added that there are also deferred outflows of resources and inflows of resources reported here that haven't been in the past, and those items, as well, relate to that pension standard.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Mulroy referred to Page 10, Revenues and Expenditures, and pointed out that, again there are three columns, with the third being the Statement of Activities column. She explained that it details out total revenues of \$963,000 for 2015, the majority of that are \$753,000 from federal sources; and there are total expenses of \$950,000, which is a difference of \$12,836 net income for the year. She added that they are also showing the prior period adjustment or restatement to the beginning of the year balance, again for the implementation of that pension standard, so that keeps showing up everywhere in the report this year.

Mulroy reported that the next several pages are the notes to the financial statements. She said that the only thing she would like to call to your attention is on Page 15, Note 4, Pension Plan, and explained that this is where you can find a whole lot information on the Pension Plan and NDPERS.

Mulroy referred to Page 23, Note 8, and explained that it talks about that prior period adjustment that they made to implement that Standard at the beginning of the year.

Mulroy referred to Page 24, Budget to Actual Comparison; and explained that overall for the year there was a shortfall of budget compared to actual revenues of \$305,000; the shortfall, actually a positive in that you spent less then you had planned to of \$299,000, so at the end of the year you ended up with income of \$43,533, you budgeted for \$50,000 so that was just a little short of the overall budget. She said that, again, those numbers are a little different in that those are the shorter-term focus numbers that don't include the pension numbers and the compensated absences so that is why they may look a different.

Mulroy stated that the next two pages are additional required supplemental information that relates to that pension standard, so it shows the schedule of the employer contributions to the PERS Retirement Plan, and the proportionate share of the overall plan.

Mulroy commented that the next section is a letter in regard to the Government Audition Standard. She referred to Page 28, first paragraph, and explained that there is one significant deficiency, which she will go through with the next couple of pages, other than that it was a clean report.

Mulroy stated that Pages 29 through 30 is a letter in regard to their audit of the federal program. She said that, as mentioned, you did spend \$753,000 of federal money for the year, and the threshold is \$750,00, so you came real close but you were over that \$750,000 mark which then requires that program to have its own audit, so at the top of Page 30, they do issue an opinion based on their audit of that program, and it is a clean opinion so there were no findings, and they found the MPO to be in compliance with those program requirements.

Mulroy reported that Page 32 has notes to the schedule of expenditures of federal awards; Page 33 summarizes the previous two letters; and Page 34 talks about the one significant deficiency she mentioned, and that is just the fact that the MPO uses the Auditors help to prepare the financial statements, and implement their proposed adjustments, so there is an auditing standard in place that says that when they do this they need to inform the board of it.

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO RECEIVE AND FILE THE 2015 MPO  
AUDIT REPORT, AS PRESENTED.***

***ROLL CALL VOTE:***

***Voting Yes: Strandell, Vetter, Powers, Vein, DeMers, and Malm.***

***Voting No: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Mock and Wasvick.***

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

Haugen reported that included in the staff report are updates on both the Sorlie and the Kennedy Bridges.

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen stated that in regard to the decorative lighting, there has been another draft of the plan that details what colors can be used on which dates. He said that it hasn't been finalized yet, but based on the draft there are again some desire to add some dates to the potential list of light changes, and there is also discussion about a more simple protocol so that when someone does want to suggest a change in dates it can flow a little smoother than the current agreement is written.

Haugen commented that December will be the next time that the NDDOT staff person anticipates another draft available for distribution.

Haugen reported that also noted is that North Dakota did submit the Sorlie project for an award, and it was given a regional award and has now been forwarded on for national consideration.

Vein asked what the award was specifically for. Haugen responded that it was for the amount of monies that were saved in going from a potential replacement project to a rehab project.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that included in the packet was a letter from Roger Hille, MnDOT, on the status of the Kennedy Bridge project. He said that, as we have discussed at previous meetings, the bid letting is being moved back, and there has been some discussion about a November letting date, and he is only the peripheral of this discussion so he isn't sure what all it entails, but he felt it important that you know that as it gets moved back further, if you recall North Dakota is using FY2016 funds for this project, and the federal fiscal year ends in September, and so there is still opportunity to obligate monies even in November, but as we get later in the year it becomes more difficult for the North Dakota funding source to stay in place; and Minnesota's funding source is FY2017 monies, so from their perspective the project can wait until the end of June, so

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

as this project is getting from the design to the point where they can obligate the funds it is starting to become critical, from the North Dakota side, of when that date occurs, so there is some discussion at the State level about getting this project to obligation in timely fashion.

Haugen stated that the aesthetics will be included as part of the project cost. He explained that right now the aesthetic lighting is being done as part of the regular project cost, adding that at one time it had been discussed that perhaps the aesthetics would be considered as an add-on that both cities would have to contribute towards, but right now the plan is to absorb it into the overall project cost, and no city share is being requested.

Haugen commented that the aesthetic lighting plan, at one time it had been discussed that it would be a separate lighting plan, but now as they have experienced some of the work and public action to the Sorlie lighting plan, that they are thinking that it can be one document that governs both bridges, so there may not be a separate lighting plan now, you may just see one that covers both bridges.

Haugen pointed out that included in the packet were the latest schematics of the cross-section, and also how the aesthetic lighting would be attached to the trusses.

DeMers stated that he has two questions; first going back to the original lighting agreement, how are the color changes made and who does it. Haugen responded that when we requested that they consider aesthetic lighting on the Sorlie and Kennedy, it was something new, particularly to North Dakota, and so internally they first hinted that perhaps they could do this but that it might come at a cost 100% to the local entity. DeMers said that he was referring to who flips the switch. Haugen responded that on the Sorlie it is Grand Forks that operates the lighting changes. DeMers asked if it is something that has to be done at the bridge. Williams stated that she thinks it might be handled by Community Development staff, but she isn't sure, but it does have to be done at the bridge. DeMers commented that he would think that as part of agreement if the two Mayors can agree to a change it should just happen, it would give some deference to both sides, and allow both Mayors to weigh-in on the changes.

DeMers said that his other question is for Mr. Vein. He stated that he knows that the Grand Forks City Council discussed the Kennedy Bridge project at their meeting, and that a letter was drafted, or a resolution, or such; and he would ask for an overview on what happened at the meeting.

Vein responded that he appreciates the opportunity to discuss this issue, and in-fact was hoping to be able to present something. He stated that Grand Forks has had issues throughout the whole duration of the project, although formally they have approved things through the MPO, but in actuality concerns were brought up about a year or so ago.

Vein commented that the main concern has been the new cross-section, which takes away the center median and reduces the lane widths; and he isn't going to say it makes it unsafe, but it does make it less safe. He said that they talked about this at their City Council meeting, and the fact that we are up for an award for saving money on the Sorlie Bridge, well guess what, we are

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

saving probably more money on the Kennedy Bridge by going from a full reconstruction to a rehabilitation project. He asked what the original cost estimate for the reconstruction of the Kennedy Bridge. Haugen responded that it was around \$29,000,000 with a 50/50 split in cost for each State. Vein said, though, that originally we talked about reconstructing it, that was more than \$29,000,000 wasn't it. Haugen responded that that was the number was placed as "the" number towards the most expensive project option they envisioned at the time, and that was replacement of the Kennedy, \$29,000,000.

Vein stated that it seems, though, that with both bridges there have been some compromise, and he doesn't think pedestrian or bicycle traffic is accommodated to the level it should be. He said that he knows that they did look at a cantilever on the Kennedy, but couldn't do it for some reason. Haugen responded that it was mostly geared towards maintenance, and, if you will recall, part of the driving force behind the Kennedy was a time issue, and as he just discussed about North Dakota having 2016 dollars in, the Kennedy Project was being shepherded through the process to get to an environmental review that was the most expedient way to move a project, and so adding things on that required more historical oversight was not favored, but from the technical side of view it was kind of an issue of maintenance, the impediment to maintenance vehicles inspecting the structure after it was attached. Vein said that there are various reasons for it, and he kind of question those, but the fact of the matter is that in order to accommodate bike and pedestrian traffic they made a change in the cross-section that he didn't feel was; if you look at the bridge, it has been there for fifty years, it had a good cross-section that was safe for traveling, and now we are going to change it for the next fifty years by narrowing it, which he doesn't think makes a lot of sense.

Vein commented that ultimately, we took two bridges that were scheduled for replacement and just did rehabilitation to them, with fairly significant cost savings, and the Council disagreed with the new cross-section, and the City of Grand Forks voted to not approve plans and specs, whether they had any authority to do that or not, that was the agenda item before them, and they so declined to approve it as a City Council, and then passed a motion, unanimously, that they should look at a different cross-section, and also at a separate pedestrian bridge, so that is what they are trying to do, to have some communication up the ladder, at least on the North Dakota side with that. He added that he had a slight conversation with Mr. Grasser before he came today, just because he would like to see it potentially go between them and the Governor versus the DOT because he thinks it is a political issue at this point, so that is where they are at, they will be writing a letter to whomever letting them know of our concern.

Vein stated that he does, 100% support the replacement of the pier that is moving because if there is a safety issue, that has to be done, and there would be no reason why we wouldn't move forward with that, but the other things they talked about is the fact that there is going to be significant downtime on this bridge, where you will be at one lane of traffic in each direction, and there will be times when there is no traffic on the bridge while they are doing this, and that is going to be even more critical, and he doesn't know how that traffic is going to be rerouted through our communities, but that is significant and he would like to know what the impact of that will be because it will impact our downtowns, and all of that for our communities, so it seems to him that we should know that information before we proceed with the project.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

DeMers commented that there is also the rescue services that will be impacted as well. Vein agreed, adding that all of that needs to be considered, those are things that will be significantly impacted to do this, and that safety issue should be identified, and he thinks that maybe we, as an MPO, should identify those issues as we go forward as it has been programmed because ten or twenty years from now no one is going to care when North Dakota had their money allocated or not, but we will be stuck with the consequences.

DeMers asked if Mr. Vein felt it would be beneficial to run the same track in East Grand Forks, because if that is the case he would be curious to get the language and stuff that Grand Forks has already done and take it to his council as well. Vein responded that he knows he is late, and he will be the first to admit that, but he would rather at least try than not to, and he did think it would be great if both communities felt the same way, and it isn't one versus the other, but where they are currently at he isn't sure what the exact wording was on the motion, but they have to go back and look at the tapes to get that so he doesn't have it at this time, so that is an issue for them.

Vein said that in the end what he would like to see us do is to build, again, a pedestrian bridge that serves both communities that gives good access across, and leave the bridge as it is.

Haugen put up a slide of a letter the MPO sent on this issue, and the response we got when they came to our December 2015 meeting to talk about this. Vein asked who responded to the letter. Haugen responded that it was the District, Joe McKinnon. Vein said that that is why he was thinking that we should go up the ladder a little bit because our DOT Director answers to the Governor, and if it is going to be political then let's go to the Governor and tell him we aren't satisfied with the direction the DOTs are going with this.

DeMers stated that he would talk with his council, with Mr. Vetter, and see if this is something we want to do; whether it is fruitless or not, he thinks the effort needs to be made. Vein stated that he does want the pier fixed, so let's get that done. Haugen commented that at one time that pier project was going to be a separate project, a couple of years ago actually, and then it got delayed and rolled into this bigger project.

Vein commented that East Grand Forks might want to talk this over, Grand Forks made their decision, and will pursue it. DeMers said that he just wanted to make sure he knew what Grand Forks was doing. Vein stated that if we, as an MPO, maybe at a separate meeting, want to identify this concern, again, as Mr. Haugen suggested, we have already said this once, but if we are going to take another crack at it again, potentially, because they will hire a proflist, then what.

**MATTER OF ADOPTION OF DRAFT COMMUNICATION PLAN**

Haugen reported that a copy of the final version of the document with the last edits highlighted still in red. He stated that this has been vetted through the Technical Advisory Committee and we also made sure that Federal Highway was comfortable with the language being amended, and they are.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen stated that Federal Highway asked us to prepare this document this year, and we went through a rigorous process of drafting and redrafting the document, and we now have a final document that staff and MPO Technical Advisory Committee are recommending this body adopt.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE ADOPTING THE DRAFT COMMUNICATION PLAN, AS PRESENTED, AS PRESENTED.***

***ROLL CALL VOTE:***

***Voting Yes: Strandell, Vetter, Powers, Vein, DeMers, and Malm.***

***Voting No: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Mock and Wasvick.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF GLASSTON RAILROAD CROSSING STUDY**

Haugen reported that this is the Final Glasston Railroad Safety Crossing Study Report. He said that, if you recall, we did this study in response to two potential major facilities on the Glasston Subdivision; the first one is the Nitrogen Plant, and the other is the Mill's desire to locate an unloading facility on the Glasston Subdivision, so we did the study, and it concluded with recommendations that if those things happen there will be an increase in trains, there are some things that we can do to mitigate that increase. He added that the study was done, essentially, a year ago but there were some edits and changeovers for the consultant that led to the delay of the final report being presented to you for approval.

Haugen commented that those proposed facilities, when we started this study, were probably more promising to be completed, but right now it probably isn't as promising, so we are seeking approval of the study, and if those things, or something similar come to be that causes an increase in train traffic on the Glasston, at least we have a study to start with.

***MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE FINAL GLASSTON RAILROAD SAFETY CROSSING STUDY, AS PRESENTED.***

***ROLL CALL VOTE:***

***Voting Yes: Strandell, Vetter, Powers, Vein, DeMers, and Malm.***

***Voting No: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Mock and Wasvick.***

**MATTER OF ADOPTION OF SELF-CERTIFICATION**

Haugen reported that every year, as part of our T.I.P. approval process we have to certify to our State and Federal partners that we are fulfilling all of the requirements of an MPO. He added that ever third year we have to do a detailed report documenting how we are able to self-certify compliance, so you will see a response to each of these requirements we have to meet, how we are meeting those requirements.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen referred to a slide that illustrated the requirements we need to follow as we proceed through the year of our Work Program. He said that as we've documented, we believe we have fulfilled every one of them, thus the Technical Advisory Committee and staff are recommending that the MPO Self-Certify its compliance.

***MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE ADOPTING THE SELF-CERTIFICATION, AS PRESENTED.***

***ROLL CALL VOTE:***

***Voting Yes: Strandell, Vetter, Powers, Vein, DeMers, and Malm.***

***Voting No: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Mock and Wasvick.***

**MATTER OF ADOPTION OF THE 2017-2020 T.I.P.**

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

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

There was no one present for discussion.

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

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Haugen stated that he has a presentation that highlights what is in the T.I.P. document. He said that our responsibility is to make sure things are consistent with our plans, and that these are our priorities that are being funded.

Haugen commented that the area in which we study and have programming responsibilities is not just inside both cities, but we do extend out into the rural area as well. He added that this is a twelve month process.

Haugen said that we do have FAST, and it is still being implemented so there are still some things that we don't know how they will impact the program, so what do today might be subject to a change down the road.

Haugen reported that we have to do some year of expenditure on both the revenue side and the expenditure side. He said that one change that was discussed when we did the draft document is, with the FAST Act we are actually forecasting an increase of federal funds coming in to the MPO area on both sides of the river, and we are still maintaining a 4% expenditure increase on the North Dakota side and 5% on the Minnesota side, and that is the same as what is in our planning document.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen stated that shown highlighted, are the total programs on each side of the river that will be expended. He explained that because of the Kennedy Bridge project we do have a pretty significant increase in funding that would be atypical in a typical four year T.I.P. cycle.

Haugen then went over the projects briefly.

Haugen commented that the only change from our draft is that we had requested three vehicles to be funded out of the FTA program; our priority was the first vehicle should go to Valley Memorial, and then two for CAT, but the State overruled our priority and funded the two for CAT and didn't fund the one for Valley Memorial. He said that their reasoning was that these are for more general public use and their preference is to finance general public used vehicles over more privately used vehicles.

Haugen stated that on the TAP program, the North Dakota side had one project submitted, and it was funded. He pointed out that the project is on 55<sup>th</sup> Street, from University to the AMTRAK Station. He added that East Grand Forks did have a project, however it was not funded.

Haugen referred to a map and pointed out where the North Dakota TAP project was located. He explained that this was originally going to be on the north side, and was originally going to cost \$900,000, but due to some issues it has been relocated to the south side with a lower dollar amount, so to plant a seed, perhaps that savings you have could finish off another portion so that you have one project done.

Haugen commented that on the HSIP side, this is primarily a North Dakota program, and three projects were submitted, and all three were awarded, but it was awarded as one project, but all three were awarded monies as requested.

Haugen stated that there are some changes. He explained that every T.I.P. covers a four year period, but it is a rolling three years plus one; so in 2017 Grand Forks is asking to relocate their federal funds from 42<sup>nd</sup> Street over to Washington Street and 44<sup>th</sup>. He said that they have asked that a couple of additional projects be included; traffic signals at 55<sup>th</sup> Street and Gateway were requested in 2017 and are being funded in 2020; we requested in 2017 DeMers and Columbia Road in front of the Boden Apartments, so we are going to fund it, just not the year we originally requested; ramp detections at 32<sup>nd</sup> and Gateway were not funded in this T.I.P. cycle.

Haugen reported that on the North Dakota side there was a project on U.S. #2, west of 69<sup>th</sup> that was originally listed as a complete reconstruction on the westbound lane, but it has been re-scoped to just a hot bituminous pavement mill and overlay so the cost has gone down from \$23,000,000 to \$9,000,000 and there is about a three mile stretch that is located in our study area, with a \$2,500,000 in federal funds.

Haugen said that on the Minnesota side East Grand Forks is asking that its sub-target project be switched from 10<sup>th</sup> Street. N.E. to Bygland Road. He explained that we discussed this back in the spring that Minnesota changed how it is funding transit capital, and that it increased by about \$100,000 that is available to East Grand Forks as part of their sub-target program, so they are asking to switch the project to a round-about on Bygland Road and Rhinehart Drive, as per the study that we did last year.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen commented that 2020 is the new S.T.I.P. year on the North Dakota side, and the City of Grand Forks has requested, and it is being funded, to do an overlay of University Avenue from Downtown out to State Street, or just past the Wilkerson Complex. He said that also on the regional side we requested the reconstruction of the underpass on Washington Street that was not programmed, however there was pavement work on North Washington north of 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue to Gateway Drive, then it skips up to the flood protection bridge.

Haugen stated that new projects on the Minnesota side, there were none for the FY2020. He added that in 2020 North Dakota is looking at a mill and overlay of North Washington between 1<sup>st</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Avenues, and we will likely see, because the underpass was not reconstructed in this T.I.P. cycle/S.T.I.P. cycle, this request in FY2021.

Haugen reported that on the Minnesota side, the next agenda item will discuss this in more detail, but they are talking looking at doing work on U.S. #2 from Fisher to 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.E., East Grand Forks.

Haugen referred to the Environmental Justice map, explaining that it shows all of projects in relationship to our Environmental Justice areas, so we do have some project that will be inside our Environmental Justice areas. He said that they are all within the existing right-of-way reconstruction so they aren't impacting negatively, or adding any additional capacity, etc., so the impact would be minor, or it will be positive in-fact because of a better transportation facility.

Haugen referred to a table, and explained that it shows, by year, whether it is a transit or street project, and how the expenditures are spread out between both states.

Haugen said that both staff and the Technical Advisory Committee recommend you adopt the 2017-2020 T.I.P., as presented.

Vein asked about the flood protection bridge on North Washington, and why it needs repair as it isn't very old. Haugen responded that he doesn't know exactly what it all entails. Powers asked which one they are talking about. Haugen responded it is the one up around 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue North on U.S. 81/North Washington. Vein said, again, that it is relatively new and they are already having to do repairs to it. Haugen commented that the best he can come up with is it may be the same work they do on almost all the concrete streets where they stitch in the rebar so the panels are more uniform and stay in place, that may be the intent, but it is fairly minor work, it is more preservation work for the pavement that is up there.

Vein said that the other project he is wondering about is the Gateway Drive westbound lane was changed from a reconstruction to an overlay project, what is the rationale for that change. Haugen responded that they produced a document that said that they can maintain a drivable surface by just doing the mill and overlay versus reconstruction as the pavement isn't in bad enough shape to warrant it. Vein commented that once you have, usually a concrete base, you can do that forever, so you get to the point of, when do you replace it, because you are already doing that on University Avenue and it has to be four or five times that it has been done there.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Vein stated that the fact that they aren't reconstructing the underpass on Washington Street, he remembers when Frank Orthmeyer was here, that was up for reconstruction, so you can tell how long ago that was, and it still isn't being reconstructed and being extended, is that right. Haugen responded that it is, and he would say that he thinks that this T.I.P./S.T.I.P. cycle it got caught up in a paperwork shuffle between the District and the State, and he thinks that if the paperwork had been more thorough and timely there would have been a great chance it would have been funded this cycle. Vein asked if there is a better chance, then, of it getting funded in the next T.I.P. cycle, or is there anything that can be done to make sure it does get done. Haugen responded that he does think it has a much better chance in 2021.

***MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE ADOPTION OF THE 2017-2020 T.I.P., AS PRESENTED.***

***ROLL CALL VOTE:***

***Voting Yes: Strandell, Vetter, Powers, Vein, DeMers, and Malm.***

***Voting No: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Mock and Wasvick.***

**MATTER OF ADOPTION OF THE 2016 UPWP AMENDMENT**

Haugen reported that as we discussed regarding future projects in the T.I.P., MnDOT is looking at working on U.S. #2 from Fisher to East Grand Forks, and as part of that work they just completed a District Safety Plan, and in that plan identified high crash locations, and the intersection of U.S. #2 and U.S. Business #2 was identified in that plan.

Haugen commented that in the plan their solution to the safety concern of that intersection is to close that intersection so U.S. Business #2 would no longer intersect with U.S. #2. He stated that as a subsequent response to some inquiries they then developed this concept of relocating that intersection up to Polk County 17's intersection with U.S. #2, so as part of this projects evolution it needs to be brought into the Long Range Transportation Plan, and we know there would be some strong interest in what happens on the U.S Business #2 and U.S. #2 intersection, so we asked MnDOT to appear before the East Grand Forks City Council to get some initial feedback, and based on that feedback we visited, as staff, and offered that the MPO, since we have to bring it into our Long Range Transportation Plan, would be willing to work with MnDOT on determining whether or not there are any other viable alternatives instead of complete closure of the U.S. Business #2 and U.S. #2 intersection.

Haugen stated that in order for the MPO to undertake this study we first have to amend our work program to show to the feds and our state partners that we do have the ability to undertake this study and these are the new sources we are allocating to it, and that is why we need to amend our work program, to show that we do have the \$70,000 available to undertake this study. He added that MnDOT will be providing the local match so there will be no costs to either East Grand Forks or Grand Forks, or the counties.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen said that, assuming you approve this, in the next agenda item we have to go out and hire a consultant, so the actual physical study will be starting sometime in November, and will carry over into the next year.

***MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE ADOPTION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT #2 TO THE 2016 UPWP, SUBJECT TO PARTNER AGENCY REVIEW.***

***ROLL CALL VOTE:***

***Voting Yes: Strandell, Vetter, Powers, Vein, DeMers, and Malm.***

***Voting No: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Mock and Wasvick.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF RFP FOR U.S. #2/U.S. BUSINESS #2 STUDY**

Haugen reported that, having just approved the amendment to the 2016 Work Program to include this, the next step is for us to advertise for consultant services. He explained, again, that the primary focus will be the intersection of U.S. #2 and U.S. Business #2, however to do a proper study we know that this intersection is in close proximity to some of our solutions so we need to conclude that.

Haugen referred to a map of the area, and pointed out where the alternative intersection MnDOT is proposing, and added that there is a Polk County Safety Plan as well that has some improvements suggested outside of whether Business #2 is relocated to it or not so we need to incorporate that.

Haugen stated that in looking through MnDOT's District Plan and the Polk County Safety Plan, there is also a rather significant improvement for Highway 220 so we are asking you to look at a broader study area than just U.S. #2 and U.S. Business #2, so the RFP is drafted with that scope in mind, it is drafted adding a consultant cost of \$60,000, and the study is drafted as a PEL Study so we are taking it, just as we did with the I-29 Study, through a preliminary environmental stage so that we can actually eliminate alternatives from further consideration. He said that if we don't go through a PEL route our study would be just informative, and when there is a project development that starts they have to go back and revisit some of these alternatives that, from our planning point of view, have been determined not to be viable alternatives, but because we don't do the PEL inclusion, they have to look at them again.

Haugen commented that we are also asking the RFP to include some animation as well. He said that, if you recall, on the North Dakota side of the U.S. #2 study we included animation and it really helped identify what the alternatives are really trying to do in terms of traffic operations and safety improvements, so the \$60,000 budget includes a safety analysis of traffic operations analysis, and going into the preliminary environmental issues so that we can actually weed out some alternatives from consideration, and it will give us some animation that will assist us in informing what these alternative concepts are trying to do traffic operation wise.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen said that we have to follow the North Dakota qualifications based selection process even though it is completely a Minnesota side project, with Minnesota match, as North Dakota is our lead agency and we have to follow their process.

Powers stated that what we are basically doing, then, is to okay a \$60,000 study. Haugen responded that the previous action was to approve the study, now you will be approving the RFP to do the study.

DeMers asked if there is any estimate as to what broadening the scope to the north, to basically the section line road that enters from the north, would be. He said that he was just thinking that the geometry of those curves is similar, so you're going to have the same type of problems, similar problems on it because of those curves, and, granted there isn't quite the business traffic as it isn't U.S. Business #2 that comes off there, but there is potentially business that could occur in that area so he thinks that if you're examining that road, that other curve will be as much of a factor as the other, and certainly as much as the intersection of the bridge. He added that you're talking about the same thing, the bridge intersection is a little bit different problem, but he thinks it is valid, but he also thinks the one to the north is going to be much more similar to this and if you're going to do a study you might as well do the same thing. Haugen responded that staff had discussions with MnDOT staff about what the length of the study should be, and the one area he believes you are talking about is also a Polk County intersection, just as you come to the curve, and the Polk County Safety Plan does address that, and does have recommendations, so it was felt that maybe we wouldn't have to go that far north because that has already been looked at and there is already a solution. He added that that solution is not as controversial as the ones being discussed here. DeMers asked what the solution is. Haugen responded that it involves adding some lighting and some geometric improvements, with lighting being the major improvement, illuminating the intersection.

Haugen stated that he didn't highlight that Minnesota does also want to revisit the Gateway Drive Access Management Plan that is in place, so 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.E. signalized intersection, their District Safety Plan wants to convert that to a signalized reduced conflict intersection, so there will probably be a lot of local input into that possibility, but we didn't want to take on too big of a package so that is why we focused in on these two major intersections that are MnDOT controlled intersections for the most part, and they are funding the local match on it.

Haugen commented that if you want to expand this to include that we can, it wouldn't cost much. DeMers asked if we would be talking \$5,000 or are we talking more. Haugen responded it would be around the \$5,000 mark.

DeMers stated that to him, we've got someone looking at this so it wouldn't hurt to have them look at this too. Vein agreed, adding that really, that way you would be consistent with your improvements enough determine a different type of solution and different access. DeMers commented that they are slightly different, but both have access onto a curve of a divided major U.S. Highway. Haugen added, again, the movements and the crash history for the Polk County Safety Plan that was done; the crashes are quite different on this curve than the one up on the Polk County intersection. DeMers said, though, that the cause of that is probably just because of

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

development, right, and at some point, which we are already learning now, we will have to find somewhere around there to expand our business park infrastructure, and then all of a sudden we have crash data because we have expanded our traffic counts, so, he gets that, but he just feels that another \$5,000 to bring that in and have some sort of consistency through that same north/south border makes a lot of sense.

Strandell commented that he hasn't seen the Polk County study, that is done in-house by the engineer, but he doesn't think they will ever see it as a county board member. Haugen stated that that is one of the issues of these safety plans, that they are done by a consultant and are basically internally reviewed, and things like complete closure of a U.S. Business Highway doesn't get any public input on it, and that is how we end up with some of these documents, and you, as a governing board member see what those things are.

DeMers asked if this would require that we amend the previous motion. Haugen responded that he thinks it would be cleaner if you do that. He suggested that you could reconsider the previous action to add an additional \$5,000 to the budget. DeMers said that we should continue with this item and go back if we have to.

Trent Peabody, Lumber Mart, said that theirs would be one of the affected businesses if you did so chose with this study to close off Business #2. He said that he stated at the last Council Work Session that he is adamantly opposed to any thought of closing off that intersection, and he does agree with Mr. DeMers, that you aren't looking at the whole picture, and that you need to, as a City, go back further into the community, maybe go back to what he refers to as the stoplights at the former Ryan Potato Company and come back around the Mallory Bridge. He added that the intersection that Mr. DeMers is talking about is a high traffic area, and starting tomorrow, go out and just sit and watch the beet trucks go through that intersection, you're waiting for an accident to occur, and while illuminating it might help at night, it won't help during the day; but if illumination is what it takes to improve an intersection, throw some lights down at the intersection of U.S. #2 and U.S. Business #2, it's not the answer. He stated that the biggest issue that you have, common sense wise, and he was born and raised here and has seen a lot of those accidents, is speed – slow the speed down. He said that you are spending a lot of money on a study that won't combat a common sense issue, and there are just as many accidents at County Road 17 and 2, if he isn't mistaken, but if you think that you're going to close Business #2 down you are going to have another problem on your hands, and that is called condemnation, and you will be running businesses out.

Haugen stated that what we are trying to do is to take what is in these safety plans and bring it out into the public light, and get the public engagement, plus the governing bodies' engagement on it. He said that a Steering Committee would be formed, and we would be seeking business owners from the affected area to help guide the study process.

Peabody commented that he does have a problem with the information being given out. He said that he appreciates Mr. Strandell keeping them informed and in the loop, but he never once received a letter of intent, or had any discussion at his business telling him what is going on, or a phone call other than the contact from Mr. Strandell. He added that none of the other businesses, to his knowledge, have been informed of this either. He said that this is a pretty quiet program, if you want the input, hire the people it is going to impact, have them involved with this process

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

from the start. Vetter responded that that is what this does, this does the study and gets the input from everyone out there. Powers added that we are just getting started.

Haugen explained the study process.

Vetter reported that Mr. Haugen did come to him months ago when the State came out and said that they were looking at closing this, and asked him if we wanted to bring this in front of council, and he said definitely, by all means, so we don't want to sweep it under the rug, we want everyone to know about it, and that was our first step, to make the council aware of it, and then based on that discussion the State said that they needed to do further study, and that is where this is coming from.

Peabody stated that he does agree with Mr. DeMers' comment that we need to expand the scope of the study so we can get the whole picture. He pointed out that you have an Industrial Park that is going to be growing, and you will need to expand it to handle the growth of the community and will need another access coming out there rather than a frontage road ?? forcing everybody to bottleneck at that point, it's just common sense with what we are seeing with ??, whether that is another 30 years down the line or whatever we need. Vetter added that there is the County building there too, so should there be a frontage road going to a different access point for them. Haugen reported that there is an access management plan in place that kind of controls that section of U.S. #2, all the way to the Kennedy Bridge, so as we discussed with the study limits, as staff we know that going north of here we already had a recommendation that seemed reasonable for this intersection, and then we will ultimately be asked by MnDOT to revisit that access management plan, they want to make changes to it, so if the desire is to add the \$5,000 to go north one more mile that would be fine.

Wayne Gregoire, Bert's Trucking, reported that he has been affiliated with Bert's for forty plus years, and it is a family run business and isn't a great big conglomerate but they have been able to provide well for our families and our employees families, and his issue is that you cannot have a business on a cul-de-sac. He said that cul-de-sacs are for residential, homes, that's where you develop those types of things and the reason why you do that is because you want there to be less traffic; but they aren't in the type of business where they can get by with less traffic. He stated that not only do they need the frontage, but their customers' equipment is getting bigger and bigger all the time and they need to be accessible, and he can envision a big sign downtown saying "Dead End" and "No Through Traffic", and they would be tall weeds in no time flat, so they need to have accessibility.

Gregoire commented that in all the years that he has been active with the company he has been to several of these meetings, one was right after the flood and they talked about the cul-de-sac concept, but over the forty-plus years that he has gone to these types of meetings, about the safety of that intersection, they have expressed their concerns, but they have never seen any improvements made to the intersection, and there has to be a way to make it safe and keep it open.

Gregoire reported that Crystal Sugar is adding a third scale, so they will have three entrances to the plan on Business #2, and the majority of their truck traffic comes from U.S. Business #2 onto

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

U.S. #2, although there is some on 17<sup>th</sup>, and believe him, they shoot it, they don't stop, but that road is just a county road, there are no parking lanes so that would have to be improved and widened while Business #2 already has 10-foot parking lanes so you can sit off to the side on concrete or asphalt, it's there, and, again, they just can't afford to have the intersection closed, they need to work on keeping it open.

***MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO AMEND THE STUDY LIMITS IN THE RFP FOR THE U.S. #2/U.S. BUSINESS #2 STUDY TO INCLUDE THE AREA UP TO 10<sup>TH</sup> STREET N.E. AND THE SECTION LINE ROAD INTERSECTION.***

***Voting Yes: Strandell, Vetter, Powers, Vein, DeMers, and Malm.***

***Voting No: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Mock and Wasvick.***

Malm commented that he feels that we don't involve enough people, on all of these projects, that know what is happening out there, and then you hire a professional from somebody else, called a consultant, and he comes in with his works, he never lived here, and sometimes he thinks we'd be smarter if we did it ourselves and have our engineering take a look, and have the people that live in the area rather than somebody from Minneapolis tell us how to direct traffic. He said that he doesn't live in Minnesota, but... Powers said that he had that same discussion just before the meeting with Mr. Haugen, so they are on the same page, but, again he thinks that on a project of this magnitude, we have to have some professional direction. Malm said, but then we need some people who say, he's out there with a business, and he is out there with a business, and he can say "wait a minute, we've got to look at this from a, you know"; the simple solution is, yes a roads a road, you do that all the time, you're doing something that is easy, and for those of us who are elective bodies, we want it cheap.

DeMers stated that he thinks that is the importance of the Steering Committee; and especially on something like this, these guys have got to be out there. He added that every study group he has been on, the hired consultants listen to the steering committee because they are there every meeting, and they hear it over and over again, and they might not get everything in there, but they tend to listen so he thinks that would be the best way to do this, and he agrees that sometimes a little common sense is needed, but when it is tied to federal and state funding that isn't going to meet their stamp of approval.

Malm commented that we do this all the time and then you come back, they come in, these guys, that's their livelihood, but when you get into residential districts people don't worry so much about it, and he drives all the time to go over the Point Bridge, and those historical people won't let us fix the road, and for two blocks you're flying in the air, they listen to the historical people.

Powers stated that what Mr. Peabody and Mr. Gregoire said, that's why we are here, to represent their input. Malm agreed that that is good because their livelihood is there, but if somebody lives there, if there were about twenty houses out there, well that would slow traffic down, you know, those people, we are talking about from East Grand Forks who want to get on to Highway 2, otherwise you have to go all the way back and come in down there at that miserable intersection further down.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Vein asked if we need to amend our earlier motion now. DeMers responded that he thought we still have to approve the main motion for this item first. Haugen said that when he talked about amending the previous motion earlier to add \$5,000 to the budget, he is now thinking that there might be enough room in the \$60,000 budget to leave it as it is and see what we get back as a proposal and scope-of-work, then if we have to add more money we can reconsider it at that point.

***MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE RFP FOR U.S. #2/U.S. BUSINESS #2 STUDY, AS AMENDED.***

***Voting Yes: Strandell, Vetter, Powers, Vein, DeMers, and Malm.***

***Voting No: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Mock and Wasvick.***

Haugen commented that from a staff perspective our next steps would be, other than issuing the RFP, to seek the membership on the Steering Committee so we do have someone from the East Grand Forks Council, and you gentleman may want to be on it as well. He added that now that the study and RFP have been approved, you will be kept informed at each step of the process.

**MATTER OF SOLICITATION OF 2017-2018 UPWP PROJECTS**

Haugen reported that we have to develop by the end of November our next two year work program. He stated that he would like to highlight, however, that we have our Long Range Transportation Plan due then, and we also have to be in full compliance with the FAST Act, therefore we will be allocating almost all of our resources to that activity. He said, though, that we do think there might be as much as \$60,000 to do things, just like the study we just identified, so we are asking you and your staff to see if there are any particular projects for 2017 that you might want us to consider.

Haugen stated that, as an MPO, we do ask that any project you would like considered be vetted through the appropriate governing body so that everyone is on board should the MPO decide to do the project, that the appropriate agency makes the request. He added that they need to be submitted to the MPO by October, so you might see some activity at your council or commission meetings where staff is asking you to approve study requests of the MPO.

Haugen commented that, unfortunately this is going to be a small dollar amount this time, but three years from now the funding should be a lot closer to a couple hundred thousand dollars available to allow for more studies.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

a. 2016 UPWP Project Update

Haugen reported that this is just our monthly progress report we put together to keep you, and others, informed of where we are at with our current work program activities.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

b. NDDOT Participation On MPO Executive Policy Board

Haugen reported that the NDDOT has requested consideration that both State DOTs be listed as Ex-Officio Members of the MPO Executive Policy Board. He said that currently we do have two Ex-Officio Members, they are the two Mayors. He explained that Ex-Officio in our by-laws means that they are invited to attend, but they aren't able to be voting members.

Haugen stated that the NDDOT had some recent intense discussions with FM/COG, and as one of the solutions asked if it would be beneficial to FM/COG to have Ex-Officio membership on their board, and FM/COG did bring them on as Ex-Officio members. He added that they have been a long standing Ex-Officio member on the Bismarck/Mandan MPO, but even though they have been long time members it has been a long time since they have participated at the Bismarck/Mandan MPO Board level.

Haugen said that if you are interested in pursuing this, the formal thing that would have to be done would be to amend the by-laws to bring them in. He explained that to amend the by-laws it takes two meetings, thus if you are interested we would draft an amendment to your by-laws for your consideration at your next meeting, and then it can be formally amended at the following meeting.

Haugen reported that if you decide to approve they be Ex-Officio Members, it is unlikely that someone from the Headquarter Offices would be attending any of your meetings, but would most likely get the District Engineer, or someone representing the District Engineer.

Vetter asked if we invite them on a month-to-month basis to our meetings already. Haugen responded that we do. Powers commented that the way Mr. Haugen explained this to him is that it is kind of like the Mayors are Ex-Officio, and how many times have you seen either Mayor here. Vetter stated that if they are already getting invited, what would be the difference, and why would we want to go through the headache of amending our by-laws, they are already invited, if you want to come, come. Vein added that the DOTs are part of the Technical Advisory Committee as well, so most Technical Advisory Committee recommendations that come here they are already aware of. Malm asked if they both attend the Technical Advisory Committee meetings. Haugen responded that they do on a fairly consistent basis. Malm said that he agrees with Mr. Vetter's comment, we've never seen either Mayor here yet.

Haugen asked if the board wanted to take some form of formal action to convey a message back, or do you wait until they show up and present their request formally, in person. Vein asked if they were planning on requesting. Haugen responded that this is their request to consider adding them on as an Ex-Officio Member.

DeMers said that he just doesn't understand what the benefit is. Haugen responded that possibly having them show up at your board meetings, initially on a regular basis. DeMers agreed that he thinks there would be a benefit of having them at our meetings, but he wonders if there might be a conflict of having them on both a Technical Advisory Committee and the MPO Executive Policy Board, granted they are non-voting members, but... Strandell said that they must want to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

have some influence. DeMers agreed, adding that that is what he is wondering, what is the benefit here, if you're already getting an invite, do they want it stamped with a gold seal, cause he doesn't understand what the difference is. Vetter asked if, at a federal level, is there a preference in dealing with the grants or anything if they are Ex-Officio Members. Haugen responded that there isn't, adding that in a larger metropolitan area of 200,000 or more an MPO is also called a TMA (Transportation Management Area), and in a TMA the States do have to be on the MPO Board, but we aren't 200,000 therefore it isn't a federal requirement, but if it is good enough for a TMA why isn't it good enough for a small MPO. He said, however, that even our federal representatives on the Technical Advisory Committee are Ex-Officio members, and that was at their request.

DeMers stated that, unless you flesh out some even mediocre benefit he doesn't think we want to amend our by-laws do we, but he thinks a "no" sends a wrong message too. Vein added that he would think they would be sending anyone out of Bismarck. Haugen responded that he agrees, adding, however, that they might request that they can participate by phone. Malm said he would be against that, explaining that he thinks it is one of the biggest mistakes we make, allowing members to participate by phone. He added that he has to put up with it about once a month. Vein agreed, but added that while being the one on the other end it is hard to participate, but on the same token sometimes it is nice to build strong relationships, and you work together closer, and they understand more of where and why we are doing the things that we do, like on the bridge for example, so there can be advantages to having them here, especially since they can't vote. Malm said, though, that they are invited to come every time we have a meeting, so if they want to they can come. DeMers asked if there is something, through their budgeting, or their organizational stuff, if they have a membership they have a requirement to attend.

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO RECEIVE AND FILE THE  
REQUEST FROM THE NDDOT TO BE EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS OF THE MPO  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD.***

Powers stated that he would rather make a yes or no decision.

***Voting Yes: Strandell, Vetter, Vein, DeMers, and Malm.***

***Voting No: Powers.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Mock and Wasvick.***

Strandell said that he has one last comment, and he just has to tell Mr. Vein that he agrees with what was said about the bridge, and he would think that his Polk County Board would feel the same way, it just plain isn't a good plan to narrow those lanes, and he would much rather go with a rehab of the current project and then try to get a pedestrian bridge in a separate action, it makes much more sense to him to do that.

Vein commented that another thing is that there really isn't even connectivity on the sidewalks, on either side. Haugen responded that there would be on the North Dakota side, and it is part of the project that you have to make a connection to the Greenway Trail on the Minnesota side.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Vein said, though, that the trail goes north/south and the sidewalk goes east/west, so it really isn't solving pedestrian traffic that goes east/west, it is just giving you another place to turn around if you're in the Greenway and you want to go back and forth.

Powers asked if everyone remembers that study that we did a year or so ago, that did traffic counts, pedestrian and cars; well he found on the very bottom line in fine print that there were three pedestrian crossings on the Kennedy. Vetter said that that is because it is not allowed. Powers agreed, but added that they did a projection, assuming it were allowed in the future, how many crossings would there be, and it went anywhere from 30 to 300, but he thinks we are sacrificing moving the traffic in order to get a pedestrian crossing, which is way too big.

DeMers commented that he definitely feels the pedestrian aspect of this is important, he thinks that if you look at the development along there, especially from and East Grand Forks perspective; we have a pool there, a grocery store along that corridor, restaurants, and he thinks we want to promote pedestrian traffic along there, but he doesn't if the way you're doing it is the best way, but I think we want people from Grand Forks to come over and he is sure there are kids riding their bikes over to the Riverside pool too, so he thinks it is a good goal, just doesn't think the execution is right.

Haugen said, just to clarify, when we see this report on the Kennedy Bridge, the current cost is \$23,000,000, that is an all-inclusive cost, but if you look at the T.I.P. document it stays at \$18,000.00 for the construction portion of the project, so the cost is not escalating, the numbers are just being reported different. Vein stated that earlier Mr. Haugen said that the cost estimate for replacing the Kennedy was around \$23,000,000. Haugen responded that that is correct. Vein said that he can't believe that. Haugen explained that three or four years ago that was the estimated cost. Vein said that they were talking about building the 42<sup>nd</sup> Street Underpass at a cost closer to \$50,000,000, so he isn't sure that amount is right. Haugen referred to a table showing the estimated costs of a more modern type bridge.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO ADJOURN THE AUGUST 17<sup>TH</sup>,  
2016, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:40 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE  
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, September 21<sup>st</sup>, 2016 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mike Powers, Chairman, called the September 21<sup>st</sup>, 2016 meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:06 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Mike Powers, Clarence Vetter, Marc DeMers, Gary Malm, Jeannie Mock, and Al Grasser.

Absent: Ken Vein and Warren Strandell.

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

Guest(s): Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Powers declared a quorum was present.

**WELCOME NEW MEMBER**

Powers welcomed Al Grasser, Grand Forks Planning Commission Representative, to the MPO Executive Policy Board. He then asked that everyone please state their name and the organization they represent.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 17<sup>TH</sup>, 2016, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 17<sup>TH</sup>, 2016, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

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

Haugen reported that included in the staff report are updates on both the Sorlie and the Kennedy Bridges.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 21<sup>st</sup>, 2016**

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen stated that, not included in the packet, but at the Technical Advisory Committee an oral update was given. He stated that essentially the project is done, and we are all appreciating the lights, but the controller has not yet been accepted so the project has not yet been closed out. He explained that the controller is currently being examined.

Haugen commented that another thing with the Sorlie is, as you will recall, there is a temporary “patch” done on both approaches to the bridge, and coming up North Dakota will be looking at major reconstruction work on DeMers Avenue and we may be seeking another examination of whether they can coordinate with Minnesota to do something more “permanent” to both approaches.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that, as you will recall, there was a lot of discussion last month, essentially with the action, or non-action the Grand Forks City Council took on the Kennedy Bridge Project. He pointed out that included in the staff report was a copy of the Grand Forks City Staff Report that was provided to the City Council. He stated that, essentially there was a meeting held by the NDDOT and MnDOT with Grand Forks and East Grand Forks personnel to sort of communicate as to why they need to proceed with the bridge as proposed.

Haugen stated that the action taken by the Grand Forks City Council following that meeting was still not to essentially approve the project, but to allow the proper signatures be obtained to keep the project moving forward and to make sure they are still participating in the project.

Haugen referred to a drawing of the proposed cross-section for the bridge project, and commented that the bid letting is still being scheduled to occur in November.

Grasser interjected that the lighting, and this will reflect on both the Sorlie and the Kennedy Bridges, has generated some interest on both sides about being able to do a little bit more with the lighting, maybe having more flexibility, as the question of being able to change the colors more often has been brought up multiple times. He stated that he isn't sure whether or not the board has any thoughts on this, but he knows, and although he can't speak directly for the Mayor, but he seems to be a bit frustrated at the limitations that we currently have, so that is something that they probably will want to pursue when this committee gets together, roughly about November.

Haugen reiterated that the Kennedy is moving forward, the bid letting is still scheduled for November, and there is still some work that has to be figured out on it, including the connecting to the greenway trail system, etc.

**MATTER OF DRAFT VISION STATEMENT AND ADDED GOALS TO LONG RANGE  
TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

Viafara reported that through a series of community engagements, we have completed a review of the vision statement for the four elements of the Long Range Transportation Plan. He said

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 21<sup>st</sup>, 2016**

that the new statement provided by the community, and supported by the community, reads – “The GF-EGF Long Range Transportation Plan envisions a community that provides a variety of complementary transportation choices for people and goods.”

Viafara said that this is now the element, the vision statement, that we will be framing our Long Range Transportation Plan, the four elements of our Long Range Transportation Plan.

Viafara commented that this will be guiding the different eight goals that, so far, have been present in our documents; and later it will also help us to articulate two new goals that are mandated by legislation for us to implement into our plans; one is Goal 9 – Resiliency, which has to do with readiness and preparation for catastrophes and the protection of the overall infrastructure; and the other is Goal 10 – Tourism, which will give us the opportunity to promote and enhance the traffic modes to provide tourism.

Viafara stated that the community has been reviewing this information, and we are incorporating them into our documents.

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON I-29 STUDY**

Haugen reported that included in the packet was the executive summary from our latest report on the study, as well as the summary of the Steering Committee meeting. He said that he would like to take some time to read some of the questions and comments they have been receiving from Federal Highways in Bismarck’s Central Office on how the study is progressing.

Haugen said that, if you will recall, in June we had to amend the contract to add additional locations to the scope of work, based on a federal comment we received.

Haugen referred to a slide illustrating the study limits and said that he would just like to reiterate that these are the study limits, so it is going beyond the three existing ones in the urban area, both north and south.

Haugen commented on the current status of the existing intersections, adding that you can’t forget that we do have issues, particularly at Gateway Drive and DeMers Avenue. He said that the current work didn’t look at those areas because mainly the solutions to those issues are within that area of the interchange. He pointed out that at 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue there are opportunities to have solutions elsewhere, beside just at the interchange, so really the report that they are presenting to you today is focusing on how we can improve the southern end of the interstate operations.

Haugen stated that they have done this at a high altitude level, and are looking at our travel demand model and using cost estimates to give us an idea of the cost/benefit ratio. He said that from this point forward they will be using what is called “Micro-Level” where they will be including more refined, fairly detailed video simulation, to make sure that geometries, on and off ramps, and spacing are all proper and adequate.

Haugen commented that they did, then, with the additional, particularly the 62<sup>nd</sup> Avenue items, they did look at quite a list of alternatives to include, again, particularly the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue area, and in the end they looked at three criteria to guide us on how to rank and come up with what to move forward.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 21<sup>st</sup>, 2016**

Haugen said that, just to give you some idea that we have identified, at the same level, what could be done at 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue to make it run efficiently by 2040; and already in our Long Range Transportation Plan we've identified widening to take place, but what we did not identify is the need to widen the interchange overpass itself, and take this over to the west side.

Haugen stated that this gives us a baseline to compare what other costs are versus what we can do at 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue itself. He said that you might ask – well we'll look at other interchanges; why are we looking at modifying this – well one of the federal highway requirements is that we show them what it would take to modify what exists today because they are rather protective of adding access onto the interstate system.

Haugen reported that you asked staff to look at what additional river bridges might do; essentially they add minimal traffic onto the interstate, and our study confirmed that again, however that doesn't mean that there is no benefit for those at all, it just means that for the isolation of the interstate traffic, there is less than 1% benefit ratio, so for some there isn't really an incentive to carry this forward to the next stages.

Haugen said that, Grade Separations, again, part of the federal review process is that we have to show that it can mitigate traffic, particularly if it's local traffic, without accessing the interstate system; so they looked at a myriad of grade separations rather than just interchanges, and for the most part they fail primarily because they don't eliminate the need to do that widening of 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, particularly the widening of the interchange there, so none of the Grade Separations are meeting our criteria to move forward. So we are recommending we don't move these forward.

Haugen commented that when they looked at individual interchanges, they looked at Merrifield, and Merrifield, as you see does give us a pretty good benefit, it does attract a bit of traffic off of 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. He stated that its primary benefit is what it takes off of I-29, and it is a cost effective alternative, so it is an alternative that we are going to take into the next micro-simulation stage.

Haugen stated that the 42<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Interchange also is being forwarded. He said that it does have slightly different benefit that it is providing, it obviously has a tremendous impact on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, however a concern of Federal Highway is if this impact to them is a negative impact on the interstate system by adding a lot of additional traffic to the interstate system, however it still has a great benefit/cost ratio as well the highest cost effectiveness benefits ratio.

Haugen said that they looked at doing both; there has always been, in the past, a desire to have both interchanges built, and they do meet our three criteria. He explained that what happens, though, is that because there is a lot of stealing of vehicles off of each other, we don't double all of our benefits, we don't double our benefit/cost ratio, we don't double our effectiveness, and essentially we just add cost and reduce some of our benefit/cost ratio, but it did meet all of our three criteria so we are suggesting it be moved forward.

Haugen commented that, as you read the minutes in the packet, you will also notice a lot of discussion about proper spacing of interchanges. He stated that 62<sup>nd</sup> Avenue was something that North Dakota Central Office and FHWA was pushing quite readily upon us, and if we do that spacing we

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 21<sup>st</sup>, 2016**

kind of end up with no allowance for 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue to be considered, nor Merrifield Avenue either. He said that, if you go back to all the analysis we did of 62<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, it didn't meet those three criteria that we were trying to meet to make sure the projects we are moving forward are great project to move forward.

Haugen stated that when we looked at the difference between 47<sup>th</sup> and Merrifield, we could see that there are quite a few more advantages to the 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue issue versus 62<sup>nd</sup> Avenue; but, again, we aren't moving 62<sup>nd</sup> Avenue forward, and we think we have federal highway and central office to sort of see the light on this and they are allowing us to move forward with this.

Haugen commented that one of the things that happened with each of these interchanges is that they both have a different traffic operation done with them; 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Interchange only has traffic loading and unloading on the north side, and Merrifield only has traffic loading and unloading on the south side, so as we look forward, and if we come up with a spacing issue again, the closer we are to 32<sup>nd</sup> the less desirable it is from a federal highway and central office perspective; so as we get closer to Merrifield, we wanted to think a little outside the box in that maybe instead of two complete interchanges we build half an interchange on the north side to attract the north traffic and half an interchange on the south side. He explained that this is a rare alternative that Federal Highway allows, and we are kind of holding it in reserve in case we do have some spacing issues that we can't resolve, although we aren't anticipating having this problem, but if we should we are introducing this concept to you so it doesn't come out of nowhere down the road. He added, though, that we wouldn't be saving a lot of cost building two complete interchanges, even taking into consideration that we aren't building two of the four ramps. He said that another issue is the impact on the interstate system, as we've shown, the 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Interchange does have a lot of traffic attracted to the interstate system, but we wanted to give them some idea, and according to our demand model, how regional is the traffic that is using our existing interchange system, and what is our model forecasting for the 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Interchange, and so 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue is on par with the existing interchanges, so it is kind of giving Central Office, Federal Highways, and ourselves a little piece of mind that we aren't degrading the interstate system, and are only attracting regional traffic at the same percentages as the existing interchanges are in the system.

Haugen stated that Merrifield is a little higher, it is kind of a function of the volumes as a percent, and also the miles it takes off of the interstate system; a lot of traffic is not taking the interstate to go up to 32<sup>nd</sup> and access the southern part of Grand Forks so there are a lot of miles that are being saved by not having to do a circuitous route.

Haugen reported that these are the alternatives that we are carrying forward into the next phase. He said that we obviously had to carry forward that baseline on the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue modification, but then the three new alternatives, and sort of give you some idea of their cost effectiveness, making a comparison.

Haugen commented that the next level, then, is going to do the micro-simulation to where, not only do we look at those Merrifield Interchange options; 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Interchange options; in finer detail, but we also are going to look at the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue modification, the DeMers Avenue one, which is probably going to be maybe the toughest one because of the railroad track, and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 21<sup>st</sup>, 2016**

then Gateway Drive, so we will be going into the micro-simulation and come up with some better cost estimates, better benefits, etc., and identifying what really is necessary on the I-29 Corridor in Grand Forks to make sure that we are correcting some deficiencies that are there today, but more importantly to identify the future deficiencies.

Haugen reported that right now we aren't planning on holding any type of open house, or public meeting on this; but we have posted this information on our website, and also have the Drive I-29 Corridor where this information is; and we are promoting and sending press releases, and public notices that people can access to read up on the information and provide us feedback that way.

Mock referred to a slide showing the mainline conditions, and asked if each of these interchanges can only handle less than 20% of the traffic, is that what we are supposed to believe, because that is incredibly inefficient. Haugen responded that that isn't what it is handling, that is what it is attracting from the outskirts. He explained that from our outskirts of the main U.S. #2/I-29, what we would term as regional traffic coming into the urban area, 17.1 of that regional traffic is flowing through the Gateway Interchange, 16% is flowing through DeMers, 22.2% is flowing through 32<sup>nd</sup>, so it's not the total traffic, it's just that portion of the regional traffic that is flowing through that interchange.

Mock stated that she fails to see how those numbers would warrant a 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Interchange, that does not seem right. Haugen responded that the warrant comes in in that you don't have to do the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue project at all, plus you have a tremendous cost savings benefit by reducing the miles people have to travel, and the time needed to travel. He added that it does cause some pain to Federal Highway in that we do have quite an increase of traffic on the interstate system, but what it would do for regional traffic, again, the interstate system is not local traffic, a lot of the 63% increase in traffic is kind of local traffic, but it is showing that the interchange is on par with what the other existing interchanges are doing to attract and be used by the regional traffic; so it is a big investment, yes, but it does have, according to the three criteria we use, it does have benefits. He added that this doesn't mean that it will be approved by Federal Highway, it just means that we have good arguments to keep moving forward.

DeMers asked if there was a breakdown between regional and local traffic on the model. Haugen responded that basically what is left out of the 100% is local traffic. DeMers said, then, that the guy or gal that jumps on the interstate to go to Target instead of taking 32<sup>nd</sup> is considered local. Haugen responded that this isn't interstate traffic, this is traffic using the overpass of the interchange. DeMers asked if there was a difference between the people that cross over and the people that are using the interstate as an alternative traffic conduit rather than using a local street. Haugen responded that right now we probably don't have a great capture of that, the closest data we have would be the old bridge intercept survey we did about five years ago, and that would only give us some idea at the three bridges where they are coming from and going to, and the routes they are taking.

Haugen said that we will be talking about our Travel Demand Model update later on the agenda, and one of the things we are going to be purchasing, hopefully, is that GPS based Origin Destination, and so with that data we think we might have better answers for you, because we will have quite a bit more data, and those bridge intercept surveys were one day, this will be a months worth of travel.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 21<sup>st</sup>, 2016**

Grasser referred to a slide, and pointed out that it looks like we are including that realignment of 42<sup>nd</sup> Street. Haugen responded that we are because it was in past plans, and we are going to see if it is still capable of being done either way, with or without traffic relief at 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. Grasser asked, if it is needed will that end up in the cost or the benefit side of the equation as you move through that process. Haugen responded that he does not have that answer yet, but his guess is that it is not a need, it is something we would like to do, so how it probably ends up is more of a cost, but there will be benefits to it, it will improve operations because we would be separating some of the movements away from each other.

Haugen said that the real issue that will be tough to handle will be the DeMers Avenue Interchange, just because of the Railroad. He stated that AI can probably attest to you the problem in getting a shared use trail across there. Grasser added – “or lack of ability to” get a trail across there. Haugen added that the three lanes that we currently have are barely enough today, but by 2025 they certainly won’t be enough, and definitely by 2040, if everything happens as we are forecasting, then we would be having similar levels of gridlock as what we are forecasting on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, at DeMers Avenue.

Haugen commented that there is a press release out, and we will have a public notice put out. He explained that we will be brought up to speed, but will not be holding an open house or public meeting to present this information as it is essentially very technically detailed information, plus we ended up back to where we were ten/twenty years ago; we want one at 47<sup>th</sup> and we want one at Merrifield.

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON TRAVEL DEMAND MODEL**

Haugen reported that we are making improvements, and are taking the model from our 2010 year to our 2015 base year, working with A.T.A.C. and city and MPO staff.

Haugen stated that one of the first things we did was to try to improve our TAZ structure. He explained that TAZs are our Traffic Analysis Zones, and in our model those are the core units of geography that generate and attract traffic.

Haugen reported that, essentially, after the Flood of 1997, we probably went too far with the pendulum and created too small and too many TAZs. He said that now that we are quite a ways away from that experience, we are now finding that we can consolidate quite a few TAZ. He cited an example between Columbia Mall and Altru Hospital, where we used to have several TAZs, but now have consolidated them into just two TAZs. He explained that this allows us to also eliminate some of these street networks that were difficult to really calibrate and validate model traffic assignments to them, so they are local streets that we are cleaning up and streamlining down to just our functional class.

Haugen stated that we are also splitting some TAZs in growth areas. He again cited a location south of 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue where we used to have just two TAZs, but now that we have different types of development going in on the north side of this roadway, we are creating TAZs to show those different land uses taking place.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 21<sup>st</sup>, 2016**

Haugen said that in the end they went from 568 TAZs to 550 TAZs, and, again they worked with City Staff and A.T.A.C. to come up with this new structure of TAZs.

Haugen commented that the next step they are implementing is populating those TAZs with the data that tells us the type of housing that is taking place in them, and the type of employment. He referred to a slide and pointed out that it indicates that all three MPOs in the State of North Dakota are now updating their Travel Demand Models, so we are able to jointly purchase this data at a great savings to us, and the biggest feather in our hats is that we convinced North Dakota to allow all of us to use those de-obligated planning dollars from this budget cycle, so it was freeing up money to all of us so we didn't have to take monies from our current work programs to make this purchase. He added that it also helped that North Dakota is doing a statewide model so they needed this data set as well, so they were more than willing to use some of the de-obligated funds so that no-one would have to take the brunt of the costs.

Haugen stated that the next thing is the Origin Destination, again, the three MPOs are seeing that if we do a joint purchase we will have a 30% cost savings to each of us. He added that we had requested to also use the de-obligated monies, but this time around NDDOT doesn't seem quite as interested in this data, and we are a bit puzzled as to why that is, because, again, they are developing a statewide travel demand model, and having Origin Destination is one of the key ingredients to ensure that it is a properly calibrated model. He stated that staff is meeting with them next week, and we will hopefully be able to get an answer on that issue.

Haugen reported that Bismarck/Mandan MPO staff is taking the lead on drafting the RFP. He added that FM-Cog did the socio-economic portion, so our investment is hopefully not a lot.

Haugen commented that we are also working with both cities on updating; going from a 2010 to a 2015 street network so when we are incorporating all those improvements that have been made, so we are modifying the street networks, and will populate the TAZs.

Haugen said that the next big task will be to complete and adopt the Grand Forks Land Use Plan. He commented that last night the Grand Forks Land Use Subcommittee met and gave preliminary approval to the Grand Forks Land Use Plan Update; and it will now go through the October and November cycle for approval, so hopefully with those documents we can then populate where we think the future growth, employment, housing, etc., will be located. He added that the East Grand Forks Land Use Plan has already been completed and adopted.

DeMers asked if a reduction in number, and especially in certain areas; and the increase in size of the TAZs have any bearing on how you plan for transit, and if you are doing interim zoning traffic studies, say from here to here, does that big of an area affect how you plan for transit. Haugen responded that it does not directly impact it. He explained that we don't use our travel plan model for transit planning. He added that, again, the geography is probably too large, but we do have the block by block census data that gives us a better idea of what the new transit types are and what areas. He said that we probably will be seeing that just because of the time of the system, to get from one end to the other, we might be getting off of those local road neighborhoods and focusing more on maybe the collectors and above, to try to cover and get people from here to there on time.

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON BIKE/PED SURVEY**

Viafara reported that a number of community activities have been undertaken to provide opportunities for people to give input, and also to provide the needs, in terms of ideas for the development of the plan.

Viafara stated that there were three newspaper articles; and there was a community Stakeholder's meeting held on August 29<sup>th</sup>. He added that as part of the Survey Monkey survey, we have garnered a series of comments. He said that this information is preliminary because they still have to take the base survey that is being tabulated, after which they will put together these comments and the comments coming from the paper review.

Viafara said that they would like to bring a couple of questions to your attention; Questions 12, 23, and 24 on the questionnaire.

Viafara stated that Question #12 asks what intersections need improvements to become more bicycle friendly. He pointed out that, as you can see, there is a recorded copy on many intersections like Gateway, Bygland Road, DeMers Avenue, Washington Street; that continue showing up as needing some kind of improvements to ensure bicyclists and pedestrians are more comfortable and safe.

Viafara commented that we have five intersections, that if improved, would become more pedestrian friendly. He stated that there are a number of times that Columbia/DeMers become more prominent, so it behooves us, as planners and engineers to pay attention more often to what the communities are bringing to us as areas that if improved would become more pedestrian and bicycle friendly.

Viafara said that we have something called, additional comments, and those are comments provided to us by people on maps that we have placed strategically around key areas. He cited, for instance, in East Grand Forks City Hall's atrium, there is a map; there is another map in Grand Forks' City Hall, and whenever we go to community engagements we have these maps where people are able to read and to write, so then we have gotten some comments that are also transcribed so we know what they thinking.

Viafara commented that it is important to mention that some of these comments are also in response to people that are very active in bicycling, and people coming from the University of North Dakota; where bicycle and pedestrian issues are of interest and importance, so now when you proceed to review comments you know what you are addressing.

Viafara reported that in addition to these comments they have also tabulated some of the questions from the Survey Monkey questionnaire; and he would like to bring some snippets of information from those results.

Viafara referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request), that lists the survey questions, and the results of the survey, and went over the information briefly.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 21<sup>st</sup>, 2016**

Powers asked if there is anywhere in either city where people shouldn't be biking, has that ever been looked at. He cited locations like Gateway Drive, Columbia Road, Washington Street; because to him it isn't using good common sense to ride bikes down those roadways. Haugen responded that the only place that might prohibit bikers might be one side of the Kennedy Bridge, currently, but other than that there are no other locations that prohibit bicyclists as bikes are the same as a motor vehicle. He added that the Interstate System in North Dakota is open to bicyclists, although this isn't the case in all States, Minnesota being one that doesn't allow it; but no, they haven't looked at areas where we should try prohibiting bicyclists. Powers commented that he just thinks it is something that should be considered, especially now when we are getting into beet season, he just thinks it is a safety issue, particularly with the mentality of some of these bicyclists that think that they should be able to ride bikes anywhere they please; when in reality it isn't safe. He added that some roads are not designed for bicycles. Haugen responded that that is why on some roads there is a separate multi-use trail along the roadway, to provide bicyclists the ability to go down the corridor without intermingling with traffic, but there is also an element of bicycling in a community that are capable, comfortable and safe in the traffic.

Powers stated that one of the comments is that Bygland Road is not bicycle safe. He asked how one could say that. Haugen said that from our Bygland Road study the comments they were receiving was concern with the speed of the vehicles, and the disregard of turning movements of vehicles neglecting to look out for the presence of a bicyclist either on the road or on the sidewalk. He added that crossing Bygland Road was also identified as an issue, and gets back to certain volumes, times of day, and speed.

Malm said that he is very shocked at what they say about Gateway Drive. He commented that the real problem on Gateway Drive is that there is a bicycle trail that goes all the way on the south side, until you get to Columbia Road and then nobody can figure out how to get across to go to the Fairgrounds to downtown, because you never have to go out on the street, but that corner, when you go past the Jewish Cemetery, you can't figure out how to get over there, there are no signs pointing anyone where the trail continues to the downtown without ever having to go onto the street. He stated that we just don't sign these things very well.

Viafara commented that one of the objectives of the plan update is precisely that, to close the gaps and to realign the situation that you are discussing because in some areas the system is not complete, so we would like to verify, and then do the assessment to see, financially, how feasible it is to complete that system, that is what they are considering.

Malm said that he would ask that they look at Gateway Drive and Columbia Road, because that was not the place to cross that bicycle trail, it should have been on the north side back at Stanford Road, and then they could have crossed there and gone down the front, but then you had to drive through everybody's parking lot. He commented that somebody didn't use a lot of thought when they planned that out.

Haugen commented that the thing that is really happening on the bike side of life is there is just an acceleration of innovation taking place on design facilities, and to give you some idea, the AASHTO book on bike planning from 1994, didn't have any updates until 2009, now there has

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 21<sup>st</sup>, 2016**

been an update in 2012, and there will be a 2017 update, so it is really a field that is converging with a lot of new techniques, and Mr. Viafara and the group will be trying to keep up to date with those changes and try to come up with a new system, or an expanded system.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

a. Minnesota Documents

Haugen reminded everyone that they still have the ability, until the end of the month, on the Minnesota side to comment on their three documents.

b. October Executive Policy Board Meeting

Haugen reported that we will be moving our October MPO Executive Policy Board meeting from Wednesday, October 19<sup>th</sup> to Thursday, October 20<sup>th</sup>, to allow for the NDDOT Director. Grant Levi, and his staff to give a presentation. He added that it will be held here, but please allow for more time in your schedule for Mr Levi's presentation.

c. FHWA Training

Haugen stated that the dates for this training had been moved several times, but it now appears that it will be held on November 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> in Bismarck. He explained that, as you will recall, last year Federal Highway came through and did a financial audit on us. He added that they also did one on the NDDOT, and as a result of that audit they are mandating that all MPO staff, and NDDOT staff attend this training. He said that they also wanted to make sure that if the board is interested in going there might be some room for them. He added that we also told the Technical Advisory Committee about it as well, and if there is room there may be an ability for them to attend as well.

d. North Dakota State Audit

Haugen explained that we were also recently notified that the State of North Dakota, now, is going to be doing a financial audit of the three MPOs. He said that Ms. McNelis has determined that we are the first guinea pig, so we are diligently making copies of four months of financial records for them to review. Vetter asked if they wouldn't accept the audit that Brady Martz did for us. Haugen responded that they won't. He explained that part of the federal highway audit result was that they felt that North Dakota was very lax on oversight, so this is in response to that. He added that he thinks that this might be kind of, assuming we have the same results we did as we did with the Federal Highway Audit, because we are following basically the same things, in the future he has seen documents where North Dakota will, instead of doing complete audits, will do random requests of a single month, requesting all of the financial documents for that month to them for them to review, and that will be the extent of the audit. Vetter asked when they will be doing this audit. Haugen responded that right now we are assembling all the paper work for them, then they will do a desk type review, and then they will schedule a site review as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 21<sup>st</sup>, 2016**

Powers asked for more clarification on Brady Martz. Haugen responded that they did our audit. Vetter added that Brady Martz did the MPO financial audit, and that is the same thing, you have federal grants and they have to go through the A131 Standards, so it should be acceptable. He said that that would be one topic that he would want to bring up at our October 20<sup>th</sup> meeting with the NDDOT, it is redundant, a waste of our time.

e. 2016 UPWP Project Update

Viafara referred to the table, and explained that the last one is the completing of the Discovery Elementary School project. He said that they received comments from the administration, and those comments have now been incorporated into the final report. He stated that the final draft will be circulated among the Stakeholders and the report will be presented by the School Principal at the next Technical Advisory Committee, so they are working toward getting that all completed.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY MALM, TO ADJOURN THE SEPTEMBER 21<sup>ST</sup>, 2016, MEETING OF THE  
MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:05 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD OF THE  
GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Thursday, October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mike Powers, Chairman, called the October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016 meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:07 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

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

Absent: Ken Vein and Al Grasser.

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

Guest(s): David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Mike Yavarow, Grand Forks Engineering; Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks District; Grant Levi, NDDOT Director; and Ron Henke, Deputy Director For Engineering, NDDOT.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Powers declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 21<sup>ST</sup>, 2016, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 21<sup>ST</sup>, 2016, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

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

Haugen reported that included in the packet are updates on both the Sorlie and the Kennedy Bridges.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen stated that if you will recall, last time we talked about the Sorlie there was desire about making the approval process for local events, changing the lighting to be a little quicker and smoother, and in your packet was the draft language that was written. He commented that, essentially it is saying that both Mayors will sign off on it, that is the proposed new method for those special events; and then annually the Lighting Committee will meet to go over those events to see if they should become a scheduled event or if there should be a different process after a trial run.

Haugen said that this is still a draft document, and the Committee is scheduled to meet December 8<sup>th</sup>.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that the first thing is, as you will recall we have been talking that the bid letting was scheduled for November, but that has now been moved to December 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Haugen stated that included in the packet were copies of the design concepts that show how the bike/ped facility on the bridge will connect on both sides of the river. He referred to the drawings and went over them briefly; pointing out that they also include a temporary greenway trail that will be constructed to maintain connection on both sides while the permanent ones are being built.

Haugen commented that on the Minnesota side the project will take the trail along the northerly right-of-way down to River Road. He said that there is, however, some commitment between MnDOT and the City of East Grand Forks to actually make the trail connect over to the Greenway Trail system as well, but as of now the project is going to River Road.

Haugen said that the last drawing that was included in the packet is the detour route plan. He stated that, as described in the packet, from west to east at U.S. #2 and Washington Street, is where the detours will be established to follow Washington down to DeMers; then following DeMers through East Grand Forks up to U.S. #2 again, and reverse for the other direction.

Haugen reported that at the Technical Advisory Committee there is a lot of discussion about the detour plan. He said that one of the follow-ups that MnDOT will be doing is to try to establish a signal coordination timing plan while this is occurring so that traffic can hopefully move smoothly through the signals if they weren't retimed.

Haugen said that the other issue that was discussed was that in 2017 NDDOT will also be doing work on DeMers from essentially the overpass west to the Interstate so there will be times when that portion of the detour route will also have NDDOT construction going on as well.

Malm asked if they have any idea how long the project and detouring will take. Haugen responded that the project itself could last up to two years, but it won't be shut down completely for most of that time, but there will be some windows of time when it will require that traffic is

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

shut down completely off the Kennedy Bridge. He added that they asked for a lot of the local contact information such as the Schools, media, etc., so that when they do have time and location of closures they have the ability to get the word out to the public well prior to it occurring.

DeMers stated that concerning the multi-use path on the east side of the Kennedy, you said that there might be some commitment with MnDOT, is that outside of the TAP funding or is it covered. Haugen responded that it would be outside of the TAP funding. DeMers said, then, that they might not be able to use the TAP funds for that. Haugen responded that he doesn't know how much they ultimately have available.

DeMers asked if it will be part of the process to do a pavement analysis for the detour route. He explained that he asks because he has concerns about the type of traffic, as well as the amount of traffic that will be funneled down DeMers. He stated that he feels that South Washington is a bit better constructed to handle higher volumes of traffic, but he is concerned about the downtown area of DeMers being able to handle the higher volumes. Haugen responded that on the North Dakota side they have a project to reconstruct DeMers Avenue in 2019; and on the Minnesota side they do have last year's pavement management analysis in place, and beyond that he isn't aware of anything being identified. DeMers said that it would be nice to have a baseline before and after two years of pounding. Haugen responded that they do have that baseline, although it is a year or two old already.

Yavarow reported that last he heard North Dakota is going to run the project, not Minnesota. He explained that Minnesota does not have the staff or capability to run the project.

Yavarow stated that, as of a couple of days ago there are two sets of plans; one for the bridge and one for the approaches. He said that they have a final set of plans for the bridge, but not for the work off the bridge yet.

Yavarow commented that one thing on the Sorlie Bridge is two more of the walkway lights went out a week or so ago and have not yet been replaced as they have to be sent to the manufacturer for replacement lights, which once installed and reprogrammed will start the 90-day warranty period again. He added that a week or so before these lights went out they installed the new controller, which had taken three or four months to get fixed, so this will set everything back once again.

Yavarow added that regarding the lighting agreement for the Sorlie, the minutes from the Historic Preservation Commission were distributed last week, and in them SHIPO stated that the change being proposed will not be allowed in the agreement, as far as the optional lighting, because they feel it is beyond the scope of what the initial agreement was. Haugen suggested that there may need to be three parties that sign off, both Mayors and a representative from the Historical Preservation Commission.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL FOR U.S. #2/U.S. BUSINESS #2 STUDY**

Haugen reported that we have two issues here. He stated that the first issue is the local match contract MnDOT would like the MPO to enter into with them for the local match. He explained

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

that we normally bill and invoice projects on a monthly basis, but MnDOT prefers a different method, and so included in the packet is their proposed local match compensation payment schedule, which is essentially a three payment schedule of 30%/30%/40%. He said that this should be doable for us so we are recommending that the board authorize execution of the contract with Minnesota for the local match on this study.

Haugen stated that the second issue is that the RFPs were due October 7<sup>th</sup>, and we only received two. He said that we still need to get concurrence from Federal Highway that we can proceed forward, so any action that we take today on the contract for the study as a whole, and for the selection of a consultant, would be contingent upon their approval. He added that there is no anticipated problem getting that approval, it is just that people have been taking some time off during teacher's conferences/conventions that are taking place in both States, so it is just a matter of having people return to their desks to get that approval.

Haugen reported that the two firms that submitted proposals were interviewed, and the Selection Committee is recommending SRF be hired. He said that, included in the packet was the Scope of Work. He explained that a couple of reasons SRF rose to the top was due; one to the time constraint we have on this study and the fact that SRF was involved in all of the District and County Safety Plans so they have a good start; and two they also have done recent work in East Grand Forks with the Land Use Plan Update that was done and are also doing the work on the Kennedy Bridge right now.

Haugen stated that staff, then, is recommending that the board authorize execution of a contract with SRF. He pointed out that, noted in the staff report, their initial cost estimate was just under \$65,000 and our budgeted amount is \$60,000; and we were able to work with them to get their cost down to below \$60,000. He explained that essentially what was negotiated was one less interview with a property owner and then they agreed to streamline the document into technical memos instead of a start and stop process of writing a full report, so with that we do have a cost estimate below \$60,000.

Strandell asked if this focuses on the intersection out there that is of some controversy. Haugen responded that it does focus on two principal locations; one is U.S. #2 and U.S. Business #2, and the other is 220 North and U.S. #2. He added that it does also look at a couple of other Polk County Intersections as well. Strandell asked if one was 17 and 83. Haugen responded that was one, and the other is at the north curve.

DeMers pointed out that in the proposal it does state that they have taken into account a Merrifield Bridge, but he would change that wording to a southend bridge because the distance from the center of gravity may make a difference on how much traffic would actually use that, either as a by-pass or local traffic. Haugen responded that they did point out that in our travel demand model 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue has a more important consequence to the intersection of U.S #2 and 220.

Strandell commented that he thinks that we need to keep some of these people abreast of this; Lumber Mart and Bert's Trucking in particular. Haugen responded that once we have the consultant under contract they will begin the engagement process in earnest, and those affected will be kept informed directly from SRF, not just from staff.

***MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE EXECUTION OF THE CONTRACT WITH MnDOT TO PROVIDE THE LOCAL MATCH, AS SUBMITTED; AND TO APPROVE EXECUTION OF THE CONTRACT WITH SRF CONSULTING TO PERFORM THE U.S. #2/U.S. BUSINESS #2 STUDY, AT A COST NOT TO EXCEED \$60,000.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstaining: None.***

***Absent: Vein and Grasser.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF 2017 STATE PLANNING AGREEMENT WITH MNDOT**

Haugen reported that included in the packet was a brief staff report. He explained that this is our annual agreement with MnDOT for funds that we use for our overall match of our consolidated planning grant. He said that no changes have been made to the contract, thus staff is recommending approval for the appropriate officials to execute the contract with MnDOT.

Haugen stated that this is roughly \$11,000 that we get annually from the State of Minnesota for our local match.

***MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING THE APPROPRIATE OFFICIALS TO EXECUTE THE 2017 STATE PLANNING AGREEMENT WITH MNDOT, AS SUBMITTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstaining: None.***

***Absent: Vein and Grasser.***

**MATTER OF BIKE/PED PLAN SURVEY RESULTS**

Viafara reported that this is another component of the analysis of existing conditions to compliment the plan.

Viafara referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and stated that he has three points he would like to bring to your attention:

- 1) There are a number of comments made by the respondents on Question #9; and when we go to them we can realize that some of them deal with roadways that are not related to us in the sense that they belong to other jurisdictions.
- 2) Most of the comments also allude to issues of ?? environment, so even though care is exercised when building these components of the highway system, users would still like to see some kind of improvement.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

- 3) People that don't bike or ride; there is nothing compelling people not to ride or walk, so if they do it is their own decision.

Presentation ensued.

Viafara summarized that this presentation is comprised of the comments that we got from the survey. He stated that there were 81 respondents to the paper survey, and previously, 37 from the web survey.

Viafara said that they believe they have gathered a substantial number of opinions that will help drive the overall existing condition analysis, but they will still continue working on this area of the study.

Strandell stated that the comment he would have has to do with Bygland Road in East Grand Forks. He said that he just cannot support the idea of creating bike lanes within that roadway. He added that as long as there are sidewalks on both sides of that road, he thinks those sidewalks could be improved to allow bicyclists to use them safely, but to put them on the road, that is a recipe for disaster.

Viafara said that he appreciates this input, and certainly they will discuss it further. He added that you are always invited to partake and bring your points to the different committees that have been addressing this matter. He stated that this is a plan that came from the community, so you are a member of the community, so therefore it behooves us to heed your advice as well.

**MATTER OF PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF THE GRAND FORKS LAND USE PLAN**

Haugen reported that this is the Grand Forks side of the Land Use Plan Update that we are completing. He said that, if you will recall, a year ago we did the East Grand Forks side; and now we are in the final stages of the Grand Forks side.

Haugen stated that during the month of October we did receive preliminary approval from both the Grand Forks Planning Commission and the City Council.

Haugen referred to the packet and pointed out that it included a more robust presentation, but what he will be discussing today involves us, so he will only be hitting the highlights.

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

Haugen reported that one of the big items of discussion has been "what is the population forecast by 2045". He explained that historically the MPO, and the City of Grand Forks has been using a 1.2% growth rate; but the last census results during the decade of 2000 to 2010 showed a .7% growth rate. He added that the most recent building information we got from 2010 to 2015 has indicated over a 2% per year growth, so a lot of these forecasts that we've put out to 2045 were getting to show extremely high numbers of population. He stated that we didn't want to use too short of a timeframe, and felt that even the last ten years might not be appropriate, but when we get into the last twenty years we get into the flood event, and that isn't appropriate, so we looked

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

at essentially from 1960 to 2010 and what the annual rate of growth was for Grand Forks, and it was .9%. He said, though, that 1.2% has been sort of the preferred rate, and we believe that when we go for final approval there will be motions to take it 1.2%, so we have already given you an idea of what that change will be, and that is roughly about 6,000 people that we would accommodate and we believe that we do have the ability, with the existing maps and such, to accommodate that additional population without causing a change of the mapping systems or land use allocations within the planning document; so it sounded like it might be a huge leap to go from .9% to 1.2%, but the plan has movement in it to allow for that additional growth. He added, though, that if we were to go to the 2.49% growth rate we would be back to the drawing board, essentially with a lot of it. He commented that, based on this information we are looking at right around 76,000 people.

Haugen stated that Grand Forks has always used a growth tier system since the 1970s. He said that, essentially Tier #1 is the area they identify contiguous to the City where they want growth to occur; Tier #2 is the area next to that where they will allow growth to occur, but for the last several planning durations that growth would be at the urban standards rather than rural large lots standards so that if and when the City were to grow, and the City limits needed to capture that growth, they aren't capturing large lots so it allows for smoother transition; and then most of the area has been determined to be agricultural preserved.

Haugen referred to a map illustrating the different Tiers, and pointed out that in the outer peripheries, where they have Tier #2 identified, those are areas where existing rural subdivision plats exist, and vacant lots can and should be built upon in those areas rather than creating new areas for growth. He added that the major difference between this plan and the current plan is that they scaled back quite a bit of the Tier #2 area.

Haugen pointed out that the next map shows where the future land uses will be. He stated that there is a lot of purple, which is a mixed use area where they aren't really solely identifying as one particular use, and are saying that there could and should be a mixture of uses in those areas including residential and commercial.

Haugen stated that in the current plan you will notice that there are a lot less future land uses designated in the area adjacent to the Tier #2 area. He said that the asterisks indicate the type of growth allowed if someone wanted to do something in the Tier #2 area.

Haugen commented that they have gone through this iterative process, and if you will recall we had several consultants working on this as a team; and one of the key components was making sure that transportation and ladders of opportunity were incorporated into the plan. He said that another thing they did was, because we have a lot of words in the document, they tried to bring visualization and life to those words by going to the Pilot Sites, but the Pilot Sites are not something that are to be built, to actually go out and start constructing, they are intended to give an idea of what vision the plan is trying to create with words.

Haugen referred to slides illustrating the three Pilot Site locations, and went over them briefly.

Haugen stated that this was the presentation that was prepared for this past Monday nights City Council meeting; so we will now move forward to the next round in November. He added that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

this will come back to this body at your November meeting, assuming it is given final approval from Grand Forks; after which we will be able to close out this contract.

**MATTER OF SOLICITATION OF 2018-2021 T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS**

Haugen reported that we are opening the next T.I.P. cycle process on both sides of the river. He said that he has a short power point presentation he would like to share.

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

Haugen referred to a map of the MPO study area and commented that he would just like to remind everyone that it is isn't just inside Grand Forks or East Grand Forks, but if there are project out in the area shown in gray that are receiving federal funds, or meet federal approval, they need to be showing up in our document as well.

Haugen stated that there are still some unknowns; FAST is over a year old now, but there is still a lot of regulations that still need to be developed and implemented. He said, though, that the one thing that we do know is that after May 27, 2018, whatever action we do with the T.I.P. document, it needs to be fully compliant with FAST, so for our next cycle we will have to have everything compliant with FAST, performance based management is essentially the big hurdle that we need to overcome.

Haugen pointed out that there is a new rate of growth proposed for North Dakota as a result of the FAST act. He stated that on the Minnesota side, even though we are starting the T.I.P. cycle, they don't give us guidance until December, as to what revenue forecast we should be working off of, but on the cost side they do have that information and North Dakota is still at 4% and Minnesota is at 5%..

Haugen referred to a slide listing the estimated funding for the Urban Program on the North Dakota side and explained that these were the dollar values we were informed were available to the local system, and you can see that there are now additional funds available for programming. He said that by the end of the three year period that amounts to about \$1,000,000, so it has risen significantly. He added that the guidance they are giving the City of Grand Forks, to the staff, is that because of the differences in each individual year, currently programmed projects, if needed, could receive more federal participation. He said that there is also a small possibility that a smaller project could be squeezed into these program years, that previously was not programmed. He stated, though that the way the State would most likely prefer this be done, to make life easier for everyone, is just to think of this dollar amount as being available in 2021, so instead of having just \$2.7 million dollars, it would be closer to \$3.8 million dollars.

Haugen referred to the next few slides, explaining that they discuss the individual programs and their schedules, and went over them briefly.

Haugen stated that the Transportation Alternatives Program is slightly different for each side of the river. He said that there is a funding cap on the North Dakota side of \$290,000, and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

applications have to be submitted to the MPO by December 7<sup>th</sup>, then to the NDDOT by December 31<sup>st</sup>. He added that all projects have to be vetted through the City of Grand Forks. He explained that even though FAST opened up eligibility to other organizations such as the School District, some non-profits, etc., North Dakota is following what Minnesota has always done and that is that they have to have a City of five thousand or larger that is tapped into the federal aid program to be a sponsor of their project so that there is more of an assurance that the project will get completed, that someone that is familiar with all of the process and hoops that they have to flow through is in charge; so every project that might be coming through to the MPO must flow through the City Council for consideration.

Haugen reported that on the Minnesota side there is a minimum amount an application must request, there is not an identified minimum amount on the North Dakota side. He stated that on the Minnesota side there is also a letter of intent, part of a two-step process, that is due to the MPO at the end of October, and then as staff we will look at the projects to ensure they are consistent with our planning documents and are eligible for funds. He said that once it is determined a project is eligible, a more complete application is filled out and is due to the MPO by January 5<sup>th</sup>.

Haugen commented that they aren't sure about the Safe Routes to School as individual. He explained that Safe Routes To School is eligible as Transportation Alternative activities. He said that, as you will recall, on the North Dakota side we just approved a non-infrastructure, small dollar amounts, and this might be another round, but they aren't sure at this time.

Haugen stated that on the Minnesota side, in the past, they have set aside state funds for this activity, separate from federal, but they did not do that this go-around at the Legislature, so there will not be any solicitation for projects.

Haugen reported that there is a Regional Trails Program component to this. He explained that typically on the North Dakota side it is due at a later date; and on both sides of the river it is run by the Parks Department, but if they are awarded funds they still have to come through the MPO planning process because these are federal transportation dollars.

Haugen said that on the safety side; Highway Safety Improvement Program solicitation for projects is already going on on both sides of the river. He stated that applications are due by December 7<sup>th</sup> on the North Dakota side and by November 10<sup>th</sup> on the Minnesota side.

Haugen commented that Transit Capital is also in the process of beginning solicitation for projects, with applications due to the MPO by December 7<sup>th</sup>, and to NDDOT by December 23<sup>rd</sup>. He stated on the Minnesota side it is not really a separate program; their Office of Transit works with the Urban Programs and shoves all the monies to one entity, and the 5310 Program has a different timeframe for solicitation.

Haugen gave a brief recap of the presentation, and commented that if anyone has any specific projects in mind start talking to your staff members to get them into the pipeline by the application deadlines for consideration.

Information only.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

a. 2016 UPWP Project Update

An updated table was included in the file.

**BREAK**

Powers stated that we will take a five minute break before our discussion with Grant Levi, NDDOT Director.

**RECONVENE FOR DISCUSSION WITH GRANT LEVI, NDDOT DIRECTOR**

Powers turned the meeting over to Earl Haugen, MPO Executive Director.

Haugen explained that, as you know this was a special date and time to allow Grant Levi, NDDOT Director, and Deputy Director for Engineering, Ron Henke to be here for a discussion. He pointed out that an agenda was distributed, along with corresponding information on the topics of the discussion.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

Haugen asked that everyone please state their names and the organization they represent.

**NDDOT/MPO DISCUSSION**

Levi thanked the board for giving them the opportunity to spend some time as part of your Policy Board meeting. He said that they don't get this opportunity all that often, and they really appreciate you taking the time to meet with them.

Levi commented that they have a handout to distribute that is basically an agenda, with some attachments. He said that they wanted to take some time to come out and visit with you, and hopefully to accomplish a couple of things. He explained that he hopes that if you leave here with anything today, the comment they would like to share with you is "Thank you for your partnership", they appreciate, as a Department of Transportation in North Dakota, the opportunity to work with you to ensure the transportation system really accomplishes their mission, and that is to safely move people and goods, and the only way they can accomplish what they do is through their partnerships will all of you, so thank you.

Levi referred to the agenda, and corresponding attachments (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request), and explained that they put some things together to talk about, but most importantly they came here to listen to you; to see what concerns, if any, you might have and to have a conversation with you.

Levi stated that there has been a lot of things occurring in this part of our country, things that happened rapidly in parts of Western North Dakota when we had an energy boom. He said that we had a lot of activity that created an awful lot of rail traffic; that did a lot of different things, it

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

caused economic prosperity across our State, along with a very strong agriculture economy, and many other different things that are happening.

Levi commented that the State of North Dakota is going through a little period of time of somewhat of a slowdown, we're not stopping, we're slowing down somewhat, and we're readjusting; and as we are going through that it is always important, but it is as important now as ever that we make sure that we are truly aligned with our partners and we make sure we are selecting the right priorities, making sure we're doing the right things.

Levi stated that it isn't possible for them to step forward and fund those things that are nice to do right now, it is really essential that we do those things that are absolutely essential for us to do. He added that when you get to those situations, communication becomes essential, and they thought it would be good, with that as sort of a base of our conversation, just to take a little time to talk about some of the planning activities we have underway.

Levi reported that he has been with the Department of Transportation for over 30+ years, he has had the opportunity to work in all parts of the organization throughout his career, including working as a District Engineer, working in planning and project development, so he has had a chance to move around a little bit, and as he went through that process it has always been very true and clear to him that you have to plan, you have to know where you want to be and where you want to get and how you're going to get there, so they attached one attachment that basically lays out the planning activities, and they tried to list, and he would look to Mr. Haugen and yourselves, those things that they understood are important to the MPO, they tried to put them on this piece of paper. He said that, as they looked at them they wanted to make sure that what they are doing compliments or supplements it, and in addition to that they want to make sure that they are working on things, and he must say that Mr. Haugen does a nice job representing you when they have conversations, so they want to make sure that as they are doing things you have ample opportunity for input, although he will be the first to confess that sometimes they drop the ball on that, and that is why they are here today.

Levi commented that they are here today to make sure that they continue to strengthen our relationship, so he wants you to know that they do hear you. He added that he will also like to say that, we are not always going to agree, but we should always understand each other, as we go forward, as to why we're doing what we're doing.

Levi referred to the agenda, and commented that they have a lot going on at the State and the MPO has a lot occurring here. He said that he has always appreciated the fact the you have given our District, and usually that is our District Engineer, Mr. Noehre, the opportunity to work with you on the local planning activities, to him that is very important and insures that we all stay in touch.

Levi said that he noted that the MPO is doing a Ped/Bike Plan, and this is a very important function as our communities continue to change. He added that they are talking to their team right now, at the DOT, and are in early stages, and they don't have a list of their activities, about considering proceeding of what is called an Active Transportation Plan in North Dakota. He commented that the difference between a Ped/Bike Plan and an Active Transportation Plan probably can best be summarized by stating that it is ensuring that the non-motorized modes of

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

transportation have a means to appropriately connect to motorized transportation modes. He stated that historically this is referred to as “transit”.

Levi commented that what they are seeing, and they want to be part of this, is that as our communities to grow, and as population base changes, and as the dynamics change in respect to individuals and how they want to live; many no longer want to drive, they want to be able to come into a community, they want to be able to take the community’s transit systems, they want to be able to bike, they want to be able to walk, they want to be able to do what they are doing. He said that they feel it is important that they are part of that.

Levi stated that as you get into rural North Dakota, the active transportation part really comes into play as it connects to communities, so they are here to have a conversation with you to see if maybe you want to consider modifying slightly your scope of work, just to get your reaction to that as a policy board that sets direction. He added that they aren’t quite sure what direction they are going to take with this, they are in early conversations, but they are really interested to see what you think about all of this.

Malm commented that what he sees is; he lives close to the University of North Dakota, and they seem to carry a heavy balance, when you come out and study the bikeways, they have all kinds of ideas but he never sees any bikes out there. He said that we talk about all this and spend money, but he doesn’t see people using bikes, he doesn’t see a lot of people doing a lot of walking and he used to live two blocks from an elementary school, you didn’t want to go by there at 9:00 in the morning or 3:00 in the afternoon because the streets are full of vehicles, so he thinks we have to figure out some way, and he doesn’t know where it fall with the NDDOT, to try to do something with that kind of movement. He added that we were talking earlier about the bridges that need repair; he came through downtown last night to go to East Grand Forks and he was backed up four blocks from the bridge, and only five cars got through the light at a time, so he had to wait through three cycles just to go a block, and he is wondering what we can do about this issue. He said that we have a river, and we have to get across it, but we don’t allow bikes on the bridges because we limit them off the bridge, so when we ask for help with bicycle transportation to put up a pedestrian bridge we don’t get it, so he thinks we need to look into this further.

Levi responded that this is the reason they are here, to talk, because the first thing we all have to do is agree where we want to be, and he found Mr. Malm’s comments very interesting and very valuable in the sense of bike use, and what is occurring. He stated that, if you sit with the avid bicyclists, the one that want to ride to work, one if the reasons they don’t is because we don’t have facilities in place to make it happen, because we aren’t connecting to the right places in the right areas. He said that, in addition, our struggle is how do we prioritize our resources and where do we spend them, and they feel the only way we can get there and make those decisions is to make sure that we all agree where we want to be tomorrow, and what we want it to look like.

Levi commented that he knows that on the Kennedy Bridge there were some discussions, and he also knows that not everybody is happy with the final decision, and he knows that at one time it

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

was placed on the agenda and was taken off because they had conversations and have discussed it already, but one of the intents is to provide for some of that movement, but it also takes away from other things, that is what happens. He said that it is really a matter of what sacrifices do we make over here to allow this to occur, with limited resources, and that is why they think it is so important that we plan together and we get on the same page. He added that bicycle and pedestrian movements are modes of transportation that are essential, and they are there, and we need to find a way to make them attractive to bring in that next generation that is needed in order for the economy to flourish, and move forward.

DeMers stated that he agrees with the ideas that you are talking about, but one of the problems he sees is that it seems like there is a division between recreation and transportation, and recreation has its place, especially in East Grand Forks and Grand Forks where we have been blessed to have a great recreational greenway trail system around the area; but the problem with the transportation side, especially bikes, is that it is winter here, and hard winter here for a good portion of time, and whatever facilities you create people end up not being able to use it because it is really difficult to maintain spots for bikes when it is 30 below and we have slush or snow, it is doable, but at what cost for what percentage of users. He added that the number of people that would choose biking and/or walking over using transit is maybe a different thing, so he gets the idea of active transportation trying to get alternative transportation to the transit system, because he thinks you are correct in your assumption that the next wave of people don't necessarily want to be dependent on cars, but he doesn't know if the alternative transportation is the key part of that, he thinks it is the transit part of it just because of the weather issues, so if we could enhance some of the transit system we would get more impact for our dollars.

Levi responded that he appreciates Mr. DeMers' comments, and he understands, but he isn't here advocating that we need to do all of this, what he is saying is that we need to have a conversation with the community, we need to have a conversation with the people and we need to get more input on just what you're saying.

Levi commented that there are conversations that have occurred that we should be building a separate bridge at a location here for pedestrian, bicyclists, whatever it may be; and as he hears that his thoughts are, okay, what purpose is it going to serve, is it recreational because if it is recreational then how do we separate that with taking those limited transportation dollars and how does it fit in, he isn't sure. Strandell said that it is still recreational use on the bridge, whether it is on the existing bridge or a separate bridge, and you can still use transportation money for recreational. Levi responded that the comments there with the bridge are that you have to accommodate a movement from a safety perspective, and you can do it in this instance by putting it on the existing bridge, and it is more economical than building something separate, and you are still meeting all standards. Strandell asked if it really is more economical. Levi responded that according to the studies it is. Strandell said that it can't be very much of a difference, if you redesign the bridge, take the median out, and he doesn't know what kind of value you put on safety, but that seems to be the hangup with a lot of the discussion they have had at these meetings, you take out the median and then you can end up with crashes and such as that. Levi responded that, as he shared at another conversation, if you drive around the area there are many many bridges throughout the States of North Dakota and Minnesota without medians that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

carry way more traffic, and our partners, the Minnesota Department of Transportation and themselves sat down and looked at all of our standards and determined that this meets all those standards and will be safe and it is more economical as well.

Levi stated that in respect to local bridges, such as the Nielsville Bridge, they made it very clear that that is a local conversation; and there are resources that go to Trail County, and Trail County needs to make some decisions, he told them very clearly that he respects their right to make decisions. He added that he is here today to say that they want to work with you, but in no way would he even suggest that they, as a State, should try to impose their will on you when it is truly a local decision because that is what you are here for and you know much better than they do those things that are important locally.

Malm commented that he was born and raised in this community, and transportation across the river here hasn't gotten a heck of a lot better in the last 70 years. He stated that they built a bridge and put a curve in the middle of it, didn't have enough sense to figure out a way to do that better; and Grand Forks didn't, in its wisdom, figure out how to get good access to the bridge, East Grand Forks has better access to the bridge than Grand Forks.

Vetter stated that you're right, 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Bridge, twenty years ago was placed in the 40 Year Plan, and here we are twenty years later and you would think it would be in the 20-Year Plan, but no it is still out in the 40-Year Plan. He commented that we have Crookston 20-miles down the road, and he can drive to the Walmart in Crookston quicker than he can get to the Walmart in south Grand Forks, so you talk about economic impact, you are taking it away from North Dakota when we don't have the access. He added that Grand Forks continues to grow south, we need that 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue bridge just for traffic flow and connectivity, so it is time that bridge gets off the 40-Year Plan into a 10-Year Plan.

Levi asked how you've submitted that to the States, as far as priority, as an MPO. Malm responded that they can't get it through the Cities to put it on 32<sup>nd</sup>. Levi stated that for him, he hopes you appreciate they don't see themselves stepping in to do that, they look to this body to do that. He explained that he spent some time in the organization, and this is probably back twenty or twenty five years ago, when he worked in the local government portion of their organization, and they were discussing that and it was opposed then by certain groups, and that is why he brought it up. He said that those are things that they look to you to help resolve and to work through, and really to establish that partnership between two communities, and they will come together as two States and talk.

Malm commented that he has worked with this issue for so long, and, they had a great plan for Merrifield, but we couldn't get it into Minnesota, the Minnesota people had their differences with the Merrifield Bridge. He stated that they had the property given to them for the interchange, we don't have that anymore, and then of course they have been told that the Department of Transportation says you don't build more interchanges if there aren't enough businesses out there, they want to place them further apart, the Federal Government doesn't like us to do that, but we are going to the south. He asked how we get the backing to get these things done.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

DeMers said that he understands Mr. Levi's comment that they don't want to dictate what we are doing, and that it needs to come from the local entities; but what they need to know, or at least to have some idea, is if the communities can come together and decide on another bridge at some location, is there going to be the willingness to expand the system because they heard that maintenance is the top priority and that you want to maintain your existing system before expanding it, so that is maybe more what his question is, and he knows you can't say right now that you would willingly say that "yes, we will help you", but that is the type of help that he thinks we need to know, that if we go through the process and get something done is there going to help on the financial side of it; or is this an expansion and you don't want to go down the expansion route we want to take care of what we already have.

Levi responded that they, like the Cities and the Counties, have to place priority on taking care of what exists; however having said that, there are appropriate times to expand the system. He added that many times you justify expansion of the system because it avoids an expenditure on the existing system, and that is why modeling and the traffic work that your team does at the MPO and all of that is so important. He stated that they have come to the table on many different issues to expand the system, but where they have struggled is when they get requests to expand the system, and the expansion is for economic growth purposes, and he isn't necessarily opposed to that, but they have said that they agree it is needed, but they aren't so sure they can bring the dollars because of our challenges taking care of other things. He said that when they can come to the table and say that this new roadway brings to us the opportunity not to have to expand this roadway, after we have looked at all other options, we've come to the table and said okay, and he thinks that is evident by just looking at where Grand Forks was twenty five years ago and look at where it is today.

Levi stated that he can speak to Grand Forks better than he can East Grand Forks, he does have one hat on and that for one side of the river, but the same holds true, he is here today to partner, along with Mr. Henke and Mr. Noehre, in all aspects, but his comment is that it is difficult for them as a State Agency to step in and resolve those things that are local in nature, that's why he doesn't envy any of your jobs because they are tough, there are all those local disagreements and discussion that occur.

Mock said that she is a little new to this, she doesn't have the thirty-year history of bridges, but part of the discussion going on right now with the Grand Forks side, they have a lot of local streets and local roads that are seeing heavy traffic, especially by the school, and they are engaging with the MPO and City Engineering to do more of an actual study of the area, and modeling so that they understand that, so that would actually help supplement this discussion she believes.

Malm asked why there are so many ways to get across the interstate in Fargo, and not in Grand Forks. He said that it seems that every time Fargo grows two blocks south, or half a mile south they build another interchange, where is the difference. Levi responded that they worked with Fargo, and have been for many years, and they justified the expansion of the system based on the fact that they could no longer handle it on the existing locations. He said that if you look at the investment Fargo and West Fargo have made locally, it is tremendous. He stated that if get off of the interstate system you can drive roadways like 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue from Fargo to West Fargo, and they haven't put a penny into much of that, they did it with local dollars and local improvements.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Levi commented that what they have said, concerning new interchanges; and if they aren't conveying this in the proper manner he apologizes because they have had these conversations, is they've said that if there is a local street infrastructure, and there is a need to do it they will come to the table and talk. He said that West Fargo and Fargo built an overpass and funded it themselves, at 9<sup>th</sup> and Veterans Boulevard on Interstate 94. He added that they later came to them and said that they needed an interchange, so we met with them about the fact that they would help build ramps to it, and they did that because we couldn't carry traffic at 45<sup>th</sup> Street anymore, but we also said to them, and he has been a part of this conversation for many years is; you have to build a local street system because you can't channel everything to the interstate. He said that he will compliment all of you because you have done that.

Levi stated that another thing is that the interstate system sits in a little bit different place here than it does in Fargo and West Fargo, but it is changing, there is much more on the west side of I-29 here now than there used to be.

Viafara asked if Mr. Levi could elaborate on his suggestion about Active Transportation; what kind of support, what kind of policies, and the opinions of the overall policy. Levi responded that they came here to basically suggest to you as a policy board that as you proceed, we should have a conversation. He explained that this would be a conversation on whether or not we want to go down that path together. He stated that the policies, the direction they take comes from that planning process, and from their perspective, as a State DOT, is they look rural, they don't intend to be project specific, they intend to establish that if we can go down the path, and they are still working through that because they have to prioritize too, if we go down that path they are going to look at it and ask where it is appropriate for them to make certain investments, what type of criteria is needed to develop those types of policies. He added that they are a little different in the sense that they don't think that they can get right to this project A, B, C, and D at this point; but they think they should at least be in a position to be able to say that if something comes forward it should be considered in this manner, with this criteria and it should be vented publically because that is who we answer to.

Levi asked if this answered Mr. Viafara's question. Viafara responded that it did, adding that he has noticed that in North Dakota the need for enforcement is quite compelling; so if they were to one day decide to go into Active Transportation, enforcement becomes an issue. He asked about enforcement from outside, in terms of behavior modification. Levi responded that those are all policy conversations. He added that they put this out just to start a conversation, they are looking to the MPO, they aren't sure about this so they are looking to the MPO to see what you think, and he appreciates the comments.

Malm said that he is really interested in the fact that you have the Washington Street Underpass planned for 2021. He asked what kind of underpass they are going to look at, or is that too far into the future to know that. Levi responded that they put the Washington Street Underpass project on the agenda at the request of staff. He said that what they tried to convey with the Year 2021 is that they don't presently have it within their S.T.I.P., but their thought process is that they are hoping to fit it in in 2021. He added that how they are going to build it, and how it will look will be worked through with a development process, they will come out and look at

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

different alternatives, they will work with a team of people to discuss those alternatives. He said that he thinks that in a piece of correspondence that he saw from Mr. Haugen, was how do we move this up, how do we do it more quickly, how do we get it into the present; and they came here to say that they are struggling to find those resources to be able to do it any quicker because they aren't sure what they can get rid of with the resources they have, but they also acknowledge it is a challenge.

Haugen commented that hopefully this is a start because we did the Comprehensive Washington Street Study, which also included an analysis of the condition of the underpass, and he knows that when Mr. Noehre has proposed this in the S.T.I.P./T.I.P. cycle, in the project scoping worksheets he was referencing this document as sort of his base for the cost estimates and the features that are being proposed for it, so that is a start; but it really is just the underpass structure, a lot of the traffic issues that Mr. Malm described are more a result of the intersection of DeMers and Washington, which would be a separate thing from the underpass. Malm commented that we haven't gotten very far with that issue either, and every time we bring that up and come with a plan and nobody can figure out how to get in and out of it. Haugen responded that he thinks this study does have a fairly good recommendation for that intersection, the Continuous Flow Intersection concept, which is half the cost of the interchanges that were always the concept there, that blew up that whole intersection and property around it, where this is allowing the fire station to remain in place, and impinges only minutely on the railroad property.

Noehre commented that they are separate, and yet they are also intertwined in that the turn lanes are too short, and any improvement to one would require improvements to the other, so in that respect they aren't stand alone and would need to be looked as to how they function together.

Malm asked if there are any ideas about where we are at with Highway 2 at the Grand Forks Airport, because the plans they got should be burned. He explained that he is on the Airport Authority and they are opposed to the proposed plan.

Levi asked how the roundabout works, how well is that received. Malm responded that it works, but you get probably two or three cars in the winter time that drive right through the middle of it. Levi said, though, people seem to have accepted it. Malm responded that they seem to be fine with a roundabout.

Levi stated that they are struggling, as an agency, getting back to what he said earlier about how do you expend your resources, and where do you spend them; and he will share that the first roundabout they put in place on the State Highway System that included trucks we out in Killdeer, and it was during the peak truck traffic and they took a lot of criticism because they put it in at the intersection of two major highways, lots of truck traffic. He said that when they started it the Mayor from that community didn't speak very kindly of them, but his point is that he came to them as they were building some other things and asked us to put another roundabout in because people got used to it and loved it.

Levi commented that a concept was proposed at the airport called "J-Turns", and that is the one you want thrown away. Malm said that that is correct. Levi stated that they tried to introduce

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

that concept, also at another location in the district, and they went up to a community and they were totally opposed to it and they agreed to back away; but the challenge they have is that this concept works, it has been used in other parts of the country and it reduces crashes, reduces fatalities, and it functions well, but it is new and unfamiliar. He said that all he is saying is that as they look at that future project is that he would ask that we keep an open enough mind so we can talk about it, and that is what they said to the airport; let's talk about it, let's discuss it, but they will discuss other options as well.

Discussion on alternative options ensued.

DeMers commented that, one other thing on Active Planning; the reason he focuses more on transit is because he thinks, and this is more of a question or thought regarding planning, or exercising planning; but part of the reason he thinks transit is important is because he thinks that people are moving away from wanting to own a car, wanting to do that, but he thinks that the solution isn't necessarily what we have now, the solution is going to be that technology is rapidly changing, the private sector is already moving into autonomous vehicles, autonomous types of things, and he feels that that is going to lead itself into transit, whether its private or public transit, and how we deal with that from an investment standpoint is going to matter because it will dictate how we do everything including how we design streets and pedestrian facilities to what investment we put into signalized intersections because twenty five years from now there is a potential we won't need signalized intersections, it will be done by computer, so we need to make sure we have the investments, at least on the public side, that match what the private side is doing from a technology standpoint. He added that he foresees the changes that we are going to go through divesting from personal vehicles to autonomous vehicles whether they are part of the public system or some sort of private entity, is going to be as big of a change as personal computers and the internet have made in the last twenty-five or thirty years. He said that obviously you are more on the cutting edge of this, but he wonders what planning investment strategies we are thinking about to deal with this.

Levi responded that there are a couple of thoughts that he would offer for you all to consider with respect to that; the mindset used to be that if you had a traffic problem, and you had people that couldn't get through signal lights, the mindset used to be "go build another roadway over here". He said, though, that as we look to the future, there will probably be less need for pavement infrastructure because you will be able to have vehicles that can basically almost touch each other and drive simultaneously because they aren't operated by us, so you will be able to take that same corridor that we have problems with and now be able to push more people through it because the vehicle will be able to do that by talking to the vehicle in front and in back of it, and the infrastructure that is in place, and that is what we need to prepare ourselves for, but until we get there we still have to solve the challenges that are referenced here because people are frustrated, and in our business right now we are trying to find that balance.

Levi stated that one of the things that Mr. Haugen brought up to us was funding balances. He referred to the document distributed earlier, and pointed out that it shows that the GF/EGF MPO is spending the money that is being made available to you, and that is what they want. He stated that part of the challenge they have, is that the way they have set up the distribution of funding in North Dakota; you are spending at a rate much quicker than the other two MPOs.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Levi commented that as they look at this he isn't sure that they came to the table with a solution other than acknowledgement, but what they have said in the past is that maybe it is time for the MPOs in North Dakota to sit around the table and talk about how funds are distributed because they have the Bismarck/Mandan MPO that is spending at a rate that is quite old, they are spending old money while you are spending current money.

Haugen reported that in his discussion with his counterparts, they have indicated that they aren't willing to change the formula, but are interested in looking at gifting us some of their carryover monies, but he tried to describe to them that that puts an onerous on us by basically doubling our work program, and we have to spend it the same year we get it, so we end up doubling all of our workouts and that gets old. He said that he isn't sure that the directors will be able to reach an agreement on changing the formula.

Levi stated that they brought this up because Mr. Haugen requested it, but he isn't sure that they have a solution, but maybe they can agree to facilitate another conversation with everyone in the room. Haugen responded that he thinks that is necessary. He added that it was discussed at their last MPO Director's meeting, it was laid out there, and the Directors have tried to discuss it since then, but there doesn't seem to be a willingness to really entertain a look at the formula. He said that part of the discussion is what is going to happen in 2020 with census results, and should we change the formula now when we know that in 2020 we will have to revisit it anyway, and obviously the replay is that there is a huge funding imbalance between the three MPOs that causes these period when we have a large sum of funds gifted to us, or have the de-obligation of a whole years worth of funds. Levi commented that the formula is attached to the document, and is based on a base amount of \$120,000 and based on population; and they are willing to come to the table and talk about this and they have made a note and will bring it up again.

Levi reported that they would welcome the opportunity to be at these meetings and to sit around the table as a non-voting member. He asked how this body feels about this Strandell responded that he doesn't have a problem with that as they have Grand Forks City staff here all the time, and he thinks they are given the opportunity to comments, so he doesn't have an issue with it. He asked how much influence are you asking to have. Levi responded that in the spirit they came here today with, which is the spirit of cooperating and working with, and making sure we understand each other and where we are going and what we are doing. He said that they have had this conversation with the Bismarck/Mandan MPO and the Fargo/Moorhead/Metro Cog; and both of them have agreed that they would allow us to come and sit at the table and have a conversation but that we wouldn't be allowed to vote, and he feels that that is appropriate. He added that he would most likely designate the responsibility to Mr. Noehre.

DeMers stated that this was discussed at a previous meeting, and one of the questions he had was what's the difference between being a technical advisor to the board versus being a board member with no voting privileges. Levi responded that the way he would look at it is; he has sat in many meetings as a technical advisor, he sat in the back and really didn't feel comfortable speaking up unless he was spoken to, and in the spirit of cooperation he thinks there is a benefit of having to sit at the table, sit with you and be able to engage in a dialogue, but respect the fact that we don't vote, much like you've allowed us to do today. DeMers asked if in his opinion, if we agree you would be more likely to attend, or have someone attend. Levi responded that they would feel more comfortable engaging in a conversation.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Powers commented that Ms. McNelis sends our meeting packets out the week prior so if you would get a copy of that you would see what is applicable and what isn't, and go from there. He said he doesn't want to waste your time. Strandell stated that we do have the technical committee for the engineers and such, and they have a lot of input as to what is going on here as well. Noehre responded that one of his engineers usually attends the Technical Advisory Committee meetings. Levi said that this is just something for you to ponder, they just respectfully ask for you to give it consideration.

Levi summarized that as you recall we started a conversation on projects, and we attached to your packet a list of projects, and he knows that Mr. Haugen and his team does a nice job of keeping you up to date of what is in the T.I.P., and his intent wasn't to get into any detail other than to supply a map to you of what is there. He said, though, that we talked a little about Washington Street, and he would note that they had a Grand Forks/East Grand Forks MPO allocation of urban funds of \$2.5 million dollars for them to make decisions. He stated that they found it interesting in Fargo, how the Fargo/West Fargo, with their allocation, were taking a portion of their allocation and asking us to make it available for transit, which they agreed to do, which gets us back to your point, and getting back to some of your issues; and he appreciates the fact, though, in reading Mr. Haugen's e-mail; that there are many roadway needs and other issues that you are dealing with.

Levi stated that another thing that Mr. Haugen requested we talk about is the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Road Safety Study. He said that they just jotted down some of the recommendations that you will see in front of you. He explained that they have a process in place where, basically the MPO, working with the community could submit to them a requested safety project along that corridor and we would give it consideration. He asked if Mr. Haugen had anything else he wanted to discuss with respect to 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. Haugen responded that he just wanted to bring to the board's attention that there is a safety review document in place, and as we heard from your staff it really is hoped that an urban safety project proposed for this isn't spot safety, but looks at the corridor as a whole, and isn't looking at it as a project that solves not just safety issues, but everything that is really focused on the safety solutions that are being recommended for consideration. Levi pointed out that you do have, as part of your packet, basically the study, but again, for the sake of time, they aren't going to delve into any further, but he would just echo what his team has shared with you, we hope that the MPO has an interest in proceeding as they put some time into a study and they think some improvements can be made, so they will take that into consideration.

Levi said that the last thing on their agenda is "what is on your mind, what would you like to talk about". He stated that you have shared some things already, so he will look to you to let them know what you would like to discuss with them, what do you think they should be doing differently, do you have any ideas on the North Dakota side or the legislative issue side as they have session coming up in North Dakota.

Vetter responded that one thing he would like to bring up is the recent financial audit that you are doing on us. He said that we just had a financial audit done by a reputable accounting firm here in town, and he is wondering why we need to have a separate one, why couldn't we have just submitted the one that we just had done. Levi responded that the one they are conducting is a result of action by the Federal Highway Administration; Federal Highway Administration came in and did some work and identified some things they had some concerns with, and they agreed

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

to do a separate audit. Vetter asked if this is going to be an on-going thing, or is it just the one time. Levi responded that he doesn't like being audited either, he hopes it is a one-time thing that they can do and satisfy the conversations they have had with Federal Highway Administration. Powers commented that we just spent a ton of money on our audit, but you're saying basically it's because its federal money. Levi responded that that is correct. Vetter said, though, that in our audit they used the 133 Standards so you'd think that the Federal Government would have accepted that. Levi responded that one of the discussions that occurred was that there were some questions that when they came in and did a review of all the MPOs in the State they brought to our attention, in their report, some practices they had concerns with, and they brought them up to us in a meeting, and as they had concerns with those practices, and as they brought them forward we basically sat back and said, okay, let's do an audit, let's take a look at everything, let's bring it to the table so we can talk and if we are doing something we shouldn't be doing, then lets discuss it and see what we should be doing differently. He added that the traditional 133 audit doesn't get into, from their perspective, some of the details. He said that he has some knowledge of all the issues, but he didn't come here today prepared to talk about it, just to indicate that that was the discussion.

DeMers said, then, that this audit would be above and beyond our financial audit. Levi responded that would be correct. Vetter commented that a lot of it is redundant. He said that he could see if you're getting into a specific grant, and they are looking at certain things within the grant to do the whole financial audit again, but this is so redundant and is a draw on the time of our staff. Levi said that he would take that comment back, but he would hope that as they do it, and as they look at it that they aren't duplicating efforts that were just recently ??; he isn't close enough to it to know, but they will discuss the comment. Vetter said that he appreciates it.

Haugen said that one thing that wasn't discussed too much was our fiscal constraint hangup that we have with our federal requirements. He explained that in order for us show that our state highways were being maintained in some fashion of State of Good Repair, we had to show in our financial plan the use of what would traditionally be local street federal funds, to, for lack of a better term, to prop up the state system; so that is kind of the discussion that, when we will go through our next Long Range Transportation Plan, we still have the fiscal constraint hangup over our decision making, and he is wondering if, in the legislative session or somewhere else, we see some wiggle room of more revenue or some lessening of what is termed as "reasonable revenue sources", to use in a financial plan. He stated that he knows that with our initial State of Good Repair from the District, we had to scale considerably back from that to the financial constrained State of Good Repair Plan that we were able to come up with, and the hidden thing is all that really did was to push back and delay, just outside of our horizon year, a lot of the reconstruction needs, so we have a huge balloon sort of hidden there, and that was five years ago, and now we are going to do an update and are most likely going to be reaching those big balloons in the next update. He added that FAST did provide a little bit more revenue, but not to the magnitude we can use.

Levi stated that Mr. Haugen touched on a couple of things; one is, and they feel this way, is the requirements by the Federal Government to create a fiscally constrained document in the manner in which they require us to do, it sometimes limits our ability to put those things in and identify them as true needs because some people come and take a look at our planning documents, and they look at them from that perspective; and as we look at that part of it, we appreciate what you have had to do here, but they struggle with that on a State level as well as they prepare the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

S.T.I.P., and as they put everything together. He added that the general challenge is, and this will come forward through, and they forgot to put this on the agenda, but as you mentioned, in the State of North Dakota we are doing the Urban Needs Study, and it is being generated in basically a cooperative manner with the twelve major cities in the State, and it was their hope it would be done in a cooperative manner with the MPO so they were aware of what is occurring on the North Dakota side, and the intent is that they will take that to our legislative body to articulate what some of the financial challenges are, just like there is a County Need Study that has occurred in the State of North Dakota, and there is also a State Need Study that will be brought to the table as well.

Levi commented that when we started the process, the financial state of condition in the State of North Dakota was better than what it is today, and he is being very open, but he isn't saying it is impossible, but he will say it will be difficult to get a foot in the door to talk about additional revenue coming from the State of North Dakota.

Levi stated that on the Federal side you have all seen what is going on in the Federal Program, and Mr. Haugen said it, there were some growth in the FAST Act, but it isn't keeping pace with inflation. He said that the good news, though, is that our rate of inflationary growth in the State of North Dakota decreased considerably for a number of reasons, predominately due to the drop in oil prices and commodity prices for construction. He added that he thinks we have seen a period of downward movement in costs, on certain project that is definitely true; asphalt paving projects have seen a considerable decrease in cost.

Levi commented that he doesn't know if he has answered all parts of the question, but they are struggling with this just like you are. He said that he thinks that together we are going to have to find a way to work through it, and together, as leaders in transportation we are going to have to convey that transportation need. He stated that he shares with his team, and he will put it in these terms, that when a legislative body gets together; there's tax relief, there's social programs, there's education, and then maybe transportation conversation. He added though, that having said that we have been blessed that the last prior session with huge influxes of resources going into transportation, but last session it was a surprise that major cities in our State didn't get much from that pot of revenue, but the counties and the DOT were recipients of a considerable amount of resources even last session. He stated that when the North Dakota Legislative bodies had the resources they have invested in infrastructure.

Kuharenko said that he has a question on the H.S.I.P. Program. He said that they ended up getting that report from Chris Holder, on 32<sup>nd</sup>, and there are a large number of recommendations in that report from realigning the left turn lanes to a zero off-set, to flashing yellow arrows, to the ramp flush on the northbound I-29; and one of the things, as staff, that they are struggling with is trying to look at the entire corridor and phasing it and cost constraints because he knows the H.S.I.P. Program only has so many funds available; so what guidance can they get on how they should approach it in that regard. Levi asked if he could suggest that Mr. Noehre bring our team together and sit with them and have a conversation on this. Noehre commented that he thinks that Stacey Hanson has answered that question, to Mr. Haugen and Mr. Grasser, but he will check into it further.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Levi thanked everyone for their time today. He said that they appreciated the opportunity to visit with the board, and would request that you please give some consideration to having the NDDOT at this table as a non-voting member. He explained that their intent is to be here to partner with you as we look to the future.

Powers thanked Mr. Levi, Mr. Henke, and Mr. Noehre for coming today. He said that it was very informative and appreciated.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY MALM, TO ADJOURN THE OCTOBER 20<sup>TH</sup>,  
2016, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 2:29 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, November 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mike Powers, Chairman, called the November 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016 meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:07 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

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

Absent: Ken Vein and Al Grasser.

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

Guest(s): Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering and Mike Yavarow, Grand Forks Engineering.

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Powers declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 20<sup>TH</sup>, 2016, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 20<sup>TH</sup>, 2016, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

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

Haugen reported that he doesn't know if there is any new information than what was shared with this body at your October meeting.

**Sorlie Bridge**

Haugen stated that they are still working on the lighting controller, and they have still not finalized the project because of the issues they have been having with it.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Yavarow explained that the lights on the Sorlie are in the 90-day acceptance period now, and have been working well. He said that there were three pedestrian lights that failed on the East Grand Forks side of the bridge that have been replaced and seem to be working well.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that, as you were informed at last month's meeting, the bid letting did slip to December 2<sup>nd</sup>, and that is still the projected date, and it shouldn't slip any further.

Yavarow commented that the Kennedy Bridge is on schedule, and it appears that the project will basically be run by the NDDOT.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DISCOVERY SCHOOL SAFETY REPORT**

Viafara reported that for the last two meetings the Technical Advisory Committee has been reviewing the document that we are submitting today for your consideration. He stated that staff did receive a number of comments, and those comments were meant to strengthen the contents of the document, and have been addressed.

Viafara stated that what he wants to do today is to give a brief presentation of the elements that were included in the preparation of the report. (A copy of the presentation is included in the file and available upon request).

Presentation ensued.

Malm asked if staff was going to go out and check these results again in the middle of winter. Viafara responded that next year the MPO has scheduled a review of all those traffic conditions around all the schools in both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks. He stated that we are now beginning to put together the scope of work for this study. He added that Safe Kids is helping us with parent surveys again as well, which will give us a look at what we can expect when we embark on the complete review.

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE DISCOVERY SCHOOL SAFETY REPORT, AS SUBMITTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstaining: None.***

***Absent: Vein and Grasser.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE GRAND FORKS 2045 LAND USE PLAN**

Haugen reported that last month we did provide a preliminary report. He stated that, based on the feedback received from the Grand Forks Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council, we did make some revisions. He added that, also in your packets were communications received from the Grand Forks Airport Authority.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen stated that the Grand Forks Airport Authority, as noted in their letter, has some land use compatibility zones in and around the airport. He referred to a map and explained that they have letters A, B, C, D zones; pointing out that the A zones are those that run adjacent to their four runways, B zones are zones that have take-off and landing safety concerns, and then there are C and D zones that deal with more of the noise complaint types of issues.

Haugen commented that the area in question is the section of land where the new Walmart Store was constructed. He stated that in the C zone their land use compatibility suggests 40 acre family lots instead of urban sized family type settings, and then there are some commercial and other types of suggested restrictions placed on the land.

Haugen stated that the Land Use Plan didn't ignore that issue, but worked based off of some previous work that had been going on in the City that shows up in a graphic, and he thinks we've talked about this before about the City of Grand Forks' Strategic Growth initiatives where they've identified a key area in town where they wanted to make an investment in major infrastructure to spur development, and this is that area and the City has already awarded, and is beginning construction on a major sewer lift station to serve the area.

Haugen said that as fire response, and in communication with the Airport Director, our consultant team came up with suggestions on ways to modify the language that was in the preliminary draft to reflect some of these concerns, so that is what is included in these next couple of sections. He explained that after the Planning Commission met and gave their approval to this document, they modified it by adding language about communicating potential noise issues with people who both build homes in the residential area, as well as those that purchase those homes.

Haugen commented that on the commercial side, initially there was talk about looking at an overlay zoning district to limit the type of land uses, however the Planning Commission thought that was too much and instead they came up with this language, and instead of creating the regulatory burden they just added the Airport into their review process.

Haugen stated that there was also some language added into the text of the document to reflect this issue as well.

Haugen said that the Planning Commission also made one additional change in the land use map itself; it deals with the piece of property on North Washington Street that was originally drafted to be industrial use, east of Washington, but the Planning Commission adopted a motion that changed that to Rural Residential, and the point being made was that industrial uses should stay on the westerly side of Highway 81, and not cross over.

Haugen commented that some other things that have happened since the preliminary report was completed is that we are putting in a forecasted growth rate of 1.2%, and we did discuss this a little bit last month that it was being considered, but now it is being included in the final document as the official rate of growth. He said that there is also a new goal language specifically about the mixed use land uses that are being suggested in the document.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen stated that the Technical Advisory Committee and MPO staff are recommending approval of the Grand Forks 2045 Land Use Plan document, subject to the addition of the phrase: “Contingent on City Council action”. He explained that the City Council is holding its final public hearing on the document next Monday night at their meeting, and so our approval would be contingent on them also approving the document. He stated that if the City Council does not take action then the motion today would have to be revisited at your next meeting.

***MOVED BY MOCK, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE GRAND FORKS 2045 LAND USE PLAN, CONTINGENT ON GRAND FORKS CITY COUNCIL TAKING FINAL ACTION.***

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

***Voting Nay: Malm.***

***Abstaining: None.***

***Absent: Vein and Grasser.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2017-2018 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM**

Haugen reported that this is a required document to show our State, Federal, and Local Partners what activities the MPO will be working on over the next two calendar years.

Haugen stated that we did solicit from our Local Partners what projects or activities they would like us to consider including in our Work Program; we only received one request and that was from the City of Grand Forks. He said that they identified three items; two of the three items are things that are part of our routine cycle of things, the first is the Aerial Photo update and the second is the Traffic Count Program that we have established.

Haugen commented that as we have been talking the last couple of years, we will be spending the next two years in earnest updating our Long Range Transportation Plan, and becoming MAP-21 and FAST compliant.

Haugen stated that currently we are working on the Bike and Ped Plan and the Transit Development Plan; and the next two years we will be focusing on the Street and Highway side.

Haugen said that beside our normal routine duties of preparing the T.I.P., and managing the office; you will see that we are identifying that there is a little bit of an unknown taking place with this two year work program in regard to our Transportation Plan. He explained that this unknown is that we know that performance measures and targets will have to be incorporated into the document, and we know that for safety what those measures and targets are; but there are a host of other measures and targets yet to be finalized.

Haugen commented that when staff prepared the budget, we purposely allocated some funding amounts for consultant costs. He said that this gives us a little bit of a cushion for the unknowns. He pointed out that in the write up they suggest that there be a base scope of work, but that there

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

is a likely hood that there will be some amendments that will need to be processed as these measures and targets become identified and finalized. He stated that you will also notice that the cost has been split between both years now.

Haugen referred to the funding tables and went over them briefly.

Haugen reported that in the past, concerning our Consolidated Planning Grants, he showed that under a current typical year we actually get \$610,000 in federal funds; but if you recall in our discussion when Director Levi was here last month, we talked about how the State of North Dakota is distributing those funds, and the fact that the other two MPOs are having trouble spending down their amounts, so there is still some hope, and he did express to Director Levi that there has been a past history of two to one votes on this, so there is hope that we might get a more favorable outcome that our amount will be increasing.

Haugen said that the basic message here is that we are adopting this work program with the dollar amounts that we know that we have access to today, but it is hoped that in the near future, the early part of next year, that we will be able to do an amendment to show increased funds to allow us to do the additional studies we would like to do. Powers asked where these funds would come from. Haugen responded that it would come for the other two MPOs. He explained that in the past we were blessed by both Bismarck/Mandan and FM/COG each giving us \$300,000 of monies they could not use, and if they didn't expend it in that year those monies would have been lost back to Federal Highway; and with the balances he showed previously they are approaching that type of problem again, and we are trying to work with them and North Dakota and Federal Highway on coming up with a solution. He said that it is going to be a gift of money to us either through a one-time shot of funds, which we are arguing against; versus changing the formula that would allow us to get a higher amount each year, and not having to wait for them to not spend their monies and gifting it to us. Powers asked if we hadn't talked about changing that formula earlier. Haugen responded that we have been having that discussion for over a year now, and, again, frankly the two to one vote scenario is what has been hampering us, and he thinks it is now reaching a head based on some recent action the other two MPOs have done, that there may be a resolution and he thinks it will allow us to amend our work program early next year to incorporate more funds to do more projects.

Haugen commented that our current work program, in order to be fiscally constrained, we had to zero out having interns, and in this program we are reintroducing our intern program. He said that we are also reintroducing budgeting some monies into our equipment line item and our corridor preservation and technical assistance line items as well, although maybe not as much as in the past.

Haugen stated that the Technical Advisory Committee and MPO Staff are recommending the MPO Executive Policy Board approve the 2017-2018 Unified Planning Work Program.

***MOVED BY MOCK, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE 2017-2018 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM, AS SUBMITTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstaining: None.***

***Absent: Vein and Grasser.***

**MATTER OF MnDOT REQUEST TO REVIEW NHS INTERMODAL CONNECTORS**

Haugen reported that part of what is taking place here is with FAST, Congress actually funded a freight program, but they placed some conditions on it, and so now MnDOT is making an effort to reorganize itself to make sure that what funds they are investing in make sense.

Haugen stated that the first review MnDOT is asking us to do is what is called these connectors. He explained that this is something that has been allowed for many years, and essentially what it means is that we do have some major facilities that are off of major highways, the last mile if you will, and this allows those last miles to be part of the NHS System, which allows federal funding be used. He said that this would include airports, train depots, big agricultural terminals, grain elevators, etc.

Haugen commented that in the Grand Forks/East Grand Forks area we have never had these identified, primarily because most of our facilities have only been on the State Highway or NHS Route. He said that on the Minnesota side, if you recall, we had to re-functionally reclassify roadways, and when we did that some of those roadways were no longer part of the NHS System, and now this is giving us the opportunity to see if we can reconnect to the NHS System by designating them as connector routes. He explained that the main reason we would want to entertain designating these roadways as connector routes is for them to be eligible for the largest pot of federal funds.

Haugen stated that there is a schedule that MnDOT is asking us to follow. He said that we received this information earlier this month, and they are asking that we get something back to them by the end of December, so he already informed East Grand Forks staff to be on the lookout for us asking them to sit down and go over maps and figure out what routes we might want to try to have designated.

Haugen said that we will have to have something ready for you to take action at your December meeting.

Haugen commented that, just like the functional classification was, this is an iterative process with us and MnDOT trying to reach an agreement as to what will be finalized.

Haugen reported that, as part of this new identification are things that are also on the National Highway Freight Network, so this is another designation of freight. He said that you will notice that they have primary, which is the Interstate System; and also, to be determined in the future, these critical urban or rural freight connectors, so part of our process on the Minnesota side is to also look at these critical urban freight corridors.

Haugen commented that the reason this is important is, as he said, the freight program now has monies attached to it, and though it isn't a lot, \$20,000,000 on the Minnesota side; it allows investment on something that serves a freight purpose. He stated that the kicker is, that while they created the ability to do these miles that aren't part of the Interstate System, they have capped them. He explained that on the Minnesota side, on the rural system, there is only 150 total miles available, so if you think about all the mileage in Minnesota, 150 miles is a small amount. He added that on the urban side there is a total of 75 miles.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen reported that the game they are allowing be played here, however, is, whereas the NHS Connectors is more of a stagnant designation, they are allowing these critical freight corridors to be more flexible. He explained that what this means is that, say for instance U.S. Business #2 in East Grand Forks is designated as a critical urban freight network, it gets a project funded on it, that project gets built, they can now take that mileage and apply it somewhere else in the State to designate a different segment, and when that corridor is funded, it can be moved once again to another one. Vetter commented, then, that we can get Bygland Road classified as an Urban Freight Corridor, then get our roundabout funded through that, because beet trucks are traveling that road. Haugen responded that, theoretically it is possible, but in reality...

Haugen stated that as we work through this on the Minnesota side, we will be trying to identify those more stagnant route designations, but then also make pitches for these critical corridors as well.

Haugen said that on the North Dakota side, because this is a federal program it applies to all states; North Dakota just has not come to us with any sort of plan of action as to how they are going to be addressing this in the near future. He stated that what he can tell you on the North Dakota side is that this Highway Freight Program is not sitting as a separate program, it is being rolled into how they currently distribute funds in North Dakota; so if in the future the next Highway Bill carries this program, and carries a separate funding, then there might be a discussion on the North Dakota side as to really working on designating these routes.

Haugen stated that staff will be working over the next two weeks to get this designated and prepared for the Technical Advisory Committee consideration, and then this bodies consideration. He added that they will have to work with the City Council in East Grand Forks to make sure that what we are proposing meets their approval as well.

Haugen reported that this is one of those things that we tried to identify in the work program that with MAP-21 and FAST implementation we are going to have these, fires if you will, that we have to address in a short period of time to get things rolling down the road for potential funding.

DeMers asked if Mr. Haugen could give some examples of what types of projects have been, or could be funded with these funds. Haugen responded that, again, these things have been designated for decades, probably, and some of them may no longer actually be operational, but what can be done with the funds; you're not part of the NHS System, you're not a State Highway or a National Highway, you might be a township road or a street, and when you think of Grand Forks Airport, the Airport Road that leads into the facility is not a functionally classified roadway, it is in the City Limits of Grand Forks, it is a City street, but because it is not functionally classified it is not eligible for most federal programs. He added that by becoming a connector, it would now become eligible for the biggest pot of money in the federal program, that is the NHS or NHPP; and what that would allow, if the Airport Road needed to be completely reconstructed, just like a functionally classified roadway, it would have the ability to have federal funds pay for that reconstruction.

Haugen commented that there is a potential to identify future connectors, so on the Minnesota side there has already been talk of a north access into the beet plant; one of the major stumbling blocks is that there has not been any real funding available for it, so, perhaps this will allow that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

future designation of a connector, so that this program would then make it eligible for funds, particularly if you combine it with a critical urban freight network designation.

Discussion on possible areas of consideration ensued.

Vetter asked how often will we have to go through the re-designation. Haugen responded that the NHS connectors, probably not very frequently; the critical segments we may have to be done every T.I.P. cycle for that last year of the T.I.P. He said that the first three years of the T.I.P. are carry-overs, so those would have all be identified as work projects that are being funded, so the last year might be the one in play, and the one that they allow some movement. He added that there is also, from the State Highway perspective, they have a ten year investment plan, but that isn't something that they update every year, and that would only affect the State Highway System, which does help U.S. Business #2, but doesn't do anything for Polk County 17, and Polk County 17 could be designated as a Critical Freight Route, making it eligible, so there is some competition between locals and the state in this funding program.

Haugen stated that he didn't spend a lot of time on the actual Freight Plan itself, but there is also a requirement that they have to update their Freight Plan. He said that Minnesota just adopted one earlier this year, but they are going to have to revisit that document. He added that North Dakota adopted theirs several years ago, and they are going to have to update that as well. He said that he is sure that our Merrifield partners are going to be pretty interested in this process, and will try to argue their corridor and their two major investments that they are seeking.

Information only.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

a. 2016 UPWP Project Update

Haugen commented that this is what Mr. Viafara prepares monthly for you to give you a progress report of where we are at with our current activities.

b. Travel Demand Model Update

Haugen stated that, as you know, we rely on our Travel Demand Model Update. He said that Ms. Kouba has been working on this, and this is just to give you an idea of...he didn't put it as a regular agenda item as he didn't want to bother you with all the weeds that are taking place in this, but still wanted to give you some sense of how we are approaching this.

Haugen stated that the biggest news is that we had to spend more time than we really like on trying to identify where all of our businesses are located, and how many employees there are at each. He explained that we worked with the other two MPOs in the State to purchase some household and employment data, and we are all enjoying some data that is well populated by historical data that we probably did not need, and now have to weed through, so this is just to give you some sense of how we are going through the process of updating the model, and how it is bogged down with this type of review of data and information that Ms. Kouba can't help but have to go through to weed out duplications and whittle it down to just the one that we really want to focus on.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, November 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

Haugen referred to maps, and went over them briefly.

Information only.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY STRANDELL, SECONDED BY MALM, TO ADJOURN THE NOVEMBER  
16<sup>TH</sup>, 2016, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:49 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, December 21<sup>st</sup>, 2016 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mike Powers, Chairman, called the December 21<sup>st</sup>, 2016 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, Clarence Vetter, Marc DeMers, Gary Malm, Jeannie Mock, Al Grasser, Warren Strandell, and Ken Vein (via conference call).

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

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Powers declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 16<sup>TH</sup>, 2016, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 16<sup>TH</sup>, 2016, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF HOLIDAY BONUS HOURS**

Haugen reported that, per the MPO's policy we try to maintain the same personnel policies as the City of Grand Forks, and they approved a four hour holiday bonus for their employees on Monday night, staff is requesting the MPO Executive Policy Board approve a similar bonus for the MPO Employees as well.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE A FOUR HOUR HOLIDAY BONUS FOR MPO EMPLOYEES.***

Malm commented that these hours are not accruable, if they aren't used by a certain time they are gone. Haugen responded that that is correct, adding that they need to be used by the end of June 2017.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 21<sup>st</sup>, 2016**

***Voting Aye: DeMers, Vetter, Powers, Strandell, Mock, Malm, Grasser, and Vein.***  
***Voting Nay: None.***  
***Abstaining: None.***  
***Absent: None.***

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

Haugen reported that he included in the packet information on both bridge projects.

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen commented that they are still trying to finalize the decorative lighting plan. He explained that a meeting was held earlier this month, and prior to it there was a proposal for engaging the Historic Preservation Commission in the approval process of the temporary lighting events. He stated that at the conclusion of the meeting the language you see on the screen was determined not to be sufficient thus another draft is being drafted and will be circulated around to be approved, ultimately, and once the new language is agreed on the draft will be presented to both City Councils for adoption.

DeMers asked what the changes entailed. Grasser responded that basis was that last year it was discovered that there was a desire by both cities to have more events programmed than was originally agreed to, so an attempt is being made to try to create a mechanism that allows for more events to be added. DeMers stated that he understands this, but it sounds like the Historic Preservation Commission is opposing this change, and he is wondering what exactly the new proposal is. He added that he thinks it has already been proposed. Grasser responded that he isn't sure they are opposed to it, but more that they wanted to have some other people involved in the decision making, and that what was discussed was that a notification would be sent out via e-mail and responses would need to be submitted within a forty-eight hour period, or it would imply approval. He added that he thinks that the Historical Preservation Commission maybe didn't want ??? DeMers responded that they aren't an executive board, they are a policy board, and he doesn't think that the execution of government should be deferred to a policy board. Grasser said that he thinks that that might have been one of the other changes, it wasn't necessarily the commission, but it might have been somebody representing the historical side of it on both sides of the river, or it might have been at State or Local level.

Powers asked if he is correct that the Historical Preservation Commission has to sign off on any additional events. Haugen responded that the first draft didn't include the language highlighted in yellow on the staff report, and the Historic Preservation Commission didn't like not having input on the lighting decisions, so the second draft added in this language, and this was what was discussed at the December 8<sup>th</sup> meeting, and the language will be modified again in the new draft.

Haugen commented that it is his understanding that there will be something like eight parties that will be part of this agreement, and an e-mail will be sent out to all eight parties for each event, and will allow forty-eight hours for their response, and if they don't respond it will imply a yes vote, and any negative response means a veto of the request.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 21<sup>st</sup>, 2016**

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that the project was bid out, and there were several bids received. He explained that the bid from a Wisconsin firm was the low bidder, with a bid estimate considerably lower than what was programmed in the T.I.P., although there is a separate Engineer's cost estimate as part of the bid package that was different, but it was also higher than what the bid estimate was.

Haugen stated that staff is continuing to try to work out the detour routes and the signal timing plans to help make things go as smoothly as possible.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF 2018-2021 T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS**

a. FTA 5339 Capital Program

Kouba reported that this is a yearly grant program that we solicit projects for in conjunction with the NDDOT. She stated that they are basically capital projects for transit, bus and bus facilities.

Kouba said that they only received one application from the Cities Area Transit; and includes purchasing a couple of replacement buses and doing some maintenance projects for the transportation facility.

Kouba referred to the staff report and went over the projects briefly.

***MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE FTA 5339 GRANT APPLICATION FROM CITIES AREA TRANSIT AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE MPO LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND TO GIVE PRIORITY RANKING, AS SUBMITTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: Malm.***

***Abstaining: None.***

***Absent: None.***

b. TA Program

Viafara reported that staff is seeking approval of the Transportation Alternative application from the City of Grand Forks' Engineering Department.

Viafara stated that the application is for three shared use paths: 1) 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue North from North 40<sup>th</sup> Street to the English Coulee; 2) 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South from South Columbia Road to South 20<sup>th</sup> Street; and 3) South Columbia Road from 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue South to 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South.

Viafara commented that these paths afford a number of benefits for the communities, particularly access and connectivity to important destinations such as schools, etc.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 21<sup>st</sup>, 2016**

Viafara said that at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting last Wednesday, a recommendation was made to the Grand Forks City Engineering Department that they enhance the application by making some small changes to the language. He stated that this was done, and as a result we have a revised application included in today's packet, and the Technical Advisory Committee and staff are asking this body to approve the TA application.

***MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVE APPLICATION FROM THE GRAND FORKS CITY ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE MPO LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND TO GIVE PRIORITY RANKING, AS SUBMITTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstaining: None.***

***Absent: None.***

- c. HSIP Program
- d. Urban Program
- e. Regional Program

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

Presentation ensued.

Haugen commented that earlier this fall we solicited projects to consider for inclusion in the 2018-2021 T.I.P. He said that we are looking at any changes to the current T.I.P. projects, plus there is always a new year added at the end.

Haugen referred to a map and pointed out the area that we are responsible for, adding that it includes the surrounding rural area as well. He said that anything that needs to have federal input needs to be included in our T.I.P., which is a twelve month process.

Haugen stated that FAST still has unknowns upon us; for one thing, and we discussed this back when we solicited these projects, is that this current T.I.P. cycle is not subject to full FAST regulation, but by the end of May 2018, everything from that point forward will have to be fully FAST compliant.

Haugen commented that we will focus on the HSIP, Urban, and Regional projects; but he did want to mention that there is a Recreational Trails component as well that is due at the end of December. He said that if there are any projects for this program you will act on them at your January meeting.

Presentation continued.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 21<sup>st</sup>, 2016**

Haugen pointed out that there were two project submitted for the HSIP program: 1) Columbia Road, which is being split into two phases; and 2) Grand Forks County Road 5 and the intersections of Demers and 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue.

Haugen reported that there were no possible changes identified on the current T.I.P. program; so we are now going into the new year. He stated that with the availability of the additional \$1 million dollars there was a possibility that we could try to squeeze projects in to each individual year, but the City is requesting it all go into a new project in the new year, and that is the North Columbia Road project.

Haugen reported that we are again submitting the reconstruction of the Washington Underpass. He said that this was our 2020 request, but it was not funded, therefore it is again being requested in 2021.

Haugen referred to a drawing illustrating what the project could look like, and went over the alternative concepts briefly, explaining what, if any, properties might be impacted with each alternative, as well as the cost estimates for the shoo-fly structure and the cost of any property acquisition that may be necessary for each.

Haugen stated that the projects beyond the one year on the North Dakota Regional side, at this time will be a project that was requested by the City of Grand Forks to upgrade our traffic signal system on the North Dakota side. He commented that the cost estimate of \$6.2 million is just for the regional roadways.

Haugen reported that last year what was identified as the one year beyond project was work on North Washington just north of the underpass, but that is not being requested this year.

Haugen said that these are, essentially, the four projects that will be considered in the T.I.P.; the two HSIP projects – Columbia Road and County Road 5; the one Urban Local – North Columbia Road; and the one Regional – Washington Underpass.

Haugen stated that both the Technical Advisory Committee and staff are recommending the Board approve these projects as being consistent with the Long Range Transportation Plan and in in the priority given.

Grasser asked if the DOT was going to be waiting until we get through the concept development phase before they determine whether to put that turn lane in or not for the Washington Underpass. Haugen responded that they will make that determination when they get to the project development phase. He added that it will also depend on how the feds come down on whether or not, the way it is worded in our study is that if the CFI is not going to be done in the near future, then they should do the southbound turn lane, but if the CFI is going to be done in the near-term they wouldn't do it.

Grasser asked when the Long Range Transportation Plan Update was due to be completed. Haugen responded that it will be completed by the end of 2018. Grasser said that this question will probably be answered in the next Long Range Transportation Plan, as far as planning the turn lane, which should proceed when they get the concept report done.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 21<sup>st</sup>, 2016**

Grasser commented that just to follow-up, this is a prelude to what they will probably be looking for on the urban side, the traffic signal updates, because they are looking at doing a system-wide and so the City, looking ahead, would probably ask for an urban aid project on the city side to match the regional side so it all gets done with one package when they update their software, hardware, and structures.

***MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE HSIP, URBAN AND REGIONAL PROGRAM PROJECTS AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE MPO LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING, AS SUBMITTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: Malm.***

***Abstaining: None.***

***Absent: None.***

Vein exited the meeting.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE 2017-2018 UPWP TO CARRYOVER THE I-29 TRAFFIC STUDY**

Haugen reported that up until noon yesterday this was going to be, he thought, a fairly simple straight-forward request to amend our work program. He explained that when we adopted the work program last year, we inadvertently did not carry the conclusion of this study into the next year, and if we don't have it in the program all activities would not be eligible for funding.

Haugen commented that he has some information he would like to share that came about yesterday may cause an adjustment with this item. He referred to a power point presentation, and stated that he would first like to recap what activities we agreed to have KLJ do for us. He went over the list briefly.

Haugen reported that we are currently concluding this micro analysis, and just to recap, the difference between the macro and the micro analyses is that the macro involves doing these large regional-wide tests of what, say an overpass at 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue means to our system, and what an interchange or overpass at 47<sup>th</sup> or 62<sup>nd</sup> would mean; and from this analysis we can start figuring out if they make things better, or if they really did improve anything or just added cost without much benefit, and from that analysis we could narrow things down. He stated that a micro analysis is where we get into more refined simulation modeling, and we start really looking at the various options in more depth.

Haugen commented that this is something that we have done in past studies, although we didn't have quite the graphics we do with this study, but it is something that we have been allowed to do; however this time, when we were presenting the micro analysis report to the committee, which Federal Highway is a member of, they raised a concern that this is not planning anymore, this is project development, and so since December 9<sup>th</sup> they have been trying to work out this issue, but have not yet been successful, and the project has been suspended until January 9<sup>th</sup> when a meeting can be held to discuss it further.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 21<sup>st</sup>, 2016**

Haugen stated that we do still need to amend the work program because the only thing that is being questioned as to whether or not we can finance is the micro analysis, which the work has already been done, but we still have to do the rest of the steps needed to complete the study that we have under contract with KLJ.

Powers asked if we are in a contractual timeframe with KLJ. Haugen responded that initially the contact was to end early fall of this year. He said, though, that we have done two amendments to the contract; the first one was for the Alerus Event Center Traffic Impact Study the City of Grand Forks paid for; and the second one was because Federal Highway wanted to know about 62<sup>nd</sup> Avenue alternatives, so when we amended that into the contract we extended the timeframe into next year; so our contract obligation is now March of 2017, but he thinks in the work program we are asking to extend it to the end of the first half of the year.

Further discussion ensued.

Grasser commented that the issue of moving from planning into concept development is an issue that they struggle with a number of times, so on one hand he thinks it is good to try to have some of that discussion at a federal and state level. He said that he thinks micro analysis is something that needs to happen; and added that we look at this kind of analysis, but don't necessarily get fixed on every element associated with it, and recognize that some of it still has to be worked out at the concept development stage, but it is a struggle sometimes to define what the line is between planning and concept development.

Grasser stated that the analysis was really coming on strong supporting the 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Interchange, so it seems to him that the micro analysis will be more and more critical, even more critical than originally thought, and is an important element in the project, so he hopes this can be worked out. Haugen explained that if we had not gone into the micro analysis, we would still have had to conclude that there is the alternative of working on the exiting interchange that would satisfy the need, that is what the macro analysis was indicating, and that is what Mr. Grasser is getting into.

Haugen explained how the micro analysis works, and how it helps determine what the best alternative might be for a project. He said that there is no doubt that it is a great tool, and that it is a necessary tool to really get us to the point where we are making informed recommendations and plans. Grasser commented that he thinks this was still a necessary part of the process, and that it provided some really valuable information for us.

Haugen reiterated that as he explained, the first three work activities have had work done, and there is no question of whether they are eligible for planning dollars; but the micro analysis work is 95% complete, but they are questioning whether it is eligible for planning dollars. He added that the next two stages are eligible, so again, the only question being worked out at the January 9<sup>th</sup> meeting is who is paying for the micro analysis cost, which is \$50,000 of the \$250,000 total budget.

***MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE AN AMENDMENT TO THE 2017-2018 UPWP TO CARRYOVER THE I-29 TRAFFIC OPERATION STUDY.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstaining: None.***

***Absent: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF RFP FOR ORIGIN/DESTINATION DATA**

Haugen reported that this is a consortium of the three MPO's in North Dakota going together to purchase origin/destination data. He explained that as staff has been presenting you with the Travel Demand Model update process, we did inform you that we would be seeking GPS gathered data, and this RFP will be the vehicle to obtain that data.

Haugen stated that the NDDOT allows us two things: one is to allow us to go as three parties, which saved us at least 30% on the total cost, individually; and then they also allowed us to use funding from the monies that they de-obligated last year for 80% of the cost of this, so there is no impact to our work program.

Haugen commented that Bismarck/Mandan is the lead agency on this, so the RFP is in their format, and it will go through the North Dakota required obligation base selection process.

Haugen said that another unique thing they are asking is, based on the timing of this, that the board authorize staff to select a consultant, and also allow them to execute the contract.

DeMers asked if the geographic scope of each of these individual areas is the MPO boundary, the City boundary, or what. Haugen responded that there will be three geographical scopes, one for each MPO. He said that our MPO will include additional area outside our study area; so we will capture some data from a wider network to get a better understanding of our external to internal traffic trips and where they are coming and going from as well as all the trips inside our metro area.

DeMers asked if the monitoring was active or passive. Haugen responded that it is data that will have been collected from October of 2015. He explained that all of our other data, our street network, is being representative of what was in place on October 2015. He added that North Dakota, in particular, did traffic counts in October 2015, so this O/D data will be historic from October of 2015 as well. DeMers asked if it was passively collected, or did people have to subscribe to collect it. Haugen responded that it is passive.

DeMers asked if there was any question on the validity of the data, or is there a mechanism to adjust for the capture mechanism. Haugen responded that that is part of the proposal to have the various vendors prove their data's worthiness, and that will be part of the selection process.

Grasser commented that he is assuming that when you say to allow staff to select the consultant and to negotiate; would you describe who staff is and how that may interact with others. He said

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 21<sup>st</sup>, 2016**

that he is assuming that this is actually going to be more of a group selection. Haugen responded that there will be a representative from the NDDOT, the three MPOs, and ATAC.

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE RFP FOR ORIGIN/DESTINATION DATA, AS SUBMITTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstaining: None.***

***Absent: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF MINNESOTA NHS INTERMODAL CONNECTORS**

Haugen reported that as described last month, MnDOT is reviewing and updating what are designated as NHS Connectors. He explained that these are roadways that lead to major facilities such as airports, train depots, etc. He said that in our case, in our metro area, the sugar processing plant is our main facility.

Haugen referred to a map of the area and pointed out that the roads shown in black are the existing NHS Connectors, and the ones in red are the proposed NHS Connectors. He went over the information briefly.

Haugen explained that the reason we are encouraging the designation of the proposed roadways is because, from the revenue side of life in the federal program, the NHS areas is where the bulk of the funding is programmed, so if there is a need to do major improvements, or even minor improvements, where the money is is where he thinks you want to have your facilities if you can, so the Technical Advisory Committee, and staff, is recommending forwarding to MnDOT for consideration of adding these proposed roadways; US Business #2 and 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.E.

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE DESIGNATION OF THE PROPOSED MINNESOTA NHS INTERMODAL CONNECTORS, AS SUBMITTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstaining: None.***

***Absent: None.***

**MATTER OF TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN UPDATE**

Kouba referred to a power point presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request), pointing out that they are at mid-point in the update, and gave a brief history of what has been done to-date.

Kouba commented that just recently they brought forward the draft proposed changes to the routes that we have been talking about. She went over the proposed changes, and cost estimates briefly.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 21<sup>st</sup>, 2016**

Kouba stated that the goal is to reduce the 60-minute headway we currently have for most of our services to a 30-minute headway so that people are more interested in riding.

Presentation continued.

Kouba reported that in addition to the proposed route changes there are some additional capital needs as well including purchasing an additional coach for Route 3; structural maintenance improvements for the transit garage at nearly an \$8 million cost; and realigning bus stops and shelters.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

a. 2016 UPWP Project Update

Grasser said that he would just like to thank Mr. Haugen for the additional information on the Long Range Transportation Plan Update. He explained that he asked at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting if a schedule could be added on the Long Range Transportation Plan Update as it is difficult to always remember what sections of the plan have been completed, what is currently being worked on, and what remains to be done for the 2018 update.

b. Planning Rule Amendment

Haugen stated that he did send everyone an e-mail about the latest planning rule amendment. He explained that the impact to the MPO isn't as great as it is to other MPOs in the nation, but there is an impact. He said that what is now required is that the Planning Agreement we have with the NDDOT and MnDOT included a dispute resolution process, and having just completed our Communications Plan we may have satisfied that; however that is the only thing under the new rule that directly might impact us. He added that the other purpose of the rule is that when you have a very large continuous urbanized area, where you may have three or four MPOs controlling the area, the rule now requires that they all get together and produce one transportation plan and one T.I.P. document, but there is quite a large uproar from State DOTs and other MPOs about this rule.

c. State Audit Results

Haugen reported that we talked about the State Audit that North Dakota just concluded on us, and it was a good audit, but one thing that might impact you directly is your lunches. He explained that they are questioning that expense, so...the question is how do we pay for those lunches. He said that we are currently using 80% federal funds to pay for them, and they are asking us to further justify and document that expense.

Haugen stated that with the Federal Audit one of the things they required us to do, and we all as staff went to Bismarck in November and met with the head federal staff member that makes these decisions, and the question was asked about lunch, and from her perspective it was an allowable expense, so now it is getting in to what the State is interpreting, not just perhaps just federal regulations, but some State practices that they allow. Powers commented that he would question that just because these meetings are held over the lunch hour.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 21<sup>st</sup>, 2016**

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Powers adjourned the December 21<sup>st</sup>, 2016, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board at 1:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager